25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Dale Jirousek, the Pastor of the Berwyn United Lutheran Church located in Berwyn, Illinois. Reverend Jirousek is a guest of Representative Judy Topinka. Would the guests in the galleries please rise and join us in the invocation?"

Reverend Jirousek: "Before the invocation, I would like to send greetings from the people at Berwyn United Lutheran Church to all of you and to your families. Let us pray. Almighty God, the Members of this hall come from many different families, not unlike the families that are represented in our entire state. The gift of the family comes from God. Families are called to love, care for and respect each other. This, too, is a family, families made up of men and women, Republicans and Democrats, people from all parts of Just as our families are called to love, care state. and respect each other, we know that this family is called to care for one another and their people, to respect one another and the opinions represented here, and above all, to love one another as God continues to love us. We ask Your blessing upon the deliberations here today. We ask that wisdom would prevail and that in the minds and hearts of the people here, that good would be done for all of our people in this state. We ask all these things then in the name of God. Amen. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Bopp."

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."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Is Representative

 Topinka in the chamber? Mr. McPike, are there any excused

 absences?"
- McPike: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the record indicate that Representative Henry, Representative Rea and Representative Vitek are excused because of illness?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that those Representatives are excused. Representative Vinson, are there any excused absences?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representatives Bbbesen, Ralph Dunn, Barger and Representative Jane Barnes."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that those Representatives are excused. Have all recorded themselves who wish to be recorded? The Clerk shall take the record. There being 103 Members responding to the Attendance Boll Call, there is a guorum present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Steczo, Chairman of the Committee on Counties and Townships, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 443 and 605; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 603; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 510: tabled in Committee, House Bill 397. Representative Van Duyne, Chairman of the Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Bill 293; 'do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 470. Representative Terzich, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 223 and 'do not pass' House Bill 480; 'do pass as amended' House

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Bill 331, 332 and 488: 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 498 and 505; 'be adopted' House Resolution 77 and 81 and House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #5. Representative Satterthwaite, Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following Bills referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Bill 511; 'do pass as amended' House Bill 422; 'be adopted' House Resolution 84. Representative Farley, Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Commerce, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: adopted! House Resolution 47. Representative Pierce. of the Committee on Revenue, to which the Chairman following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 467 and 524; 'do pass as amended' House Bill 43: 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' 426.

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, Introduction and First Reading." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 837, Ralph Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 838, Pirst Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 839, Hensel - Wojcik - O'Connell - DiPrima and Hawkinson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize county boards of several counties in Illinois and various probation departments thereof to develop programs of public service employment. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 840, by Representative Steczo and Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency Act. First Reading of the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Bill. House Bill 841, Brookins, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 842, Hastert and Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 843, by Bepresentative Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. Ladies and Gentlemen, at this time, if you would direct your attention to the podium, we have with us some special guests from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And for the purpose of introduction, I now recognize Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to introduce them individually. Now we have Paul 'Peterson', Junior Vice Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. That is State Junior Vice Commander, and he's from Loves Park, which is ia suburb of Bockford. And we have another distinguished Gentleman here from Rockford, and I bawled Zeke Giorgi out this morning, because he didn't make the dinner. He told me he had so many affairs to go to, and he wanted to please be excused. I did it reluctantly. Иe also have Dwight 'Tanner', and he's from Rockford. He's the Senior Vice Commander of the Department of Illinois. Then we also, of course, have Bob Mitchler here, a former Senator and my former right arm in the Senate. And then we have Walter 'Luxrup' a past Department Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars right over here. Very dear friend. And the honoree last night was none other but our own, my chauffeur, Roger McAuliffe. And last but not least, I want to introduce the Department Commander, George Kramer, from Cicero for a few words. George Kramer."
- Kramer: "Thank you, Representative DiPrima. There's a couple other people I'd like to recognize before I say anything.

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

First of all. I'd like to recognize Representative John O'Connell, who just happens to be one of my assistant legislative aides in the state. John. Okay, and I'm originally from Cicero, and had I known that Judy Topinka was going to be the State Representative from that area, would not have moved out to Woodridge. So Judy ... I certainly want to thank those of you that did attend our banquet last night. And just to give you forewarning, years from now we're going to do it again. We do it every two years, and this banquet is in your honor. And we this because we are proud of what you have done for the And once again, I'd like veterans in Illinois. ŤΟ Representative Roger McAuliffe for congratulate what...getting the award from us, and we thank him for his 11 years in the House Veterans Affairs Committee and the job that he has done for the veterans in Illinois. my pleasure to represent the 107.000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Illinois and the 45,000 members of our Ladies! Auxiliary, and we would just like each and every one of you to know that even though our time is up having served our country when we were called upon, we have not given up the fight to retain our democracy in this country and a strong national defense. And we thank you for what you have done for the veteran in the past, and we hope that you will consider any veterans. legislation in the future. Thank you."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Commander. There's one fellow here I missed. His name is Christopher Tsilis, and he's from Sam...no, he's from Peotone, but he was originally from Vrdolyak's Ward. Sam. There he is. Yeah, anyway, alright, on the way over here I was telling these comrads about how you fellows have always supported veterans' legislation and how I was particularly thrilled with the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

new Members. They are a bunch of young kids, but let me tell you, they are just as American as apple pie. And the exuberance they show when I mention a veterans piece of legislation warms the cockles of my heart, believe me. And I was telling these fellows that we don't have to worry, that our country is in good hands. You've had the proper bringing up. Your patriotic spirit shows it. And I want to congratulate all of you. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Johnson seek recognition?"
- Johnson: "Well, just as long as we're on announcements before we get started, the Members of the House of Representatives basketball team would like to gloat in the aftermath of a six point victory last night over the staff. Tough game, good performance by the staff, but we prevailed 65 59. We have three or four games left, including one with the lobbyists, one against the Senate and one against the Pages. Particularly for the game in the Senate the 13th, we'd really like to have some people come out. We had a good time, and I think everybody would enjoy either participating or watching the game."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page three of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar there appears House Bill 137. Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call House Bill 137? It's on page three of the Calendar. House Bills Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 137, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

 Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

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

25th Legislative Day recognition?"

March 24. 1983

- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that was introduced as a result of the Law Revision Commission. It's a very thick, luminous Bill, and we have not had a chance to fully go over the Bill. The Sponsor indicated that he would hold it for us."
- Speaker Madigan: "There's a request from Mr. Cullerton to hold the Bill, and Mr. Terzich exceeds to the request. So the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. For what purpose does Mr. Vinson Seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Would you represent...recognize Representative Friedrich please, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Friedrich seek recognition?"
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a 30 minute recess for the purpose of a Republican Conference."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich, must we do that immediately, or could we call some Bills?"
- Friedrich: "At your convenience, Sir."
- Speaker Madigan: "Yes. Okay, fine. Thank you. On the Order of House Bills Second Reading, House Bill 21. Representative Topinka, do you wish to call your Bill? Is Representative Topinka on the floor? For what purpose does Mr. O'Connell seek recognition?"
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I am the hyphenated Sponsor of this measure. We have an Amendment that's being distributed.

 If we may hold it and call it when it's available or return back to that."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let me just check...Mr. 0.*Connell, I believe you requested that the Bill be left on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. 0.*Connell."
- O'Connell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we may return to it when the Amendment is distributed."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. We...we can return to the Bill later in the day."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there has been a request

by Representative Friedrich for a Republican Conference.

Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "In room 118 immediately, if it is convenient for you,
Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Priedrich. And the Chair recognizes Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a Democratic Conference immediately in room 114."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich, would one half be hour sufficient? Fine. So the House shall stand at ease for Party Conferences. All Members should the purpose of return to the floor at approximately 1:15. 1:15. all Members would go to Party Conferences, Republicans to room 118, Democrats to room 114. Thank you. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. On page three of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Second Reading, there appears House Bill 21. Representative Topinka. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Topinka — O'Connell, amends
House Bill 21 as amended with reference to the page and
line number of House Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Topinka: "If I might, Mr. Speaker, and defer to my Joint Sponsor,

Representative O'Connell, to..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment clarifies an issue that
was raised by our staff yesterday. The original Bill, as
amended out of Committee, provided for three situations in
which the number of percentage signatures for a referendum
would be reduced from 25% to 5%. What the Amendment and
the Bill as amended failed to do was to clarify or address
how...what percentage signatures would be needed if a
precinct were to go completely dry to completely wet. And
what the Amendment #2 does is to indicate that where the
proposition to be placed on the ballot is to go from a
situation of completely dry to completely wet, it would
require 25%. It is a clarifying Amendment, and I would
move that it be adopted."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Representative O'Connell, also in your Amendment I believe you use the phrase 'alcoholic beverage', and you strike some reference to alcohol with 4%...beverages with 4% alcohol content. Could you explain that please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Cullerton, we discussed that with the staff yesterday. The language in the Bill as amended referred to alcoholic liquors, and then it addressed alcoholic liquor above or below a .04%. In discussing with the staff and reviewing the Chapter 43 of the...where the Dram Shop Act addresses the guestion of alcoholic liquors, that language after the words 'alcoholic liquor' was, in our opinion, surplusage and did not change the...the meaning of our Bill and did not change the effect of any of the statutes which address the guestion of

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

alcoholic liquors. So, we left it as it was."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 46. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Cullerton indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 67, Mr. Ropp. Mr. Ropp indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 203. Mr. Olson indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 208. Mr. Saltsman. Is Mr. Saltsman in the chamber? House Bill 230. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 230, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in regard to Attorney Generals and State's Attorneys.

