49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The House will come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. All unauthorized personnel will please leave the floor. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Joe Harrod, Pastor of the First United Pentecostal Church of Springfield. Reverend Harrod is a guest of Representative Sylvester Rhem and Representative Michael Curran. Will the guests in the gallery please rise and join us in the invocation?"

Reverend Harrod: "Our great God and Heavenly Father, we come unto You at this hour to thank You for this day that You've given us. We ask Thy great blessings upon this House today as these Members gather together, Lord, to conduct business for this great state, the state that You've created for Your glory and Your honor. We ask Thee, Lord God, to give wisdom and knowledge to each one of these Representatives, that they would have Your direction, Lord. For we know that each one that is here is here out of direct will from It is Your will, Lord God, that there be government You. and that government be orderly. It is Your will, Lord God, to bless these that conduct Your business. We thank Thee, Lord, for these Members that have dedicated their life, Lord, in this part of service, which is service not only for the state, but is service for You. We know, Lord, that there are times that they re tried, and there are times that they have problems, that they don't understand what to do, but we know, Lord, that Thou art able to give Thou art able, Lord, to touch the heart of each direction. one that is here, that they may be able to do that that is necessary, that is beneficial for this state, and in the is beneficial for Thy great kingdom. We ask Thee, Lord, above all to give the spirit, and the power, and presence of the most high God, to be felt in the life of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

each one of these, that they may have health, that they may have strength, Lord, to do Your business. We pray that You would go with each one of them this day, and we ask that all in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, that humble and mighty name. Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States

 of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one

 Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for
 all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Greiman, are there any excused absences?"
- Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Christensen and O'Connell should be excused, and the record should so indicate. Their keys have been removed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that Representative Christensen and O'Connell are excused. Mr. Rhem, would you come to the podium, please? Is there any Republican Member who can speak to the question of excused absences? Are you people leaderless today? Okay. We shall return when Mr. Vinson arrives. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk, do you have any business? Senate Bills First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills First Reading. Senate Bill 13,
 Matijevich Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
 Bill 25, Levin and Olson, a Bill for an Act relating to
 shared work unemployment benefits and amending certain Acts
 herein named. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 47,
 Representative Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 53,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to remove the state income tax and wage law impediments to ridesharing. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 60, by Representative Rea, a for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 101, by Representative Matijevich and Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 107, by Representative Doyle, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 112, Representative Rea and Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 133, by Representative Panayotovich, a Bill for Act in relation to public purchases, leases, contracts, and amends an Act herein named. First reading Bill 136, by Representative Bill. Senate Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Representative Ebbesen, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have you finished that Order of Business? Do you have any further business? Ladies and Gentlemen, we are prepared to begin on the Calendar. Webb and Mr. Reilly, I would suggest that for a short time Membership if thev the have any *noncontroversial*, Bills on Third Reading. My definition of noncontroversial would be that there would be opposition to the Bill. So if anyone were to rise in opposition to the Bill, we would simply take the Bill from the record. Either Short Debate or Regular Debate, and Mr. Giorgi, greyhound racing is controversial. Oh, does anyone have what they consider to be a noncontroversial Bill on Third Reading? The Chair recognizes Mr. Pierce. Either a regular or a Third. Mr. Pierce. Please identify on

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

page of the Calendar."

Pierce: "House Bill 1090, Short Debate."

Speaker Madigan: "What page of the Calendar, Mr. Pierce?"

Pierce: "It's on... it's on page ten, at the top of page ten. As soon as I get my bifocals on here, I'll be ready to go to work."

Speaker Madigan: "Is that yesterday's Calendar, Mr. Pierce?"

Pierce: "Who's got Friday's Calendar? House Bill 1090 on Short

Debate Third Beading in the middle of page ten."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton, do you object to that being a noncontroversial Bill? There is objection to that.

Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Short Debate."

Speaker Madigan: "What page of the Calendar, Sir?"

McCracken: "Page 11, House Bill 1208."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 1208. Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1208 on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Antitrust Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a response to the United States Supreme Court decision of City of Boulder, wherein the Court held that even a home rule municipality under a constitutional provision very similar to that of Illinois was subject to federal antitrust liability in the absence of certain expressed policy statements by the state. That is that the state action exemption would not shield the municipality as it does the state, itself, in the absence of certain language. We have prepared that language. This is based on some law review articles which have been prompted by the decision. I ask for your affirmative

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

support."

- Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill?

 The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Cushing, would you remove the voting key from Mr. Domico's desk? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Alexander, are you seeking recognition?"
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a Bill on the Short

 Debate Calendar, page eighteen..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Page eighteen of the Calendar."
- Alexander: "... House Bill 2213. I know of no opposition to that matter at this time."
- Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2213, Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read this Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2213, a Bill for an Act regarding the protection of human rights by counties and municipalities.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Alexander."
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd first like to say that this Bill is a permissive authorization. It has been approved by the Department of Human Rights of our state. It has been reviewed by other persons interested in it. It merely says that cooperative authorities of a municipality have a right to define human rights and to prohibit the violations of those rights. It is a permissive Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill?

 Representative Alexander, Representative Davis indicates

 that he will stand in opposition to the Bill; therefore,

 the Bill shall be taken from the record at this time.

 Representative Karpiel."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Karpiel: "Yes, thank you... yes ... "

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, thank Mr. Speaker. I have several you, noncontroversial Bills."

Speaker Madigan: "Let's try one."

Karpiel: "I'll try one, yes. House Bill 833. It's on page nine of the Calendar. It's on Third Reading Short Debate. House Bill 833."

Speaker Madigan: "833. Just one second Representative. Mr. Cullerton. House Bill 833 on page nine of the Calendar. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I... I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Represent... Represent..."

Johnson: "I have no problem with that."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Karpiel, proceed, and Mr. Clerk, read this Bill on Third Beading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 833, a Bill for an Act in relation to quarterly tax reports being made by county and local municipalities by the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Ye... yes. House Bill 833 amends the Municipal Code and Counties Act. It requires the Department of Revenue to publish and distribute quarterly lists of municipal and county sales taxes collected by the Department during the previous quarter. At present time, they do put out a yearly report, and this is endorsed by various groups. I know of no opposition."