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

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

Clerk Leone: "No Notions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Terzich, amends House Bill 230 as amended."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the request of the Attorney General's Office, we adopted an Amendment in Committee which was technically incorrect. And all Amendment #2 does is make that correction. It's just a technical change."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

adopted? . All those in favor signify by saying "aye", all those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On page four of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 244. The Clerk informs the Chair that the fiscal note has not yet been filed relative to that Bill. For what purpose does Mr. Johnson seek recognition? Mr. Clerk, leave House Bill 244 on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 255. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call that Bill? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 266. Representative Nelson, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 266, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 267. The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 268. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 268, 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?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Cullerton, amends House Bill
268 on page two and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of the Amendment?

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 268 has to do with the practice, the procedure of taking a photograph of some evidence that going to be used in a criminal case, in certain criminal cases. And it says that ... the current law says that if the items that were stolen were taken from a person who holds a retail occupation tax, that they have 14 days...that is, the defendant has 14 days after his arrest to file a Motion to allow for the evidence to be presented itself and not allow for a photograph. Now what the Bill does is expand this to cover items that were taken from anyone. And what my...and what the Bill also says is the defendant has 30 days after the arrest to be able to obtain this evidence. Now what the Amendment does is to say that this 30 period, rather than start after the day after arrest, the day period should start after the filing of information or indictment. It is after an information or indictment has been filed that the defendant has an idea as to what evidence it is that he's...will be used against him, and he as 30 days at that point to file a petition saying that a photograph should not be used and he wants to identify the item himself. The reason for the distinction that if a retail merchant, they have items in stock, similar items. The defendant can go and review and look at But with...say someone was charged stealing a television set from a house, and the question might be whether or not it was worth \$300 or not. The defendant should have the right to look and inspect and see what that item is and whether or not it is worth \$300 or So, I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in opposition to Amendment #2, because I am House. presenting to you today in House Bill 268, a Bill that with victims* rights. It is supported by the Coordinating Council Against Organized Auto Theft and other groups in the state that are working to maintain a reasonable balance between those groups that support defendants' rights, as does Mr. Cullerton, as does Representative Cullerton, as do I, and those who are interested in seeing that there is also a balance for victims. 1 think that Representative Cullerton has explained the purpose of the Bill perfectly well, and I'm not going to go into that. But I would like to just remind him that the language that is the language of this year's House Bill 268 was his language last year. And at that agreed. when he put Amendment 2 on House Bill 2617, to precisely the language that is in the Bill without Amendment #2. House Amendment #2 by Cullerton that was adopted May 11th by this House, makes the revision that notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection B of this Section, 'A court may, if a Motion so requesting is filed by the defendant before expiration of the time period specified, order the law enforcement agency to hold such property as evidence. For all other property, the time period shall expire at the earlier of 30 days after the arrest of the defendant or at such time as the finding of probable cause. Since Representative Cullerton suggested that language last year, and since it was adopted by this House, I do not quite understand his reasons for wanting to expand the time this year. And I would ask you to join me in voting against Amendment #2 to House Bill 268."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Johnson: "Just a question, John. Does...does your Amendment establish in its 30 day measurement from the period of arrest, I mean, from the period of indictment or information apply only to non-retail merchant situations?"

Cullerton: "That's correct. I do not change the current law with respect to the retail merchants' items. That's still 14 days."

Johnson: "It's still...from the date of arrest."

Cullerton: "Right."

Johnson: "Well, I am going to support your Amendment, but doesn't
it seem logical to extend those...at least the same
protection if...even with a lesser period of time, at least
the same information or indictment protection in the case
of retail merchants? Fourteen days is an awful short
period of time after arrest to appear in court."

Cullerton: "Well, I agree with you. I agree with you, but that is the current law. I didn't want to change the current law by Amendment. I do think there's a distinction between items that are in stock that you can go and inspect similar, like items that are stolen, for example, are taken from a store as opposed to some item that is taken from someone's house or someone on the street."

Johnson: "Unless you had an antique that is sold by an antique..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Yeah, yeah, just addressing...just addressing the

Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Sir."

Johnson: "I support Representative Cullerton's Amendment to require someone to react within a short period of time of the date of arrest, which oftentimes becomes meaningless in the whole criminal process, and then to allow the use of photographic evidence which, in a good many cases, is not

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

nearly as probative as the item itself. And to allow an individual to have his or her freedom jeopardized by criminal conviction by photographic evidence, I think, without giving a reasonable notice, reasonable opportunity to petition the court for the preservation of the item itself doesn't make sense. And I think accordingly, Representative Cullerton's Amendment does make sense. don't think it does great damage to Representative Nelson's Bill, which really directs itself to the problems of ordinary citizens who want to get their property back. think that's a worthy objective. That was the reason for the Bill last year with respect to retail merchants, and I think her Bill, for the most part, would be preserved and rights of victims strengthened, even with this t he Amendment. And yet, the Amendment at the same time, balances out the whole process and is fair to everybody. So. I certainly respect her opposition. think John Cullerton has a good Amendment, and it ought to be supported."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to Mr. Cullerton's Amendment, because it does not account for the differing treatment in prosecutions between misdemeanor and felony. It is typical - at least in DuPage County, am sure throughout the entire state - that information or indictment is not the method of charging misdemeanors. method charging misdemeanors the of Typically, complaint. That complaint is made and filed at the same as the arrest is made. I believe that the second problem with the Amendment is that a 30 day period from the date of a finding of probable cause will serve Cullerton's purpose, and at the same time, will serve the interests of the Bill as a whole. Under Illinois law,

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

is required that an attorney be present for probable cause hearing at the defendant's request, regardless of his indigency. Therefore, an attorney is involved at that stage of the proceedings. Requiring the 30 day period to run from the date of probable cause, therefore serves the Sponsor's goal and does not do violence to the concept Cullerton's trying to pass. Therefore, I propose that the Amendment be defeated, and the reason is because it violence to the Bill. It does not serve the function of Mr. Cullerton's purpose, because that is served by the current language of the statute. The attorney is involved. The attorney is present at the probable cause hearing. This is the first practical time in a felony prosecution that the attorney is available. Thirty days from that date is the proper time. It does not account, also, for misdemeanors which are not charged by information or I think the Bill serves the purpose of Mr. Cullerton to protect defendants, but also to give the defendants an opportunity to view the evidence. that the Amendment should be defeated as unnecessary."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 58 'ayes', 45 'nos'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Jaffe seek recognition? Okay. Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 275. The Clerk informs the Chair that the fiscal note has not yet been filed; therefore, this Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 317. Mr. Jaffe, do you wish to call

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to your Bill? 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 394. The Clerk informs the Chair that the State Mandate's Act fiscal note has not yet been filed relative to this Bill; therefore, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill Huff, do you wish to call your Bill? House Bill 455. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Saltsman, you're a princi...you do not wish to call the Bill? On page four of the Calendar, House Bills Third Reading, Short Mr. Debate Calendar, there appears House Bill 33. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Do you wish to call your Bill, Mr. Cullerton? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." "House Bill 33, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with that are paid to court appointed counsel. Right now in every county other than Cook County, lawyers appointed...when lawyers are appointed other...to represent indigents in criminal cases other than public defenders, they are paid a reasonable fee. That's all the statute But in Cook County, we have not only a cap of a \$1,000 in felony cases and \$150 in misdemeanor cases, also have an unreasonably low hourly rate of \$20 per hour outside of court and \$30 per hour in court. So, initially attempted to have the Bill make Cook County have the same rules as applies to the rest of the state. But there was opposition from some people in Cook County, so we put the cap back into the law. There is a cap of \$1,000 for felony cases and \$150 for misdemeanor cases, but we

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

eliminate the unreasonably low hourly limits, hourly rates. So for that reason, I think it is a good piece of legislation, and I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Ropp."

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

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

Ropp: "Mr. Sponsor, do you think maybe we're going in the wrong direction here? Maybe we ought to take...put the cap on downstaters so that all those people don't have to spend so much money for attorney fees."

Cullerton: "Well, that's up to you. Right now there's..."

Ropp: "But don't you think that'd be a good idea in the essence of saving dollars?"

Cullerton: "I don't like to, you know, come downstate and tell
you what...your counties what to do too often.
Occasionally it's necessary, but..."

Ropp: "No, I know that."

Cullerton: "In this case, I don't care. Your counties, if they don't want to have a cap, that's up to them. It has to be approved by a Judge. Reasonable fees have to be approved by a Judge. Apparently your Judges down there are kind of conservative and don't like to give out a lot of money to attorneys in the first place. So..."

Ropp: "Well, I was kind of thinking of those constituents in Chicago. I didn't want them to be overcharged. But since you said that a Judge has to give the okay, I assume Judges are all above board in Chicago and would handle that in good shape."

Cullerton: "Absolutely."

Ropp: "Good. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

pass?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 12 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 139. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 139, a Bill for an Act to repeal

 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Br. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill from the Law Revision Commission, which repeals a Section which had provided for fees now prohibited by the Constitution. Article VII of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 expressly forbids compensation of officers of local government from the collection of fees. This Section also forbids payment of fees based upon the levy of extension of taxes, and it just repeals an obsolete and unconstitutional Section."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 106 "ayes", no one voting "no". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 140, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes. Again, this repeals another Section of the Revenue Act which received unanimous consent from the Judiciary Committee 16 to nothing. The Bill repeals

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Sections 2 (A) 28-1 and 28-2 and 3, which no longer can be used, and it was recommended by the Department of Revenue."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 286, Mr. Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 286, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Steczo."

Speaker, Members of the House. Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Bill 286 would allow a local school district to include the cost of converting a bus gasoline engine to a more fuel efficient engine as a direct cost that is claimed for It's transportation claimed reimbursement. reimbursement, I should say. Under present circumstances, if this is done, school districts take that as depreciable claim which is extended over a period of ten This would allow them to get that claim or that reimbursement back in one year. A fiscal note was filed on this Bill indicating that the average cost of doing this is approximately \$1,200. And the fuel savings alone would range from 40 to 60%. The maintenance cost would range from approximately 50%, and the Bill would have no direct fiscal impact until Fiscal Year 1985. The Bill received a to nothing vote by the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, and I would ask for a favorable vote." Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is now being distributed." Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of this

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

Bill. The Bill is on the Order of the Short Debate Calendar. Is there anyone who wishes to stand in opposition to this Bill? Representative Pullen, are you seeking recognition?"

Pullen: "I'd like to ask a question if I may."

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

Pullen: "You said, if I heard you correctly, that this doesn't have any fiscal impact until Fiscal '85. What is the fiscal impact then?"

Steczo: "The fiscal note filed by the Office of Education indicated that they were not able to tell how many of these engines would be converted, and they seem to say that any fiscal impact would probably be minimal, because the engines wouldn't all be converted at the same time. But as opposed to the increases in fuel and maintenance, that within a year to a year and a half after the program was effective, it would more than pay for itself."

Pullen: "Isn't it the case now that school districts may apply for reimbursement for this and that the state spreads the reimbursement over a period of years?"

Steczo: "The...presently, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, it's a depreciation expense that is taken over a ten year period of time. So, for instance in the case of an engine conversion that would cost approximately \$1,200, that would be \$100...or \$120, rather, per year. It's the feeling of the Office of Education - and this Bill is part of their particular legislative package - that by allowing the reimbursement claim all at once, it would encourage more school districts to do that, thereby reducing their fuel and their maintenance costs, which then would present less of a drain transportation claims and reduce OB transportation claims over the long run."

Pullen: "Do you know how many school districts have already

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

converted?"

Steczo: "No, I do not."

Pullen: "But this would make a faster pay-out for the state in terms of reimbursement under this program, would it not?"

Steczo: "Beimbursement for those districts that own their own buses. However, it's impossible to say, and probably would not happen, that all the districts who own their own buses would automatically decide to convert them the same year. So, it would be a process that would...that would, you know, be borne over a period of years in terms of the

Pullen: "But it would be a faster pay-out for the state than under the current system, would it not?"

Steczo: "It may be."

conversion itself."

Pullen: "Because you're paying it in one shot instead of over ten years. Is that not the case?"

Steczo: "You're paying in one shot over ten years, but you also have to couple that with the decreases, the 40 to 60% decrease in fuel costs, as well as the 50% maintenance cost reduction that would be...that would be...that you'd be dealing with, too. And in addition to that, the reimbursement...the transportation reimbursement claims that we do have are prorated. So in terms of the amount of dollars, technically there may be more. But if the...the claims are prorated anyway, then we...the state would really not be required to go over and above a certain amount."

Pullen: "So you really can't tell us what the fiscal impact to the state is going to be?"

Steczo: "Representative Pullen, only because the Office of Education filed a fiscal note. They had no idea as to the exact fiscal impact."

Pullen: "I just think that we should all know that, Sir, that the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Office of Education, that is going to be administering this, doesn't even know what the fiscal impact will be.

Thank you."

Calendar. Representative Steczo has spoken as a proponent of the Bill. Is there anyone who stands in opposition to the Bill? There being no one standing in opposition to the Bill, the question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 103 'ayes', 5 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 404, Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 404, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to development and utilization of water power.

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Third Reading of the Bill."

Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Van This Bill is very, very simple. It simply change the ... changes the length of time that the Department of Transportation can lease land to someone. In this case, it happens to be four little towns: Rockdale, Marseilles, Peru and Channahon, and they have spoused some view that they want to go into a...hydro-electric power. reason why they need the extension of time is so they can sell the bonds with which to build the power plant. there....it's...that's as simple as I can tell you. If...the current law is five years, and they want to change it to 50 years, so that they can sell the bonds with which to build the power plants. That's right. And I'd be glad to answer any questions. And if there are no questions, I just ask you for your favorable vote."

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Van Duyne has spoken as a proponent to the Bill. Is there anyone who stands in opposition to the Bill? There being no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Matijevich in the Chair. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill of the following title to wit: House Bill #327, together with the attached Amendment, which has been printed, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Passed by the Senate as amended March 24, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the House Speaker,
 Michael Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a Motion filed with the Clerk. Would the Clerk read the Motion?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. 'Pursuant to Rule 79 (D), I move to change the Order of Business to concurrences to consider House Bill 327. The Amendment has been reproduced and distributed on the Members' desks.' By Bepresentative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this

 Motion relates to the Bill, which will now carry the

 Amendment, that would provide for the adoption of the

 settlement on the question of unemployment insurance. The

 Bill has already been passed by the Senate, and I am

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

proposing that we move to a consideration of the Motion to concur immediately, and I so move. n

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook as moved that we change the Order of Business for the consideration of the concurrence of an Amendment on House Bill 327. Is there any discussion on that question? If not, those in favor of the Motion signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are 107 voting 'aye', no 'nays', and the Motion carries. We have now changed the Order of Business for immediate consideration of House Bill 327. On the Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Mike...Michael J. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to move that we concur in the Senate Amendment to this Bill. Amendment contains the agreement which has been reached between representatives of business and labor at Governor's mansion. The agreement does not answer every problem in this area. It provides for an increase in tax upon employers, and at the same time, a decrease in benefit for employee. It does provide that Illinois can begin to retire the 2.4 billion dollar debt to the federal unemployment insurance system. It will provide that there will be changes in the U.I. benefit level and tax structure here in Illinois, which will permit Governor Thompson and Senator Rock to continue their negotiations with Senator and Congressman Rostenkowski in the Congress seeking to provide some further relief for t ho Illinois Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund i n terms of the...penalties and/or the current interest charges which are being placed upon Illinois for future borrowings. This is agreed by all parties to the negotiations. I wish to compliment the Leadership and the work of Governor Thompson

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

in this effort. Also Representative Daniels and Representative Vinson who represented Representative Daniels at the negotiations, and finally Senator Rock and Senator Philip, because this is truly a cooperative effort by the Governor, the Legislature and those parties external to the Legislature. I move that we do concur in the Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 327. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, the Minority Leader, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, let me first start by congratulating the various parties that took part in the negotiations in terms of a settlement of a very difficult problem. Let me offer my congratulations to Speaker Madigan and his thanks for his efforts, to the Governor, to Senator Rock and Senator Philip in terms of a very, very difficult problem and, perhaps, highlighting a Legislative Session in terms of the solution of the employers' trust fund debt. I can truthfully tell you that there are many items contained in the settlement that cause me a great deal of concern, and I can truthfully tell you that there are many business groups in Illinois that are going to be disappointed in terms the bills that they receive and the payment of their obligation under the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. But on the other hand, I can truthfully tell you that the giving of business and the giving of labor is, perhaps, historic in the state, because both groups sat in a session, and in the true spirit of compromise, offered their solutions to an extremely, extremely difficult problem. Although it does not present to us all that maybe Speaker Madigan would like or that I would like, it does present an opportunity to resolve the differences and to

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

create a balanced Insurance Trust Fund, with some hopeful results out of a problem out of Washington where we can have an excuse of some of the difficulties that we are facing and the penalty interest. But all the parties that we are dealing with now can live with this solution. consequently, what I am saying to the Members on my side of the aisle and the Members on the other side of the aisle, is that I have offered my endorsement to this, because it is the best conclusion that we can come to and a very difficult problem. I want to join the Speaker in supporting this Amendment and hopefully join all of you in the passage of this Bill so that we can go on and continue to resolve some of the difficult problems that we face in this Legislative Session. So, Speaker Madigan, I think that we have started in a Session once again, which you and I are dedicated to to resolve some of the difficult problems of the state, and I am glad to join with you in endorsing this proposal. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I guess, I should congratulate the Speaker for the job well done, and the Minority Leader for bringing this package together. However, I think it's only fair that to remind the people in this Body that it's a shame that it took approximately seven years to do what we're doing here today. When nobody wanted to listen back in 1975, and labor on one side and business on the other side were too stubborn to come to grips to promote what we have here today, through the effort of our Speaker and the constant meetings with the Governor and the meetings of the business people and the union people, I think they realized — only to find out after — so many of the little businesses