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

McPike: "Well, I think I would rise in opposition to it, so I'd ask you to take this out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton, were you in error?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Cullerton: "No, I think it's a good Bill, but he's against it." Speaker Madigan: "I see. Representative Karpiel, I think we shall take the Bill out of the record. Let me suggest that we have a full Membership at this time, and we have about twenty-five people seeking recognition. This is what like under Speaker Blair. The line would form over on this side of the podium. So let us simply go to the Order of House Bills Short Debate Calendar. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar, on page eight of the Calendar. Mr. Vinson, on page eight of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar, there's a notation just above House Bill 503 which says next Bill. That's where I purpose to begin and then to call by the numbers. Representative Davis, do you wish to call that Bill?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 503, a Eill for an Act in relation to the publication of certain official notices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

Mr. Speaker. Davis: "Thank you, Members, 503 is noncontroversial Bill. I believe to be noncontroversial. It's a product of the Audit Commission. It has been agreed central management services in the Illinois Press Association. And what it does is remove the requirement for a three time publication in the official newspaper of advertised purchasing bids for the state, limits it to one and increases the official newspaper circulation size from twenty-five hundred to twenty thousand, in other words, paper of general circulation. The Bill also contains an Amendment by Representative Giorgi that addresses a problem he has in Rockford. I don't believe there's any

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

controversy to the Bill, and I move for its passage."

Speaker Madigan: "Before we begin with the Boll Call, let the record show that Representative Domico is in the chamber. I had been told that he would not be present; and therefore, on the record, I had directed a staff Member to remove his key. So let the record show that Representative Domico is in the chamber, and present, and should be recorded present for purposes of the Attendance Boll Call. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 503 pass?'. Those is favor... For what purpose does Representative John Dunn seek recognition?"

Dunn: "I could not hear the Sponsor's explanation. Would he...

my analysis says Amendment #1 is the Bill. Would you just

briefly explain what this Bill does, please?"

Davis: "I did John. I'll do it again. I didn't think anybody ever had trouble hearing me. The Bill is ... is a product of the Audit Commission. It limits... it removes the requirement that three publications of purchasing bid requirements be in the official newspaper. And the official newspaper, right now, is in Kewanee, Illinois, a town... a small town with a circulation of that newspaper about eight thousand. We rai... raised the limits of the newspaper, so that it has be in a paper of twenty thousand circulation or more, and the insertion need only be one time, rather than three. It's going to save a lot The Bill also contains now an Amendment Representative Giorgi that addresses a fi... a concern had with the Rockford Housing Authority about multigroup purchasing."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Are... can the publication take place in more than one paper?"

Davis: "Well, it's not required to under current statutes.

49th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1983
- The... the state has an official newspaper selected by central management services."
- Dunn: "I know, but if your Bill becomes law, will... how will I learn about a public notice for bids?"
- Davis: "How... how do you learn about it now? How do you learn about it now?"
- Dunn: "My question is, if your Bill becomes law how will I learn?"
- Davis: "The same way you do now, only one time instead of three."
- Dunn: "In other words, this doesn't help much."
- Davis: "Well, it saves... it saves a whale of a lot of money,
 and... and nobody reads the official newspaper anyway."
- Dunn: "Okay. All right. Who's newspaper is it going to be?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Bill will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Keane, to explain his vote. The Gentleman indicates he is not seeking recognition. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 104 'ayes' no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 506. Mr. Friedrich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 506, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third

 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to Bepresentative

 Keane, who's a hyphenated Cosponsor."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Mr. Cullerton seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask Representative Keane if he could take just take this out of the record for a few minutes while we review the Eill."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane."

Keane: "I have no problem with that, if we can come back to it when we resolve our problem."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be taken from the record. House Bill 516. Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 516, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the adoption of persons. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 516 is in response to the findings of the Appellate Court in 'Helvey vs. Randor', which held that the present law, the present adoption law violates the 14th Amendment of the United State Constitution and Article 1, Section 2 of the Illinois Constitution in that the rights of a parent, retarded parent to raise a family is constitutionally protected. And House Bill 516 provides that parental right of a parent who's mentally impaired, and mentally ill, or mentally retarded or developed disabled can be terminated only if a court, that such a parent is able to discharge parental responsibilities, that such an inability supported by evidence from a psychiatrist or a clinical psychologist, that the inability extends reasonable time period, and legal counsel is mandatory for such a parent. I would move for passage of House 516.#

Speaker Madigan: "Those in... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 516 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 548. Mr. Yourell. Mr. Yourell. Mr. Churchill, do

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Churchill indicates that he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 556. Mr. Hoffman, do you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 556, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe if there have been two Amendments filed to 556, would... I... I would like to have the Clerk check and see if there have been Amendments filed to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have Amendments been filed on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Two Amendments are filed on this Bill."

Hoffman: "I'd like to return 556 to Second Reading for the purpose of adopting..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave to place this Bill on Second Reading for an Amendment? Leave is granted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Barnes - Reilly."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House,
Amendment 1 requires the Governor to approve all air travel
prior to the travel in order for expenses to be in...
reimbursed. In the absence of the Governor, the Lieutenant
Governor would approve the air travel."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Who does it now?"

Barnes: "There are three or four different boards that authorize the travel."

Leverenz: "There are nine travel control boards, two of which are

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

not even in operation, making eleven. Your Amendment would replace what?"

Barnes: "It would replace the authority of those boards to authorize the travel."

Leverenz: "It wipes out all the travel control boards?"

Barnes: "It doesn't wipe them out. It's just that the Governor will approve the air travel prior to the travel."

Leverenz: "And what will that achieve?"

Barnes: "Well, I think a lot of criticism by yourself that I listened to in Committee, for one thing."

Leverenz: "I'm glad to hear that. What exactly will be the method that that will be accomplished? Will each individual request be initialled by him or the Lieutenant Governor?"

Barnes: "Yes, and it's prior to air travel. I think it's been no secret that there has been quite a bit of criticism in the newspapers, and it just kind of came down through the Committee process, too. And I think this is to correct some of the criticism, and perhaps, make some people feel more comfortable with the air travel."

Leverenz: "Your Amendment would then allow only... is it the intent of the Amendment to ban or eliminate all political air travel?"

Barnes: "It doesn't have anything to do with that. It merely says, "It authorizes travel in the air prior to the travel in the air". That's what the Amendment states."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "The Amendment would simply add another initial to a request for air travel. It does nothing to eliminate the misuse of air travel. It's frivilous. Adopt it or don't adopt it. It is nothing."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Reilly."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in support of the Lady's Amendment. from doing nothing, this does what needs to be done. It is it puts someone in a position to put... to approve prior to the time of the travel, purposed travel. Then there will be one person, or at least one office within State Government that is clearly identified for having to make that judgment. The problem now is anybody can travel at any time without any prior approval at all. Then the Bill comes in afterward and a variety of offices and no one understands, and has ... that have no public accountability, have to after the fact give approval. It makes a lot more sense to have one office that got to put its name of the line in advance, before the travel takes place. We've had criticism that there's been too much travel. We on this side of the aisle agree with that criticism and are trying to come up with a mechanism to control it. The way you do that is to put one office, put it on the line, in advance, and their judgment then is either right or wrong, and the public knows where to go."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor of this Amendment yield for a question please? Bepresentative, I wanted to ask you, is your Amendment narrowly defined to cover... cover only one Commission or is it all Commissions of State Government?"

Barnes: "The Amendment, Representative Koehler, covers all air travel."

Koehler: "It covers all air travel. Well, Representative, to go along with the philosophy of travel with State Government, the... Representative Leverenz indicated that there are nine trav... active travel boards at this time, and in my opinion, this is a patchwork attempt to get at only one

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

particular problem. There are a myriad of problems having to do with state travel. In fact, there are thirty... thirty-three million dollars worth of travel problems that we have here in the state. And I sponsored a Resolution that would give the Auditor General the power to look at all state travel, to come up with a comprehensive policy that would cover all employees of State Government. And would this compliment that, or would this just add to the problems that we currently have?"

Barnes: "Representative, we are... we are trying to correct all of the problems. It would cover all of those problems, because it is all encompassing and includes all air travel.

And I... I feel that if you feel you have some other measure of correcting the problems that we have now, I would be very happy to support it."

Koehler: "Well, thank you. I have had a problem getting that out of the Executive Committee, and I... I think it is important, though, that we have a comprehensive plan. Now is this going to make all air travel subject to the Governor's Travel Control Board?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Koehler: "Why did you choose the Governor's Travel Control Board?

I mean this would indi... indicate all agencies?"

Barnes: "Because that's where most of the employee's are that do use the air travel. Representative."

Koehler: "And, this Travel Control Board, if I remember correctly, is made up of the Governor and a couple of his employees. Isn't that correct?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Koehler: "Well, I am still con... this would also put people from the Secretary of State's Office, and the Comptroller, and all of those people under the Governor's Travel Control Board. Is that correct, for air travel only?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Barnes: "The Secretary of State is separate from the Governor.

Every... every constitutional officer has their own authority."

Koehler: "How about... what about General Assembly travel? Would that also be under the Governor's Travel Control Board?"

Barnes: "No."

Koehler: "Well, then, how could all employees be under that?"

Barnes: "The majority of employees that use air travel are under the supervision of the Governor."

Koehler: "Well, than not some of the ... "

Barnes: "All... what we're trying to do, Bepresentative Koehler, and maybe you weren't there that day, we are trying to correct some of the current criticisms that we have. The current criticisms that we had were under the auspices of the Governor, and that's what this Amendment is for. It's to correct some current problems that we have."

Koehler: "Well, I certainly want to correct the problems, and I just want to make certain that this is a... you know, will help do that, rather than exacerbate the problems that we currently have. Can he do this by Executive Order?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cullerton: "Now, as I understand your Amendment, the person to give the approval is the Governor, himself, right? Not his auto pen, or one of his aides. It has to be Jim Thompson."

Barnes: "I... I would assume since the Lieutenant Governor would be in charge if the Governor were out of town, I think that rather is self-explanatory, so no automatic pen would be use, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Right. Now, you're aware of the fact that our Lieutenant Governor has been on trips out of the state recently."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Barnes: "No, I am not, Representative Cullerton. The Lieutenant Governor does not check in with me. What I'm trying to do is address the current problems. If that falls under one of the current problems that's... that's going to be addressed."

Cullerton: "I think it's a well intentioned Amendment, and I have utmost respect for the Sponsor, but I think I'm opposed to the Amendment because I don't think it allows that type of flexibility that you're going to need. To have only two people, who are busy people, I assumed well, at least the Governor's a very busy person, and George might not be in town, so the problem would be that it would... no one would be able to give the approval and that, as I understand it, the approval must be given prior to the time of travel."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "So, you could be grounding someone, if you will,
who's performing some valuable state function, because the
Governor was too busy, or he was cut of town, and the
Lieutenant Governor was unable to be found. So for that
reason, I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I think there's been the full debate on this question. I'd like to go to Boll Call, if that's agreeable to the Members. Those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye', 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 50 'ayes' 60 'nos'. The Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Reilly - Barnes."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Reilly would like to speak first."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reilly, the Sponsor of the Amendment. Mr.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 adds to the required line items that... into which agency budgets must be divided. requirement that they break out legal services. had again some problems with this, some criticisms. don't know in my own mind agency by agency whether those criticisms are right or wrong. In some cases that I have know about, I have agreed with the criticisms. In other cases, I have not. But in the present appropriations process, you can't tell one kind of contract from another. We simply have the contractual line. Some agencies break them down more... more specifically. Others do not. Τt seems to me that since that has been a continuing area of concern over the six, now seven, years that I've been here, it would make sense to require the agencies to separate out legal services from the other items, so that we could at least figure out what that total is and make an... an informed judgment as to whether it's too high or too low or right on target. So I would offer Amendment 2. All that it does is require that legal services be broken out as a separate line item in its own right."

Speaker Madigan: "Nr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Beilly, what types of appropriations would this apply to?

Reilly: "All... all agency appropriations. At least if the agency has any legal services contracts. Some of them, I presume, might not. In other words, in each case, we have in statute now a whole list of things... of specific line items they have to break out... personal services, contractual services, travel, commodities, equipment, permanent improvements, land, EDP, and so on. We're simply adding one more to that list. And we're saying that if

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

they have legal services they have to break that out."

Cullerton: "That apply to the General Assembly?"

Reilly: "Sure. To the extent that we have legal services contracts."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Reilly: "It... not... not specific. We wouldn't have break out specific contracts, but within the line items we... we... we would have... oh, I'm informed by the staff that we don't line item at all, which only indicates, perhaps, how occasionally hypocritical we are. But any way..."

Cullerton: "Well, I think that ... "

Reilly: "... for any agency that does line item, they would have to include this."

Cullerton: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Did... would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Leverenz: "If an agency employs an attorney, currently, under what title do they operate?"

Reilly: "If... if they're actually employed by the agency, then they'd be under personal services and that would..."

Leverenz: "But I mean job title... their administrative assistant or is there something?"