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

had went out of business, so many of our industrial plants have moved, and we finally came and saw the light. I is a lesson to us and to them, too, that perhaps when they're so one sided without any compromise in sight, when we had to go from the bottom of the ladder of a state that was not fair with unemployment comp, to way up on top, and we couldn't reach a happy medium. It took us seven years, but we did it. And, hopefully, from this day hopefully. forward. we'll DOAS on. And. another legislation will be able not to make the same mistakes we did with the workmen's comp and the unemployment comp and perhaps save what we already, hopefully, just saved. Thank you. "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the previous speaker just mentioned some of the problems that have existed since I think if those of us who were here 1975 Session. back in those days - if we'd research the transcripts - we would find that the Members here present back in those days would have been warned that some of the problems that we have experienced in the last seven or eight years were predicted as a result of some of the legislation that was passed through the House and the Senate back in those days. Be that as it may, the legislation did pass back then, and it projected many of the problems that we have experienced during that interim period, not only on this subject, but on the subject of workmen's comp as well. In 1981, I participated in the mansion conference, which came up with some agreements on the unemployment insurance problems. think those were laudible; however, the economy has been such that not all the problems were solved. We got out some of the problems that was salutary, but the problems

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

just kept coming at us. The federal debt, the debt to the Federal Government has been astronomical, as we all know. I think this agreement, even though it is not what we had wanted. because it is an expensive package business, it is expensive from the standpoint of the beneficiaries. I am reluctant to support it on some score, but on the other hand. I think we have no alternative this point but to support the Amendment and concur in the Amendment to this package. I would only hope that the Members who are relatively new can understand what an agreed Bill process really is. It functioned in *81. It's functioned in *83. I would hope that it's an indication to the Membership that the agreed Bill process can properly, not only on this subject, but on other subjects involving labor and the business communities. And I hope it would be a prelude to future negotiations on other matters of importance and of meaningful dialogue to not the laboring people, but also to the business community. I would hope that we could get to some other subjects and sit down and agree on a package, rather than try and resolve the problems in this Body from legislative standpoint, because in years past, the agreed Bill process has functioned well on both U.I. and workmen's comp, and I would hope that we could get at some of the problems in the same way. I would offer concurrence to the Amendment and ask that, even though is expensive, that we don't have any alternative. It's the only show in town, so to speak, and I ask for your support to the Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."

Tate: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise this afternoon to not only discuss what I think is a

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

solution that will make no one happy, but also I think it's an appropriate time that we also reflect upon the problem on how we arrived at the situation we're at today. of the previous speakers have alluded to a package that was passed in this very same chamber in 1975. And I think that when we go back and look at the problem today, we're looking at a problem that has been created because the State of Illinois has had a policy that provided open-door policy to virtually anyone that wanted to collect unemployment benefits in the State of Illinois, people that quit their jobs, people that were fired voluntarily employees. We had one of the highest benefit levels in the country. And many of the previous speakers have alluded to the solutions in the past few months that have been adopted by other states and the differences of percentages. etcetera. And I can only point out that one example, one of our neighboring...or one of our other major industrial New York, for example. New York today is not borrowing from the Federal Government. And the reason New York is not borrowing from the Federal Government, New York has a lower benefit level. I think today what has finally come home, is the chicken has come home to roost. ¥е provided for a system with very liberal benefits. But yet, someone had the shortsightedness, unfortunately. forgot that they had to pay for that system. Today we are looking at a program that will cost Illinois employers an additional billion dollars over the next few vears. program that for the hundreds and thousands of Illinois citizens that are unfortunate not to have a job today, that are unfortunate to be on unemployment insurance, that we're going to ask them to live at a little bit lower standard of living that they ve been acclamated to. And I think the lesson that we all have to learn today is that there's no

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

free lunch in this state. Not only...someone eventually has to pay the bill. And the best example, and I think an example that we all need to take home today, is that right now today, we have a 14 billion dollar budget in this state, and today we have 2 billion dollars in Committee alone that is over that budget that we prepared. And so today every...tomorrow, we're...for the next few months when we go to those Committees, and we sit on the House floor, and we vote on additional scholarships or whatever it will be, we have to realize that the day will come that someone will have to pay the bill. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 327?". Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', and...and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall now go to the Order of House Bills on Third Reading, and we will pick up where we left off yesterday. So the next Bill to be called would be House Bill 337, Mr. Friedrich. Mr. Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "I would like not to call that now, please."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 356, Mr. Hannig. Do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 356, a Bill for an Act to exempt resident disabled veterans from admission to camping and camping fees in parks. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
 Bill as amended would provide that disabled veterans would

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

be entitled to free camping fees and camping permits at the Department of Conservation run parks here in Illinois. would only be applicable to disabled veterans who were Illinois residents. And the total disability is the same total disability definition as provided by the Secretary of State in his issuance of disability drivers plates. frankly, I would have preferred that we could have given each and every disabled veteran of any magnitude free of our state parks. But because of the fiscal problems we do face, the Department of Conservation feels - and I agree - that we cannot give...give this all away. So proposal would be a step to help some of those veterans, for example, who have incurred great loss, the loss of arm, or a leq, or both, or someone who is so severely disabled that they are confined to a wheelchair or crutches. I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 356. Mr. Ropp."

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

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

Ropp: "Yeah, Representative Hanniq, I applaud you for this interest in this matter, but I think a couple of Sessions ago, we had the problem where senior citizens had this same kind of exemption, and eventually we changed it, they could only use that during the week. And the person who was employed during the week would have the weekends free. Are you stating, under this Bill, that disabled veterans can stay at reduced fees in a campsite for seven days a week, week after week, and possibly deprive someone who cannot go to a campsite other than on a Friday night, or Saturday or Sunday, from maybe having a spot to camp out?"

Hannig: "What you're saying is basically correct, except that in

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

order to qualify for the exemption, one has to be an Illinois veteran who is permanently disabled. That is, he has to have lost the use of one leg, or both legs, or one arm, or both arms or be confined to a wheelchair or crutches. It would not be available to every veteran in the state, nor would it even be available to those veterans who are partially disabled, and yet, would not gualify under this provision. So while what you're saying is true, I do believe that the impact would be very small."

Ropp: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brunner: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Brummer: "The current law provides for free camping for an individual who is disabled already. How does this change that definition?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "This clearly defines, in law, what a permanent disability is, at least in the case of a veteran. I believe that as far as the law is concerned, there is some question as to disability. And certainly that is subject to interpretation by...by some of the bureaucracies here in the state. So what I'm trying to do is draw it in the law clearly what is a disabled veteran."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a guestion, Sir."

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

Pullen: "Can you tell me how camper fees are charged at parks?

Are they charged by the individual or by one person representing himself as the leader of a family or other group being charged for that group?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "I'm not certain as to that answer, to be quite frank

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

with you, Representative, but in this case, in order to qualify, one would have to present to the Department or to the state park employee a certificate and proper identification to ensure that people who are not entitled to the benefit would not be taking advantage of the state."

- Pullen: "My concern, Sir, is whether this is...it makes a great difference in terms of the revenue impact on whether campers are charged individually and only the individual disabled veteran, in a particular party, would end up not paying a fee, and all the other people in his party would pay the fee, or whether this would have the effect of exempting an entire party which has a disabled veteran in it. That would have a substantial effect on the revenue impact, would it not?"
- Hannig: "The Bill says and this is directly from the Bill —
 'Every veteran who is a resident of Illinois' and then goes
 on. It would be my interpretation that that would apply
 simply to a veteran and would not necessarily be extended
 to every one of his camping party, for example."
- Pullen: "Well, it would if the fees are charged by the individual. But if they are charged by the party, and the veteran is the leader of the party, then the party would be exempt. Is not that the case?"
- Hannig: "If the Department of...if the Department of Conservation takes the position that they charge by the party, and that then this person would be exempt, perhaps your case would be true. The Department of Conservation would determine how they would assess the fees."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Eill please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Pullen: "It's my understanding, having just been told by someone standing at my elbow, that the charge is by the site. So,

I believe that what this would end up doing is exempting

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

completely the fee for any party that had within it a disabled veteran. Charges by the site certainly would be more than charges by the individual, if camping parties were charged by the individual. And perhaps that is Department of Conservation estimates that this Bill would cost the State of Illinois at least \$100.000. in sympathy with the Sponsor's intent and with the people who would be benefitted by this Bill, certainly. But I think at this time, a revenue loss of at least \$100,000 from any program by singling out one group of people and giving them a benefit over all others who participate in not the right policy that that program, is #e would...should be pursuing. So I am going to have to vote against the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I know it is difficult for any Member of this House to vote against a Bill that would benefit a disabled veteran. But the truth is right now they are closing camping sites in my area, because there's not enough money to operate them. You may not realize when these campers move in, that it involves a lot of expense. The garbage has to be hauled. They furnish the light bill. And I remember how the senior citizens abused this thing. One guy that I knew...happened to know can pay, he was bragging that he had his deep in his trailer, and he also had his T.V. set. move in there for a week and let them haul his garbage, and pay the light bill and everything else. Now, those things may be nice for those who can have them, but if we're going to have campsites for the people of this state comparable to others, it's got to take revenue to do it. And every time you take off \$100,000, they are going to close another campsite or two that won't be available to you or anyone

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

else. I think it's a bad time to be cutting off any revenue to the Department of Conservation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig to close."