Reilly: "I think a lot of different... it's my understanding that a lot of different agencies use different job titles. Some... in some cases they're called technical assistants. In some agencies, they're called... they may well be administrative assistants. I'm... I'm not sure that there's a consistent practice among agencies as to what job classification they give an attorney."

Leverenz: "These are... this would then be contractual broken out one step further?"

Reilly: "Correct."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Leverenz: "Well, wouldn't it be better to just leave it with the agencies?"

Reilly: "No. One of the problems that we have now... with all due respect to the other side, these are both problems that you've talked about for years, and we're trying to respond and all of a sudden, for some mysterious reason, you have problems with that. The problem is that what you get is in effect a lump sum for contractual. You have ... short of just digging it out agency by agency, you have no way to know how much of that is for legal services, how much of that is for whatever, Xerox paper or whatever other, EDP consultants, whatever other kinds of contracts they may have. Just seems to us that it makes sense since this has been an area of controversy to break that out separately." Leverenz: "Well, then to the Amendment. As I understand the battle of what is legal and what isn't legal in terms of a budget, it is that we are trying to identify the work of an individual within an agency or a part of State Government, and that they operate under some other job title other than something that even uses the word legal or is close to it. And now we have changed that, as we did a day or two with an administrative review position, I think, in the Industrial Commission. We can find out under contractual services which are legal simply by pulling the contracts;

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reilly to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We all know that over the last six, seven, perhaps, fifteen, twenty years, for all I know, there's been a great deal of discussion as to whether legal service contracts are too high. In individual cases, it's been suggested they're too high, but in another sense, I think they are too high, and there's been a great deal of

and I would ask for people to oppose the Amendment."

therefore, I don't think this 'Amendment gets the job done,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

discussion of that. I am positive that over all State Government could save a great deal of money by instead of contracting with outside private attorneys at high fees they hired reasonable, a competent attorneys on staff. They'd get better service, more consistent service, and they'd save money. Everybody in the House, no matter what kind of bologna we may hear, knows that's been a problem, and we're trying to deal with that. It doesn't solve the problem to break that out, but it's a step in that direction. At least then, the whole General Assembly will on a consistent agency by agency basis have the information they need to make a reason judgement as to whether we're spending too much on attorneys contracts. And it seems to me that's a reasonable proposition. I've heard all kinds of arguments from the other side to that affect in the past. I guess because it's our idea, now all of a sudden, it's not a good idea anymore. It's a good Amendment. You know it's a good Amendment, and I would suggest that we adopt it."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 86 "ayes", 19 "nos". The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?" Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Let the record show that leave is granted that that Bill shall remain on the Order of the Short Debate Calendar. On page nine of the Calendar House Bill 635. Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw. The Lady indicates that she does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 643. Mr. Ronan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 643, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

relating to the licensing and regulating of private security guards, private detectives, and private alarm contractors, and certain businesses. Third Reading of the

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bonan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 633 (sic - 643) creates the Private Detective and Private Security Act of 1983. It also provides for the licensing of private alarm contractors in addition to the existing licensing of private detectives and security agents. The Bill passed out of Committee 13 to nothing. What we're doing is, we're updating the licensing provisions for detectives in the state and also including the licensing of burglar alarm installers. The need for the legislation's evident, and I move for its passage."

Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that this Bill is House Bill 643. Mr. Ronan moves for passage of the Bill. Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill? We are on the Order of the Short Debate Calendar. No one stands in opposition to the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill signify by... for what purpose does Mr. Bowman seek recognition?"

Bowman: "I have just a couple questions of the Sponsor."

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

Bowman: "I notice that this Bill has been amended. Could you describe the effects of Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Basically, Amendment 1... 1 and 2 is now the Bill. What it did was that the Bill was originally instituted to establish a system for licensing burglar alarm installers. What happened was that I was able to work with the Detectives Association, and now the Bill is the establishment of the Detective Security Act and the Burglar Alarm Act, so basically, what it did was it included the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

relicensing of the detectives in addition to the burglar alarm installer."

Bowman: "So... so burglar alarms is still in there?"

Ronan: "Yes."

Bowman: "My... my concern about the Bill is that perhaps we might
be setting up a situation where only ADT might qualify for
licensure, and I just wondered if you could describe how
many companies in the state do you think might qualify for
licensure?"

Ronan: "The Bill is... is supported by the... by the Burglar Alarm Association and the... and another group, the Illinois Burglar and Fire Alarm Association, Associated Guard and Patrol Association of Illinois, Associated Detectives of Illinois. The Burglar Alarm Association is a large association made up of hundreds of members, so it's obviously not geared towards just the large organizations. It's geared towards any organization that's a member of that organization."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "We are on the Order of the Short Debate

Calendar. One proponent has spoken to this Bill. Does

anyone stand in opposition to the Bill? For what purpose

does Representative Ralph Dunn seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, this is licensing another industry or another business in Illinois, and I think we have too much licensing. I'd like to be joined by some people and take this off of Short Debate and discuss it a little bit, if we could."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has asked seven others to join him in taking this Bill off of Short Debate."

Dunn: "I'd ... I'd like to be joined by ... "

Speaker Madigan: "It would appear as if the Gentleman has been joined by seven others; therefore, the Bill shall be taken

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

off of the Order of the Short Debate Calendar."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill is now on the Order of the Regular

Debate Calendar, and the Chair recognizes Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for some questions?"

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

Dunn: "I... I didn't get in on an early discussion of this, I

guess. Representative Ronan, is this state-wide or is this
only for Cook County or Chicago?"

Ronan: "State-wide."

Dunn: "I didn't get that. State-wide?"

Ronan: "State-wide."

Dunn: "How is... who... who asked for it, the Burglar Alarm
Association... the Burglar Alarm Installers Association?"

Ronan: "The Burglar Alarm Association of Illinois."

Dunn: "Do you know of any in southern Illinois, burglar alarm members?"

Ronan: "Yes, there are. There's members from all over the state... including members from your district, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I... I'm not sure that you know where my district is."

Ronan: "It's over by Cairo County. Isn't it, Representative?"

Dunn: "That's what I was thinking. I... I just think that this is something that ought to be debated. I have been... in fact, I'd like to see us get rid of the Sunset Committee and just let this House do away with Sunset. A lot of industries that have been regulated... how much would this cost the State of Illinois to regulate these industries?"

Ronan: "It's not going to cost the state anything. There's going to be a licensing fee involved. There's going to be no fiscal impact upon the state."

Dunn: "Does the Department of Bev... Department of Begistration

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

and Regulation support the Bill?"

Ronan: "They did not register as a proponent or an opponent in Committee. It passed out of Committee unanimously 13 to nothing, with the support of every Republican Member of the Committee, including some downstate Republican Members."

Dunn: "Fine. Thank you. I'd just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that

I think it's a bad Bill when you go to regulating burglar

alarm installers industry. Could I install my own burglar

alarm, if this were to pass?"

Ronan: "Yes."

Dunn: "In my... in my rent houses too, or just in my own property?"

Ronan: "I know that you can do it in your property. I don't know if you can do it in your rent houses. I assume you could."

Dunn: "I would just urge a 'no' vote on the Bill. I think it's a bad Bill. I think it's one that we don't need, and... and I think we ought to defeat it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps Representative Dunn ought to visit the City of Chicago and any major metropolitan area. Нe probably would have а greater appreciation of the problem. Representative Bonan indicated that the Bill has had a thorough hearing in Committee. The Bill passed Committee without a descenting vote. The problem in Chicago, particularly on the south side, is obvious. individuals who purchase new automobiles find that by time they spend one night at home those automobiles are missing. I think we should have some regulation of the industry that installs these alarms. It's a good Bill. The Department of Law Enforcement obviously would find it helpful, but more importantly, I think, is that it doesn't cost the state any money. The user fee will more than

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

offset the cost of administering the Act. It's a good Bill. Representative Dunn, we certainly appreciate your position, but the fact is, in Chicago, we need this Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is typical of a group of people who want protection. They'll grandfather everybody in that's in the business, and then the next guy has to be a Rhodes scholar to get a license. I know how this works. It may not cost the taxpayers anything, but I'll tell you, if you want to buy a burglar alarm it's going to cost you, because this guy has got a monopoly, and he's going to rack you up for his services. We don't need anymore regulation in Illinois. We've got more people regulated now than we need. Let's get rid of government, not add more."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Vinson. Representative Tate." "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise Tate: support of Bepresentative Ronan's Bill. What this essentially does is... provides for some requirements for additional training for the different registers. This is a good piece of legislation. The theory behind this is, we don't want a bunch of crooks in the business that are going to go out and set up burglar alarms and then rob the place. We're... we're just asking for some minimum requirements. There's no fiscal impact to this legislation. It's a good Bill. It's time has come. I'd appreciate an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this piece of legislation. There are several firms in my district that do supply alarm systems, both to firms and to private homes. We have had a considerable number of problem with some of those alarm

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

systems, because they were improperly installed, and as a result, they would many times be activated even when no one was in the vicinity. This has caused a good deal of problem for our police officers, who have had to make calls to places where there is nothing wrong at all. There also some firms in my district that supply alarm systems that are very reputable, that stand behind their product. It is those reputable firms that have sought this legislation. In fact, this is what I regard as good consumer legislation, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Roman to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I don't Ronan: think there's any problem with passage of this Bill, but let's look at the facts on what I'm trying to do here. T 4 m amazed at listening to some of the opposition from some of the Members on the other side of the aisle. Let's look the facts of what happens in this industry. You invite people into your home in order to establish a more safe and secure environment for your family and your possessions. I'm sure Representative Dunn's done that concerning his Does he want an unscrupulous operator, a possessions. fly-by-night thief, coming into his home, setting up a corporation saying that he's going to protect him and his family and his loved ones, and then come in and establish a situation where he's going to case his house and probably come back in while Representative Dunn's down here trying to represent the people in his district and strip the place That's the kind of tragedy that we're trying to bare. avoid with this legislation. It's about time we stood for our constituents and make sure that the people who are out there supposedly setting up security systems for our home, our loved ones, and our valuables, are actually legitimate operators, and who are people who are qualified

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

to do the job. For once this Session, let's wote for the people of our district, and I urge an 'aye' vote on this fine Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Eill vote
 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The
 Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are
 74 'ayes', 36 'nos'. This Fill, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 548. Representative Yourell. Mr. Clerk, read the
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 548, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning land titles. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell."

- you... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Yourell: "Thank This Eill affects only Cook Gentlemen of the House. County, which is the only county in the state that has a Torrens system of registering land. What we're doing with the legislation is taking... giving the individual an option to opt out of the Torrens system, if he so desires. It's supported by the Chicago Bar Association. the It's a product of the Association. Southwest Bar Torrens Committee of two Committee. the organizations, and I would recommend a favorable vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill?

 The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', 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', 4 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 662. Mr. Pangle. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 662, a Bill for an Act to amend

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Sections of the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pangle."

- Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 662 will do is correct a misunderstanding that we have had in the State of Illi... Illinois for the last ten years. In 1974, the Illinois' Lottery was enacted. At that time, the intent was to place all profits in the educational fund. Since that date, all profits from the Illinois Lottery has gone into the General Revenue Fund. I think it's about time the educational sector received the revenue that they were promised a decade ago."
- Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill?

 Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill? Mr. Pangle
 to close."
- Pangle: "I would just appreciate an "aye' vote if you love your children in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 102 'ayes', 4 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 688. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for state grants to certain public television stations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, now that they re granting more cable T.V. franchises and some of the demands in these cable T.V. franchises in downstate communities, they re asking that the cable people provide for an inhouse television station.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

And because that station does not have to be licensed by the FCC, they have... they're penalized because they don't receive state aids when the moneys available, because they are an educational, not-for-profit, public station. All this does is clear up the language, so that you people that are getting an inhouse television station from your franchise, from your cable people will be able to benefit from any moneys that might come for public television without having a license from the FCC. It's a good Bill. No opposition to it, and I urge the adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill?

Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill? We are on the Order of the Short Debate Calendar, which provides that there shall be one proponent and one opponent. If no one stands in opposition to the Bill, we will then go to Roll Call. Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed... For what purpose does Mr. Hallock seek recognition?"

Hallock: "Why, I believe we should have a chance to close on this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "If ... if you like."

Hallock: "I would like to do that."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Sure."

Hallock: "Yes, thank you very much for your courtesy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hallo... Mr. Giorgi, do you like Mr. Hallock to close?"

Giorgi: "I'd be honored, John."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hallock to close."