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

As was stated, the Bill would have a very small impact on the overall 14 billion dollar state budget, which we will address specifically in the weeks to come. This Bill is simply an attempt to try to help those veterans who, through service to their country, have lost an arm, leg or simply are confined to a wheelchair or confined to crutches. I really wonder how often we will find these people coming out there and staying day after day after day. I suspect that in most cases, they will come to a state park, perhaps to stay a couple of days and enjoy themselves. But simply because of the limitations that they do have by definition, I would not expect them to be there on such a long-term basis that they would cause abuse to the system. The Department of Conservation, the people that administer the program, would have in their power and do have in their power, the way to set up the pricing structure so that perhaps that they can get around the problem of disabled veterans bringing in large groups, which I really doubt that they'll do. The Bill basically addressed to try to help the small group of people who have given a large part of their life for this state and for this country. I hardly think that a \$100,000 is going to break the State of Illinois. It seems that this amount of money falls through the cracks in our treasury day in and day out. I believe that it is for a just cause and a good cause, and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 33 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 374. Hr. Neff, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Neff. Mr. Neff."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Neff: House. House Bill 374 makes a change in the involuntary manslaughter. At the present time, this is a Class III felony. Two-fifths of a year and up to \$10...two five years and up to \$10,000 fine. But involuntary manslaughter, if committed with a motor vehicle, wreckless homicide, is only a Class IV felony, one to three years and up to \$10,000 fine. Now most of us feel that when a person's killed by an automobile or whether we shoot somebody, it is still a death...created. And this Bill would correct that and would make it the same as if we killed somebody...lawful justification, that would determine the penalties, since the end result is the the taking of an innocent life. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 374. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 3 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 384. Mr. Birkinbine, do you

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the
 House to return this Bill to Second Reading to remove
 Committee Amendment 1 and to consider a replacement
 Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to take this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Cullerton Birkinbine,
 amends House Bill 384 on page one."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. First, I would ask leave to table Amendment 1
 adopted in Committee. Amendment #2, offered by Mr.
 Cullerton, includes the same language, but does it in a
 more correct fashion."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Birkinbine, are you requesting leave to table Amendment #1?"
- Birkinbine: "Yes, I am."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to table Amendment #1. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Amendment #1 is tabled. Mr. Clerk, are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 by Cullerton and Birkinbine."

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

 Bouse. Amendment #2 fleshes out and gives, in substantive

 Bill form, language that presently exists only in an
 appropriations Bill that provides for the Speaker of the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

House and the President of the Senate to reimburse Members of the House and Senate for trips that we may take down to Springfield to work on weeks when the Legislature is not in Session. It also includes the language that I had attempted to put in Amendment #1 that was adopted in Committee and includes it in a more correct form. I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 384. Is there any discussion? There 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'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Birkinbine, do you wish to call the Bill today?"

Birkinbine: "If...with leave of the House, I'd be glad to."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to consider House

Bill 384 today, the Bill having been amended. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Proceed, Mr. Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I just described, the Bill now includes substantive language that is needed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to be able to reimburse Members of the House and Senate for trips taken to Springfield on weeks when the Legislature is not in Session. Additionally, it provides language, and the original purpose of the Bill, that will allow Members to be able to lease towards purchase equipment for their district office. You may know that presently out of the \$17,000 that we are allotted, technically, we are only permitted to lease equipment, desks, file cabinets, typewriters,

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

whatever. Theoretically and technically, this would mean we would have to lease, in perpetuity, any such item of equipment that we would want to use, thereby using up our \$17,000 and spending actually money far longer than the item of equipment was ever worth. This is intended to correct that problem and allow us to pay for an item up until...lease it up until it's fully paid for and then end such lease, thereby allowing us to use that money for newsletters or whatever else we might need to do with it."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 384. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Priedrich."

Priedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Friedrich: "Representative Birkinbine, the only question that comes to my mind, suppose that you were elected, and some time next summer you decided you'd buy a \$600 typewriter or a desk, then you don't run for re-election. Who does the desk or typewriter belong to? The state or you?"

Birkinbine: "If you had a lease ongoing..."

Friedrich: "No, I'm talking about the purchase."

Birkinbine: "You mean fully. Okay, it would automatically become the property of the state. I don't change that law at all."

Friedrich: "Okay."

Birkinbine: "There is a state law affecting equipment either purchased here by this Body or by us back in our district offices. That stays the same. I don't change that at all."

Priedrich: "If it is purchased by home office expenses, it still becomes a property of the state?"

Birkinbine: "Yes."

Priedrich: "Thank you."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?

Representative John Dunn."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative John Dunn."

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

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

- Dunn: "Will this Bill now permit us to purchase items outright
 with our legislative allowance, or only enter into lease
 agreements which will result in title to the leased
 equipment at the end of the lease."
- Birkinbine: "It could be done either way. I used the example of lease towards purchase, because given the cost of some items, it makes more sense, at least to me. But, yes. In answer, yes. You could out right purchase something in one fell swoop."
- Dunn: "And does...does the Bill as amended still provide that at the...at the end of a Legislator's term, the...the property can be turned over to a charity or must it be turned back to the state?"
- Birkinbine: "No. I exempted that out. I did not realize that such property automatically was taken care of under existing state law. It is, so I removed that initial language that I had in the Bill that referred to leaving it either to a charity or whomever followed you in that seat. So, I just exempted that language altogether because existing state law already provides for it."
- Dunn, John: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr.
 Birkinbine to close."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 88 'ayes', 11 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 447. Mr. Hannig, do you wish to call your Bill? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. On page five of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Third Reading, there appears House Bill 1. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. 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 certain

Acts in relation to jurors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Ar. Speaker, I would ask leave to bring House Bill 36

back to the Order of Second Reading. The Legislative

Reference Bureau has recommended an Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to return this

Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an

Amendment. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill

shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,

are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Cullerton, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, apparently, inadvertently when this Bill was drafted it had...it would have had the effect of eliminating a Bill that was passed by Senator Geo-Karis having to do with guilty-but-mentally-ill verdicts. So, this Amendment puts back into the law that Section that was inadvertently withdrawn, not that I am in favor of that Section, but I would like to inadvertently withdraw it, but it's not

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

fair. So, we'll do that with another Bill. So, this puts back the law and the special verdict of guilty but mentally ill."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 36. On that question, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm impressed with Mr. Cullerton's sense of fairness to that and would only have one question in regard to the Amendment. And that question is, you'll recall that either you or Mr. Getty, I don't know who makes those rulings, but someone ruled that an Amendment somewhat earlier in this Session was out of order because the language is set to insert in the Bill was not underscored. And I note, in regard to Amendmennt #2, that the language is not underscored, and I wonder if we don't have to have consistent rulings on those things."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson bas posed a question of parliamentary procedure. The Parliamentarian will examine respond. question and Mr. Cullerton. the Parliamentarian has informally informed me that you have a problem here. Maybe you'd like to discuss the problem with the Parliamentarian, and the House can...but not the that was raised. But we can move on to some other So, this Bill shall be taken from the record, and the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Beading. House Bill 49. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 49, a Bill for an Act making the terms

 of Judges appointed to fill vacancies uniform. Third

 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has to do with the filling of

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

vacancies. If a vacancy occurs less than 60 days before a primary election in the Office of Judge, the Supreme Court can fill that vacancy for the second general election after that appointment, so that the Supreme could theoretically appoint someone to be a Judge for up to 33 months. And all this Bill does is to change that to the next general election. It stands for the proposition that if we can have someone on the ballot and have an election, we should have that as soon as is possible. So, that's what the change is, and I would ask...be happy to answer any questions and ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House 49. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 87 'ayes', 16 'no'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 55, Mr. Yourell. Is Mr. Yourell in the chamber? House Bill 79. Mr. Wolf, do you wish to call your Bill? The Gentleman indicates 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. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brookins."

Brookins: "Mr. Speaker, what this Bill would do is give the clergy and parishioners the same protection which our police officers, teachers and nurses have. It will create an aggravated battery when a worshipper is assaulted on church property. I ask you to give them that protection."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Bill 114. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting *no*. Mr. Brookins, is this your first Bill? The Gentleman responded affirmatively. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, are 85 'ayes', 17 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 169. Mr. Terzich, do you wish to call your Bill? 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. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. This Bill simply all aggravated kidnapping a Class X felony. Currently, there's a number of forms of aggravted kidnapping, but the only form that's a Class X is where it's done for ransom. There's at least four categories that are equally serious in nature that are only a Class 1: where the victim us under 13; where the kidnapper inflicts great bodily harm or an additional felony on the victim; where they're armed with a dangerous weapon and so on. This just simply brings the law in conformance with what's common sense. I think it passed 12 to nothing with three present votes in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, would you clear the scoreboard? Is there any opposition to this Bill? There being no opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

question there are 103 'aye', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 172. Mr. Johnson, do you wish to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Is Representative Preston here? Because he's my hyphenated Chief Cosponsor on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Is Mr. Preston in the chamber?"