Hallock: "This is a real team here. This is a Rockford project, and we have in Rockford a cablevision station, which is in fact a public television station. There are currently about eight public television stations in our state, some of which receive funding. All this Bill would do would say

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

that Rockford station would be eligible for that funding. It does not provide funds. It just said we would also be eligible, and I would urge your support. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those is favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes', 5 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Giorgi, I have an emergency phone call in my office. Would you please take over the podium? The next Bill? Mr. Giorgi? Mr. Panayotovich could handle that Bill."
- Giorgi: "All right, Speaker, as long as it's a special request
 from the podium."
- Speaker Madigan: "Well, you know, you're not interested then.

 Mr. Yourell, would you come to the podium. Mr. Yourell in
 the Chair."
- Speaker Yourell: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, arise?"
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just for an announcement during this transition period here. Located up in the Speaker's Gallery to the front of us are ninety students from the Galena Middle School in beautiful, historic Galena, Illinois, and the home of Ulysses S. Grant, and the early boyhood home of Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Yourell: "Welcome to Springfield."

Mulcahey: "And the Galena territory."

- Speaker Yourell: "For what reason, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock, arise?"
- Hallock: "I would just like you to know that in case some of the

 Democrats don't chose to become Speaker for a day, there

 are many Republicans who would be happy to sit in that

 Chair."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Speaker Yourell: "I waited eighteen years to get here, pal. Good luck. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 689. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 689, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Under current law we have a statute which makes it unlawful to criminal trespass to certain vehicles, those vehicles include motorcycles, automobiles, aircraft, and watercraft. The Bill was adopted in 1961 and, of course, since then we have a new kind of motor driven vehicle that's become very popular and that's snowmobiles. And all that this House Bill would do would be to include snowmobiles in those category of vehicles for which it would be unlawful to trespass. I know of now opposition to the Bill, except those who occasionally enjoy a joy ride or trespassing to snowmobiles."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this all voted who wish? question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Calendar on the Order of Short Debate Third Beading is House Bill 690. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

 Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill

49th Legislative Day

does two things.

May 20, 1983

First of all, it rectifies a judicial

construction problem involving the offense of theft of stolen property. A person commits theft under that Section of the Criminal Code when he obtains control over stolen property, knowing it to have been stolen, and these are the words. another. According to judicial • b y kev interpretation, the burden has been placed upon the state to prove that the item was stolen by someone other than the defendant. This provision would simply strike the words, 'by another', to accommodate the wast majority of ... of prosecutions in this area where an individual is found and known to be in possession of stolen property, but it's impossible to know the exact circumstances under which it And it's to help deal with a very was actually stolen. serious problem in this state dealing with the fencing That is the first part of this Bill. stolen merchandise. Second part would create the new offense of unlawful interference with public utilities services, and would create that offense, and categorize it as a Class A A person would commit that offense when he misdemeanor. knowingly interfered with or diverted any public utility service without the consent of the provider. I would respectfully urge an affirmative vote on this House Bill." Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 107 voting "aye", 3 voting "no". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 696. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

49th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1983
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 696, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation and Workers' Occupational Diseases

 Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few workmens' comp Bills that's been agreed upon by both sides of the aisle. What it provides for in 696, it sets forth procedure to be followed by the Industrial Commission when a self-insured employer becomes financially insolvent. It provides for the recovery of the bond money. It gives the Commission the authority to establish procedure. It gives a priority of claims. It... it provides for the continued obligation of the employer to pay outstanding claims. It has a filing limitation and has an appointment of the Attorney General's Defense Attorney for bankrupt employers, and I urge the support of the House of this agreed workmens' compensation Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "I just wonder if the Sponsor would take this Bill out of the record?"
- Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall...' Do you want to close, Representative Giorgi? Representative Panayotovich."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of this Bill. I just want to mention one thing. I hope that nobody in their district has to deal with a problem like I had to deal in my district where five thousand people from Wisconsin Steel Works were laid off. The company went under and these people are still fighting for their rights. So I hope that everybody gives us a positive vote, and I thank you."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Speaker Yourell: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Eill 727. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 727, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate granting of assistance in indigent war veterans and their families. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Saltsman.

 Representative Saltsman, 727."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a Bill for the veterans assistance program, and we worked the Amendment out with the County and Townships Association. And it's all agreeable, and I'd like your favorable vote. Be glad for any questions."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does an ... does anyone stand in opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, Shall this Bill pass? . All those in favor will say ... vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 114 voting 'aye', no voting... none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the hereby declared passed. Majority, is Constitutional Appearing on the Order of Calen... on the Calendar on Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 787. The Lady from Ccok, Representative Braun. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 787, a Bill for an Act in relationship to emergency medical treatment. Third Reading of the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply says that life-threat... that emergency treatment in life-threatening situations should not be denied to people because of the mode of payment for such medical services."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'.

 All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 110 voting 'aye', no voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 805. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of Orthotic and..."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Clerk Leone: "... Prosthetic practice. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think my Co... hyphenated Cosponsor,
 Representative Tate, asked me to pull out of the record,
 but because he's from the other side of the aisle, I'd like
 to take it out temporarily, but come back that if I find
 my..."

Speaker Yourell: "Out of the record."

Giorgi: "... my Cosponsor..."

Speaker Yourell: "Out of the record. Appearing on the Order of
Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 833. Read the
Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 833, a Bill for an Act in relationship

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

to quarterly tax reports made to county and to local municipalities by the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel." Karpiel: "Yes, House Bill 833 is a Bill that is a recommendation of the Local Government Accounting Tax Force and Cosponsored by Representative Keane, Representative Slape. This Bill... the aim of this Bill to provide municipalities and counties better tools for enforcement and collection of tax revenues which... within their their... their jurisdiction and give them a better ideal of what kind of revenue they re going to be receiving. At present, local governments receive disbursements of their one percent sales tax from the Department of Bevenue on a monthly basis, but they receive no itemization or no kind of a report with it. This Bill would require the Department of Revenue to publish and make available to the municipalities and the counties a quarterly report telling them where their revenues are coming from, which different types of sales tax. The state... the Department of Revenue, at present, collects this type of information, has this information. It simply does not release it to the municipalities and the counties on a quarterly basis, and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?".

All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 112 voting "aye", none voting... no voting... none voting "no". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. From... the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Pangle,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

for what reason do you arise?

- Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege.