- Johnson: "Out of deference to Representative Preston, because this is a meaningful Bill to him, I...I want to give him an opportunity to vote on it. I don't think it's controversial, but I don't want to vote on it without him here. He was here just a minute ago. So I guess we'll take it out of the record."
- Speaker Madigan: "At the request of the Sponsor, the Bill shall be taken from the record. House Bill 187. Representative Currie, do you wish to call your Bill? The Lady indicates she does not wish to call her Bill. House Bill 233, Representative Currie. The Lady indicates she does not wish to call her Bill. House Bill 257. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call your Bill? Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. Representative 30... House Bill Bill 307. Representative Topinka. House Mr. Is Mr. Birkinbine in the chamber? Birkinbine. Mr_ Birkinbine indicates he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 319, Representative Jaffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, and Mr. McPike will be in the Chair."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 319, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law relating to industrial home work. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

- Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, in the never-ending saga of House Bill 319, when we adopted Representative Younge's Amendment yesterday, the Clerk's Office informed us that there was a problem with it technically; and therefore, I would like to bring this back to Second Reading for the purpose of taking that Amendment off and putting another Amendment on in good form. In addition, there are two terrible Amendments that have been filed by Representative Piel and Representative Vinson, and we want to give them a chance to hear those Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe has...has asked leave to return House Bill 319 to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? There are objections, Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would then move to bring it back to Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe moves to return House Bill
 319 to Second Reading. Is there any discussion? The
 Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised by this move. I suppose, in part, because the Sponsor, the mover has always been perhaps the leading advocate in this General Assembly of putting Bills in proper form when they're in Committee. Now, we have seen some remarkable draftsmanship on this floor on this Bill. I believe this is the third time we're moving this Bill back from Third to Second, and I'm concerned that this process may go on forever. And I think the easiest way to deal with it is to leave the Bill on Third Reading, consider the contents of the Bill, and people can vote their conscience on the Bill as it now stands. And, for those reasons, I would oppose the Motion and ask people to vote 'no'."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Hastert."

- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in support of the Sponsor of this Bill, he took it out of the record the first time at our request to get it in order, to get some Amendments that we could live with, and the second...yesterday, we amended the Bill, and there was some problems... The Sponsor of this Bill really has acted in good faith, and I would like to see him be able to take this Bill back and get it in the shape that he'd like to have it."
- Speaker McPike: "On the Motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "I move the previous question. I...I just move the previous question so we can get on with this thing."
- Speaker McPike: "Fine. Representative Jaffe to close."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's obvious that I've been trying to accommodate the other side. I've tried to accommodate Representative Hastert, Representative Koehler, a number of other people. I talked to Representative Tuerk yesterday. He is the Minority Spokesman on this particular Committee. I've tried to accommodate the other side. I'm sorry that they don't...do not talk to their Leadership, if that's in fact what they call it. But, nonetheless, I would like to have an 'aye' vote, bring it back to Second Reading and let us move ahead with this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe has moved to return House Bill 319 to the Order of Second Reading. On that guestion, all 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 question there are 66 'ayes', 33 'nos', and the Bill is returned to Second Reading. Representative Jaffe on a Motion."
- Jaffe: "I would now move to table Amendment #3 to House Bill

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

319. "

- Speaker McPike: "On that Motion, is there any discussion?

 Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #3. All those in
 favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have
 it, and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Piel, amends House Bill
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I was really shocked by the Sponsor of this Bill when he made such disparaging remarks about the Amendment in all good faith that I turned in. But, I'm willing to talk to him about this, and I would ask, at this time, that I withdraw Amendment #4."
- Speaker McPike: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Younge Jaffe, amends House
 Bill 319 as amended by inserting...."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the Amendment that's necessary to put the language that Representative Younge wanted in the proper place. So this would say that Subsection G does not apply to producer cooperatives and this Section...Well, that's basically it."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, on the Amendment."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you gain the attention of the Parliamentarian, because we have a serious problem here."
- Speaker McPike: "State your problem."
- Vinson: "What the Sponsor of this Amendment did just prior to this action was to table Amendment #3. Amendment #3 inserted into the Bill the language, "This Section does not

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

apply to producer cooperatives. Amendment \$5, which he now proports to offer would delete language that says, 'This Section does not apply to producer cooperatives'. Because of that, his Amendment \$5 is out of order, because it attempts to remove language which is no longer in the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "We will stand at ease for a ruling from the Parliamentarian. We don't have the Amendment here. Could we have the Amendments so we can make a ruling? Representative Vinson, your point is well taken. The Amendment is out of order. Representative Jaffe, what is your wish?"

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would just prefer to go on with the Bill.

Let's get it in final shape and..."

Speaker McPike: "You want to leave the Bill on Second Reading?"

Jaffe: "Well, I think there are a number of Amendments that are being filed on this particular Bill that are really sort of dilatory. I would rather just move on with the Bill, get it on to Third Reading and then let us drum with it."

Speaker McPike: "Fine. Purther...Further Amendments, Hr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might propound a parliamentary inquiry prior to that..."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Am I correct in believing that, at the time the parliamentarian had to make the ruling that he...the Clerk was unable to supply him with the Amendments on the Bill? Is that what part of the problem was there? Was the Amendment actually filed?"

Speaker NcPike: "Yes, the Amendment was filed and distributed.

The Bill was physically not here, and we got the Bill. The

Amendment was filed and distributed."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Vinson: "Okay."

Speaker McPike: "On Amendment #6, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Jaffe, in his Bill, has brought to us a special problem. Some people are for resolving the problem in the way he wants to, and some people are against it. And that's a policy issue the Legislature always has to deal with. What I seek to do is to try to minimize the damage to families that would be caused by the Bill. What would result if the Bill is passed is that we may have the position...the situation where particularly certain women who have been able to do their work at home are now required to do their work in the sweatshop. And, if they we got to go to that sweatshop, they may not be able to take care of pre-school children at home. Now, if he wants to put them in the sweatshop, that's one way of dealing with the policy issue. But, I would just like to have an exemption for those ladies who are the parents quardians of pre-school age children so that they are not forced to go to the sweatshop too, so that they an still stay home and do their work and take care of their kids. And I would move for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this Amendment. This really makes it applicable to everybody, and this Amendment, as well as the others, are just typically anti-labor Bills of the worst kind, and they...all that it attempts to really do was to try to gut the Bill. So, I would oppose this Amendment, as I will the rest of the Amendments that are really just being filed to be dilatory and to try to be anti-labor."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from DuPage,

Bepresentative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was not going to say anything on this Amendment because it appeared to me that the significance and the impact that this Amendment would have would be obvious to all the Members on the floor. However, I could tell from the remarks of the Sponsor of this Bill, in his opposition to this Amendment, that he is more interested in activities other than those kinds of activities which would keep families together. This particular Amendment merely addresses the issue of men or women who are parents and guardians of pre-school age children."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Representative Hoffman. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Preston, rise?"

Preston: "I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "State your point."

Preston: "The previous speaker was speaking on the Sponsor and not to the Amendment. He was making attacks on the Sponsor of the Bill. Rather than addressing the Amendment, he prefaced his comments with saying, 'I'm not going to comment on the Amendment', and then started attacking the Sponsor of the Bill. I think that's inappropriate, and I'd like to know what the Speaker feels about it."

Speaker McPike: "Your point is well taken. Representative Hoffman, would you confine your remarks to the Amendment. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I should have enunciated my remarks a little clearly. I said I had not originally intended to speak on this Amendment, and then I proceeded to discuss the point that the Amendment makes, and that is that we are here exempting those people who are

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

parents or guardians of pre-school age children. Now, it seems to me, in the time in which we find ourselves that anything that we can do to strengthen and support and increase the solidarity of that most important social unit, the family, should be done. And that's what this Amendment does, and I would encourage your support of it."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some people have characterized this as an anti-labor Amendment. It's not. It's a pro-children Amendment. It's a pro-family Amendment. I would ask for a favorable vote, and I would ask the Speaker for a Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 43 "ayes", 58 "nos", and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Klemm, amends House Bill 319
as amended in Section 1."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #7 prohibits...the prohibition of the manufacturer of garments at home resulting from this amendatory Act of 1983 shall not apply to men or women who live 30 miles or more from a factory or company which manufactures any article of wearing apparel. Quite simply, in my area, which somewhat rural, we have to rely on RTA, and you know in the rural areas most of the services out there have been discontinued in spite of our taxes that we are paying. So, we have a problem where I can't hardly get my people to factories that are 30 miles away. It is a serious problem.

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

I look in the City of Chicago and look at 30 miles, which is half-way across the City, I can understand that it is a problem for people to get to their jobs. I can also see that these harsh economic times really prevent some of the people from seeking employment. As you know, this is an attempt, I think, to make reasonableness of letting those who are sincere in trying to find employment to be able to at least do the jobs to provide for their children, their families, and yet still not trying to take away the intent of the Sponsor's Bill. So, I think it's certainly not an anti-labor and not an anti-business. It's just, I think, an honest attempt to try to do something, and I would just ask for your support on the Bill."

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

Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker, I question the form of this Amendment, because, at least on my copy, after line 9 there is some obviously irrelevant language to this Amendment. It says taped and repeats lines 1 through 8 and says, 'Amendment to House Bill 319 as amendment (sic - amended)', proports to be an Amendment #8, and there's something on here proporting to be an Amendment #9. Obviously, this...none of this is in order with regard to Amendment #7. So, I would ask the Parliamentarian to rule that the...that this language is completely out of order and that this Amendment be moved out of order...ruled out of order."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I submitted the Amendment on a single sheet, a single form that would certainly have met the entire requirements. The...I think the Clerk, in trying to save some paper, has tried to just combine them, and I see nothing wrong with that. But, I don't think the objection is valid."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Klemm, your point is well taken. The original Amendment, as submitted, is in the correct form.

 On the Amendment, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, if you could hold that for just a minute.

 No one has had an opportunity to speak against the

 Amendment."
- Wolf: "That's the purpose, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved the previous guestion.

 On that point, all those in favor say "aye", all opposed.

 The "ayes" have it, and the Motion carries. Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm, to close."
- Klemm: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just think it is an improvement to the Bill. It harms no one with what we've done, and I would ask for your favorable vote. And I move to adopt Amendment #7 to House Bill 319 and ask for a Roll Call vote, please."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #7. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. To explain his vote, Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we have the votes to defeat this, so I'm not going to..."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the Amendment #7 there are 43 'ayes', 59 'nos', and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Tate, amends House Bill 319..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise this afternoon to offer Amendment 8. And for those of you

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

that are having trouble with your eye specs in reading the Amendment, I'll take the time to read this very brief *The prohibitions on the manufacturers of Amendment. garments at home resulting from this amendatory act of 1983 shall not apply to men or women who care for an elderly family member in their home. I represent a district that has parts of the City of Decatur and five counties in our surrounding area, and many of my constituents have to travel, and many...I have a very high concentration of senior citizens in my area. And with this, this would obviously provide for the attention and the protection that those people deserve. I'd be more than happy to respond to any questions that you may have, and I would appreciate your affirmative consideration."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment #8, the Representative from Madison, Representative Wolf."

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

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

All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye',

opposed. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries. The
question is put. The Gentleman from Macon to close,
Representative Tate."

Tate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is probably one of the biggest votes you'll have all year for a vote for the extended family. And this is very important to the protection of the extended family in this, and I feel very strongly on this. This gets down right down to touching of the moral fabric of our society today. And if we don't...if we don't learn to protect our grandparents and our children and provide for those, our health care costs and everything else are going to continue to escalate. So, I can only encourage you to vote 'yes' on this Bill, and I would like a Roll Call vote on that."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8. On that question, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Jaffe to explain his vote."
- Jaffe: "No, no. I don't want to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

 Speaker McPike: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, Amendment #8, there are 42 'ayes', 59 'nos'. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Mr. Speaker, it's quite apparent that there's not...Let me see. Is that 101? One hundred and one Members in this chamber. And if those people persist to punch these buttons around here...I can see 25 seats open right there, and there's 59 red votes. Now, we either dump the Roll Call and do it right, or we're going to verify this Roll Call."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate, have you asked for a verification of the Roll Call? The Gentleman persists in the verification. Representative Jaffe asks for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Barger. Barnes. Berrios. Bullock. Capparelli. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Hastert. Henry. Krska. Rea. Rice. Stuffle. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. No further."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stuffle votes 'no'. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the request and hope that the...I've illustrated my point that there's quite a few seats empty here today, and I would hope that the Members of this Body would vote their own switches. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "On Amendment #8, there are 42 'ayes', 60 'nos', and this Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Zwick."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Zwick."

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

With all due respect to Zwick: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Representative Jaffe, the intent of this Bill I really think anyone objects to, and if it did Representative Jaffe believes it did, we wouldn't be doing However, there is a sincere effort on our part to address some problems, and I...it's not dilatory. And it's not anti-labor. It's pro-people. Wе are genuinely concerned, Aaron, and what this Amendment does is basically the same as the other Amendments. The language is the same, except it applies to men and women who are the sole financial support of their family. We have tremendous numbers of unemployed people in this state whose wives are working doing this very thing that the Bill addresses. And I don't think that this Bill should apply to them. They are the sole financial support in their family. also widows, divorcees with young children, families to take care of who should not be included. I feel that should be exempted, and that's why ... that's the reason for this Amendment. I would simply ask your support of the Amendment and request a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

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

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

All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye',
opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. The Lady
from Kane, Representative Zwick, to close."

Zwick: "I would simply ask for some serious consideration on this Amendment and for your support and a Roll Call vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #9.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

wish? The Clerk will take the record. Amendment #9, there are 42 "ayes", 54 "nos". The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Piel."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Piel: If this Bill does go through in the way it was initially written up, there's going to be a lot of people who happen to be the sole providers in their home in one thing and another who are going to be forced to look for other areas of employment. A lot of them will go to local factories doing something similar, possibly, to what they are doing at home. And all this does is that, if a person does lose their livelihood at home because of this Bill and they are forced to go to a factory and do something similar or principally the same as what they are doing at home, then they would not be required to pay any association fees dues to any organizations or associations. I think this is very good, because the Bill would be a situation to where it would be pushing the people out of their homes, where they might go into hardship of leaving their homes and having to go into a factory environment to work, and it would be hurting them. And so, this would be saving them some money, the money basically they would be making at And I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #10." Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I just want the Members to know what they're voting for on this one. This is a mini right-to-work law that pertains only to the garment industry. That's what the Gentleman has. And, as a matter of fact, it's the same Amendment as Amendment #4 which he already tabled, and I would suggest to the Chair that it's dilatory in its

25th Legislative Day

- March 24, 1983
- nature. But I think we ought to have a Roll Call on that side of the aisle to see who wants to vote for right-to-work."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I would just ask for an affirmative vote on Amendment #10
 to House Bill 319, and I would ask for a verified...or an
 electronic vote, please."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. On that question, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On Amendment #10, there are 33 'ayes', 61 'nos'. Amendment #10 fails. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you check with the Clerk, I'll think you'll find that a request for a fiscal note was filed at least an hour ago."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. The Bill will remain on Second Beading for a fiscal note. On the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 36.

 Representative Cullerton. Bepresentative Vinson, if you will pay attention, this is on your point of order, and we'd like the Parliamentarian to address that."
- Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker, on the Gentleman's point of order, the Amendment #2 does not require underlining since it is reinserting in the law...in the Bill, rather, what is already the law which was inadvertently omitted in the drafting of the Bill. It should not be underlined. However, the Gentleman's point

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

would be well taken if the Gentleman were referring to the point at which it is inserted. The Amendment reads, 'on page 2, line 28 by inserting after the period the following'. There is no period in line 28. It is inaccurately drawn as 28. It should read 27. For that reason, however, the Amendment will be ruled out of order."

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

Vinson: "Inquiry of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "State your inquiry."

Vinson: "What...By what rule does the Parliamentarian rule that underscoring is not necessary in this particular case?"

Parliamentarian Getty: "It is the existing law which was inadvertently omitted in the drafting of the Bill which is being reinserted. It is not an Amendment to existing law."

Vinson: "Is...Is...Is there a particular rule in our rules which

applies to that situation?"

Parliamentarian Getty: "In the drafting of or the stating of

existing law, existing law is not underscored."

Vinson: "Is that by our rule or by the Constitution?"
Parliamentarian Getty: "That is by custom and usage."

Vinson: "I wonder, because of this custom and usage question and because of the fate of an Amendment offered bу Representative Nelson. if the Parliamentarian might consider preparing for Members a memo that would outline when underscoring is necessary and when underscoring is not necessary so that Members have that. And if the Parliamentarian would consider doing that, I would have no Representative Cullerton objection to amending his Amendment on the face to cure what appears to be a relatively minor defect. But I do think that every Member in the chamber is entitled to know what the ground rules are so that when they offer an Amendment, their Amendment

25th Legislative Day

March 24. 1983

will not be ruled out of order inconsistently with others or capriciously or whether just by their inability to understand what custom and usage has been in this chamber, they're not at peril."