 We are fortunate toda... today to have the members of the

 Momence Chamber of Commerce, are very happy that we just

 passed the lottery Bill here on the floor, up in the
 gallery to my right."
- Speaker Yourell: "Welcome to Springfield. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 842. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 842, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of
 the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 House Bill 842 is a Bill that requires the Department of
 Community and Commerce Affairs (sic Commerce and
 Community Affairs) to give notice to local governments when
 state laws have been changed. The Bill has been amended so
 that the notice is given only once a year after all Bills
 have been passed, signed, or whatever. And it's a minimum
 cost, and it really provides a valuable service to local
 government. I ask for your positive vote."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? Being no opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 103 voting "aye", no voting "no", and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 853. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson." Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a housekeeping Bill sponsored by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. Currently materials referenced in the Illinois register must be filed with the Secretary of State unless the material is already available in the state library. We're seeking to change that, because reference materials are frequently lengthy and expensive to provide copies to the Secretary of State, also some the agencies have not been maintaining a copy. So consequently, what we are doing here is to clarify that the agency adopting the rule is to maintain a copy of the reference rule or standard for public inspection. price of copy may not exceed the actual cost. favorable Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". A11 those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', no voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 862. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 862, a Bill for an Act to require prisoner population impact note for certain Bills. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

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

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

House. House Bill 862 is designed to create what is called prison impact note. which will provide this information relative to the impact of us passing legislation which would affect our prison population. purposes, in effect, legislation might have to increase the prison population or the jail population in creating criminal offenses. Most of us know that since the Governor's Class X Legislation took affect in determining sentencing of three time losers, the population in our state has risen dramatically. We all are aware that since 1977 the prison population has risen approximately 25%. We're aware of the recent media accounts relative to the early release program which is caused by overcrowding in our prisons. Since June of 1980 approximately 10,000 criminals have been released to the streets of our state under what is called the early release program. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, that the time is now that we have some idea as to what legislation what impact legislation will have on our prison populations when we pass such legislation in this Body. already have legislation which tells us the fiscal impact or, in fact, it tell us the overall impact of the state finance, an impact on financing for our state when we pass legislation in those areas. I certainly think, if we fiscal note and an impact statement, we ought to have a prison impact statement, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's very interesting that a Bill should be offered that would put this House on notice that they're increasing the prison population when trying to do something to protect the public. The purpose of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

legislation that adds penalties or increases penalties for criminal offenses does n... is not to stick more people in jail in order to cause problems for the correctional institutions or to overcrowd the prisons. It is to get criminals off the street, and to punish them and to protect the public. I have just been asked to request that this Bill be taken from Short Debate, because some people feel that it is of great enough moment. I feel that way too, but I did not want to start out that way, because I didn't want to be the only one to speak on it. But apparently..."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady moves to remove this Bill from Short

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady moves to remove this Bill from Short

Debate. Is she joined by five Members? This Bill is off

Short Debate. Proceed."

Pullen: "May I resume? Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when legislation is proposed this House to increase penalties or to add new classifications of crime, it is to promote the safety of the public, and for a Sponsor, who is attempting to promote the safety of the public, to have to produce precise information about what kind of impact it's going to have on the prison population is for ... for that Sponsor to have to prove down the road that it's not going to really impact the prisons or increase the population in the prisons. after all, what we're talking about in such legislation is trying to make the streets safe for peop... for people. Certainly, we should be concerned about what is happening in the prisons, but not by this course of action. I urge a 'no' vote on this, I'm sure well intentioned, misquided, and misdirected, Bill."

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

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this Bill should be very soundly defeated.

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

I think it should be defeated because it goes with the problem in absolutely the wrong direction. We ought not be trying to avoid sending people to jail when they commit offenses. We ought to be building the jails necessary to send them to. I don't believe that the way to deal ... you know one of the things that people once said about Class X, when it was passed on this floor, was that it wouldn't deal with the problem because the judges would find some way to avoid sentencing people, but we've proven that that's not the case. All we need to do is to build the facilities to incarcerate the people, and we can begin solving this problem. I don't believe the fact that the prisons are overcrowded means that we ought to be depopulating prisons. I think we ought to be building more of them. We ought to be intensifying law enforcement efforts and for those believe that we ought to defeat ... very soundly reasons I defeat this Bill. I would urge a *no* vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe." Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise support of this Bill. I ... I think it's sort of funny. Ιn this House we pass more phony law and order Bills than any place in the entire world. I think we passed enough Bills in this Session to put every man, woman, child, and dog in the peniteniary for 427 years. We do it in the name of law and order when, in fact, what we're doing it in is in name of getting reelected. We know that they're phony, and we know in many instances the Governor is actually going to either veto these Bills or the Bills are going to be declared unconstitutional. I think that this is a approach. All that we're saying is that if we pass a Bill, we should know the results of our actions, and I think that there's nothing wrong with that. I think it's perfectly legitimate. I think the prison system's cost us a great

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

deal of money, and we ought to know the burden that we put on these prison systems when we pass out these phony law and order Bills. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladi'es and Gentlemen of the House, it gives me great pleasure... I... I do have an introduction. I don't do this very often. But we do have the graduating class of the Robert Healy Elementary School with their teacher, Mr. 'Bearich', who happens to be a good Croatian teacher, Ms. 'Deber', Mrs. 'Hays', and the parents and students of Healy School in Chicago. The eight grade graduating class is up in the gallery, is represented by John Vitek, who happens to be a 1921 graduate of Robert Healy School."

Speaker Yourell: "Welcome to Springfield."

Terzich: "At... at the same... at the same time, I have my nephew, who's in the graduating class, and I wish him a happy birthday, to Bobbie 'Bartuzi'."

Speaker Yourell: "Happy birthday. The Gentleman from Will,
Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, back to business. Mr. Speaker, Representative Bullock is a fine Legislator, probably going to be a fine Congressman, but the truth of the matter is, boy, is misquided on this one. There are a few other states that do this. I think California is a classic example, and one only has to look at California and the mess that they get themselves in on the other side of this question a lot to realize that this is a very bad idea. The truth of the matter is the prior speaker to me, the Gentleman from Cook... from suburban Cook, has stated that we pass a order Bills, lot of phony law and and

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

unconstitutional. And they re this, and they re that. It flies right in the face of ... every speaker of this House has endorsed the... the law and order posture of the Illinois House of Representatives, and the current Speaker is not withstanding. The current Speaker endorsed a law enforcement Commission to be brought forward for law order Bills. His vote is up on virtually every law and order Bill. And I can tell you that Representative Vinson is absolutely right. And all of you that campaign in... in... in election after election have only to ask the question, if you wanted to raise the tax, and I know that's the burning issue this year, but if you wanted to raise a special tax to build new prisons, would anybody in this room, would anyone in this room object to that, to take the creeps off of the street and put them behind bars? Everybody in the room would say, *Go ahead and raise whatever tax it is to build as many cells as you need to separate the good guys from the bad guys. I think we ought to continue to pass it and keep the pressure on the prison system. Certainly look for alternatives, and there are alternatives to incarceration. And we know that things have to be done in terms of probation and alternatives to incarceration, but this is not the way. Why would we want handicap la w and order. This Bill should be resoundly ... "