Parliamentarian Getty: "In responding to that, first of all, on behalf of the Speaker, we would rule that that goes well beyond the scope of the Amendment before us, and you are making reference to a prior ruling by which the Chair was guided by the long-standing rule practice, also which was formerly the joint House/Senate rule which provides that the author of a Bill which amends a statute shall indicate the particular changes in the following manner: A) all new matter shall be underscored; B) all matter which is to be omitted or superseded shall be shown crossed with a line. Each Bill introduced shall be accompanied by nine copies. That is the old House/Senate joint rule which has been uniformly applied in this chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Vinson: "I have no problems with the Parliamentarian's ruling in this case. What I would point out is that there are no joint rules at this point. That is good authority for custom and usage, however, and his ruling would appear to be correct on the face. But I just wonder if he would undertake to distribute that particular joint rule so that all Members can do what's necessary to get their concepts offered and not offer them at their peril. And again I would say that I would have no objection to Mr. Cullerton's amending his Amendment on its face."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Vinson. Chair recognizes Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to amend Amendment #2 to

Rouse Bill 36 on its face by changing the number 28 to the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

number 27."

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has asked leave to change the Amendment on its face. Are there any objections? Leave is granted, and the change is made. Representative Cullerton on Amendment #2."
- Cullerton: "This Amendment, stamped by the LRB as a proposed LRB

 Amendment, reinserts into the Bill existing law having to

 do with verdicts of guilty but mentally ill. So, I would

 ask for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 36."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Reading is

 House Bill 172. The Chair recognizes Representative

 Johnson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

 Johnson."
- Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. Representative Preston is my hyphenated Chief Sponsor. In fact, he's the lead Sponsor on this Bill. This is a Bill...A couple of years ago, we passed an Act almost unanimously, Sponsored by Representative Preston, I believe, that made it an offense to threaten public officials. Among the categories included were Members of the Legislature, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General and certain other offices. This Bill does two things. Number one, it adds Supreme Court, Appellate and Circuit Court Judges to the

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

list of public officials that can't be threatened; and number two, it clarifies the law in that it requires that the threat to those Judges. Legislators and constitutional officials be in connection with their performance of their public duties or in connection with their job. That seems to make a lot of sense. The Bill passed out of Committee 14 to 1. Quite frankly, when the Bill passed originally, I have some...had some problem with it. But, if there's any group that's subject to threats and harassment connection with their job, it's Judges and, in particular, Judges who handle criminal cases, a lot more so than constitutional officers and Legislators. So. I won 1d submit that this Bill makes sense and ask for affirmative vote."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
Bill 172. On that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago,
Representative Mulcahey."

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

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

Mulcahey: "Tim, does that include threatening each other?"

Johnson: "Touche. Mulcahey and I are both going to jail."

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? No further discussion.

The question is, 'Shall House Bill 172 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On House Bill 172 there are 92 'ayes', 2 'nos', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. ...recognizes Representative Giorgi on the Adjournment Resolution."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of
Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following

Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #18, resolved by the Senate of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representative concurring herein that then the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 24, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 5 at twelve o'clock noon. I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Agreed Repre...Resolutions. Representative Giorgi."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resoution 120, Yourell. 121, Wojcik. 124,

 Topinka. 126, Giglio Steczo. Senate Joint Resolution
 17, Giglio."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Yourell's 120 notes a citizen of the year.

 121 by Wojcik talks about folk dances. 124 by Topinka, a
 golden jubilee. And 126 by Giglio is about a third place
 for Thornton and the same thing as Senate Joint Resolution
 #17. I move for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. Is there any discussion? No discussion. The question is, "Shall the Agreed Resolutions be adopted?".

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

 The "ayes" have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 For what reason does the Gentleman from Bureau,

 Representative Mautino, rise?"

Mautino: "For purposes of an announcement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Mautino: "I'd like to announce to the Members of the Select
Committee on Small Business, there will be no meeting after

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

adjournment today."

Speaker McPike: "Death Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 122 by Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of the passing of Kanesha Braxton.

 House Resolution 123 by Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Isiah Bates. And Senate Joint Resolution #15 by Representative Taylor, with respect to the memory of the mother of Cecil Partee."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Besolution 22 by Reilly and Matijevich, and House Resolution 125 by Representative Steczo Doyle Braun Slape and Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignments. The Chair is ready to adjourn. Are there any further announcements?

 Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until Tuesday, April
 5th at twelve noon, but to give the Clerk ten minutes
 perfunctory time."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved that the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 5th, the hour of twelve noon, allowing the Clerk fi...ten minutes for perfunctory.

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

 The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill #177, passed by the Senate March 24, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #15, Senate Joint Resolution #17 Senate Joint Resolution #18, adopted by the Senate Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Committee March 24, 1983. Reports. Representative Wolf, Chairman of the Committee on Personnel and Pensions to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 23, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 366, 387, 532, 533 and 682; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 242, 291, 295, 417, 514, 564 and 596; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 483. Representative Jaffe, Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 24, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 412 and 349; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 108, 276, 277 and 280. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 844, by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 845, Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 846, by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the 847, by Representative Berrios and House Bill Hutchins, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to the regulation of lending practices. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 848, Topinka - Mautino, Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Non-profit Health Care Service Plan Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 849, John Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill Breslin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code Administration...in the... Civil the Civil of in the State Finance Act. Administrative Code First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 851, Breslin, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Set Aside Pheasant Stamp Fund for the use by the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 852, McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Chicago World's Fair 1992 Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 853, Olson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act. First Beading of the House Bill 854, Pierce - Topinka, a Bill for an Act Bill. in relation to funeral directors and embalmers. House Bill 855, McAuliffe, a Bill for Reading of the Bill. an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First House Bill 856. Didrickson -Reading of the Bill. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election First Reading of the Bill. House Bill Didrickson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Campaign Disclosure Law. First Beading of the Bill. House Bill 858, Virginia Frederick, a Bill for an Act in relation to surrogate parenthood. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 859, McMaster, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 860, Saltsman, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Retirement Fund Article of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 861, Reilly - Barnes - Matijevich, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 862. Bullock - Olson - LeFlore - Hutchins - Hawkinson, a Bill for an Act to require a prison population impact note for certain Bills. First Reading of the Bill.

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

863, Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act in relation to the fingerprinting of minors for identification purposes. First House Bill 864, Keane - Curran -Reading of the Bill. Koehler and Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to public utility taxes. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 865, Hawkinson - McCracken - Homer - Daniels - Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 866, Flinn. Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to township purchasing. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 867. Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metro East Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the House Bill 868, Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend Rill. Sections of an Act in relation to public water districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 869, Slape, a an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 870, John Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 871, Bowman - Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 872, Bowman - Currie a Bill for an Act in relation to certain Greiman, organizations which discriminate. First Reading House Bill 873, Bowman - Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 874, Reilly - Barnes - Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to provide for the re-plating of motor vehicles. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 875, Bullock -Brookins - Hutchins - LeFlore and Rice, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 876, Levin - Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act

25th Legislative Day

March 24, 1983

to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 877, Levin - Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 878, Levin - Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 879, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 880, Ronan, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Wage Payment and Collection Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 881, Breslin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 882, Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Highway Advertising Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 883, McPike, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Anyone have any other Bills for introduction? No further business. The House now stands adjourned."

01/30/84 13:40

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

MARCH	24,	1983
SECOND RI		

HB-0021	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING		
		PAGE	17
HB-0036	RECALLED	PAGE	42
HB-0036	OTUTO	PAGE	60
HB-0049	THIRD READING	PAGE	43
HR-0114	THIRD READING	PAGE	44
			_
HB-013/	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	6
HB-0139	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
HB-0170	THIRD READING	PAGE	45
	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
HB-0230	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
HR-0266	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
HB-0286	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
UP_0210	RECALLED	PAGE	48
HB-0319	NOTION	PAGE	47
HR-0327	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
	MOTION	PAGE	24
HB-0356	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
	THIRD READING		
		PAGE	37
HB-0384	RECALLED	PAGE	38
HR-0384	THIRD READING	PAGE	39
HB-0404	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
HB-0837	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
77 D 0000	DIRON DELETHO		
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HB-0839	PIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HB-0841	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0842	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0843	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0844	FIRST READING	PAGE	67
	FIRST READING	PAGE	67
	FIRST READING	PAGE	67
HB-0847	FIRST READING	PAGE	67
	FIRST READING		67
		PAGE	
	FIRST READING	PAGE	67
HB-0850	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
	FIRST READING		
		PAGE	68
	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
HB-0853	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
	FIRST READING		
		PAGE	68
HB-0855	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
#R-0856	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
HB-0858	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
	PIRST READING		
		PAGE	68
HB-0860	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
#R-0861	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
HB-0862	FIRST READING	PAGE	68
HB-0863	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
	FIRST READING		
MB-0004	FIRST REAUING	PAGE	69
HB-0865	PIRST READING	PAGE	69
HR-0866	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
	PIRST READING	PAGE	69
HB-0868	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
HB-0871	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
	FIRST READING		
		PAGE	69
HB-0873	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
HB-0874	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
HB-0875			
		PAGE	69
	FIRST READING	PAGE	69
HB-0877	FIRST READING	PAGE	70

PAGE

2

MARCH 24, 1983

HB-0878	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
HB-0879	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
HB-0880	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
HB-0881	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
HB-0882	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
HB-0883	FIRST	READING	PAGE	70	
SJR-0018	ADOPT	en.	PAGE	65	

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND DALE JIROUSEK	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
RECESS	PAGE	8
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	8
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN CHAIR	PAGE	24
HESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	24
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	31
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	46
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	65
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	66
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	66
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	66
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	66
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	66
CONNITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	67
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	70