- Speaker Yourell: "Excuse me, Sir. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, arise?"
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you urge the Gentleman to address the Bill?"
- Speaker Yourell: "Yes. That point is well taken. Mr. Davis, would you please direct your remarks to the Bill?"
- Davis: "Well, I thought I was, Sir. Alright. Let me just in closing say, the Bill should be resoundly defeated. The

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Administrator of the Supreme Court thinks it's a lousy Bill, and I think it's a lousy Bill. It ought to get a 'no' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn." Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. Back in or 1977. Governor Thompson promoted Class X 60... legislation. He told everybody all across the State of Illinois that if we had Class X legislation to put people in prison for ... for sure, to make sure they didn't get probation, to make certain crimes you had to go to prison for, your streets would be safe. I'd like to ask you, s... how much safer your streets are today? And we have a prison population that is exploding. If we had this kind of legislation on the books, we would think twice before we the easy thing, and that is just pass another law to make it look on paper like we're defending the public. **1**f we want to defend the public, we've got to do the basic things to make our streets safe. We've go to provide more law enforcement officials. We've got to provide more education for our citizens. We've got to give them jobs. We've go to make them worthwhile citizens, give them self-respect, and then our streets will be safe, not with hokey criminal laws that on paper say they're going to do things that they never can do. This Bill makes us face the It's a good Bill. I would urge an 'aye' vote, I hope it gets 100 votes. It's one of the best Bills of this Session."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Bill is an added burden upon the State Legislature, and this burden is brought upon us by our failure during the past great many

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

years to succeed with the social legislation that we have tried to pass. We, just the other day, passed law entering into the bedrooms of the family members of this state, making certain acts illegal. These... this is a good law, basically good law, but it does add to the prison population by putting fathers and uncles into jail. This law fails... this particular Bill fails to do anything constructive. It is just another layer of problems added to the already overburdened requirements of the Members of the Legislature, and I suggest that it be defeated."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Yourell: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

The previous question is moved. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Bullock, to close."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard the arguments for. We've heard the hypocritical arguments against. The fact of the matter is, it's sheer hypocracy. It's sheer hypocracy for us to stand on the floor of this House and pass laws, and tell the courts, and tell the judges, and tell the prosecutors that we want to lock them up and throw the key away, but give no consideration to the resources necessary for those agencies do a good job. The fact of the matter is, the paper is replete with headlines, as we have here, *Prison crowding to force early release of a thousands of people. Our own Director of the Department of Corrections, Michael Lane, admitted this week that he had to lop off an average of 200 days from the sentencing of each prisoner. The Governor's own task force commissioned this report. That's the fact. We also have instances here now, where we say, *Crunch may

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

force state to free violent cons back on the streets. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Prisons are expensive. Prisons are expensive. The cost of constucting a maximum security bed is from eighty to eighty-five thousand dollars per cell. Maintaining one inmate in prison for one year in this state costs fourteen thousand dollars a year. to those of you who want to put them in jail, lock them up, and throw the key away, when are you going to ask what it costs? When are you going to give the court some relief? This Bill is a simple Bill. It merely tells us that we ought to know what we're doing when we take responsible action on the floor of the House. Quite frankly, I'm put a back. I'm ... put upon that so many of my good, solid, conservative friends had to get off of this Bill. because someone wanted to make it a political statement. It is a political statement. If you're for law and order, you'll vote for this Bill, but if you're for responsible, progressive government, you'll also vote for the Bill. So anyone who doesn't vote for it, you don't belong in this Body. I urge am 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson, to explain his vote."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was originally Cosponsor of this Bill, because I believed it was a good idea; however, analysis of this Bill shows me two things. from listening to the debate in favor of it shows шe that this Bill will be used to defeat good law enfor... enforcement legislation, and the main reason is, 1 don*t believe it's workable. There's absolutely no predict the effect; and, therefore, it will be used to

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

defeat good legislation, therefore, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative

Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I rise in ... in enthusiastic support of this Bill. This is possibly one of the best items of legislation that have seen in the seven years that I have had the privilege of serving this General Assembly. I suppose I have voted on hundreds, and possibly, thousands of law and order Bills since I have been here, and I have... have uniformly voted 'ves' with regard to them. almost Obviously though, we in the Legislature, with regard to the attitude of law and order and... and increasing the population during the last ha... seven years, have had an ultimately self-defeating purpose or self-defeating result, as a re... because of our inability to construct prisons rapidly enough to increase... to hold the number of prisoners that we have been adding to the prison system. think Director Lane indicated that he needs to build a new prison every eight weeks in order to accommodate the increased number of prisoners we are sending into the system. Now what we are really doing, when we increase the number of prisoners today with the limited bed capacity, is we are causing the release of other prisoners. We are really just pushing people out the backdoor by adding more people into the front door. We ought to know when we vote on law and order Bills here what the impact is going to, be on our prison population. This Fill will provide us that knowledge. This Bill will provide us that information, we can make some intelligent decision as to how many people we're really going to push out of the backdoor when we vote and order Bills here. That's the type of пo law information I want. I think that's the type of information every responsible Legislator ought to want: therefore,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

should all be voting 'aye' on this Eill."

- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, to explain his vote."
- Van Duyne: "Tha... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree Representative Brummer, but I fail to see what the net result of this reporting system is going to be. supposed to understand that if we have a negative report, that we don't have enough room for the people, that we're supposed to let crime go unpunished? Are we supposed to say, well, all of our prisons are full so, therefore, these people who are arrested for assault, robbery, whatever, are supposed to be held in some kind of holding I... I think maybe the facts submitted here are probably true, that we do need more space, but I see where this is going to do any good. And I think, in fact, instead of helping the law enforcement procedure will probably impede it."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, to explain his vote."
- "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ιn Ropp: a11 due respects to the Sponsor of this piece of legislation, I really think that he's dealing with the problem of prisons and prisoners in total reverse order. The real concern ought to be what we can do to prevent young people from getting into that situation. You don't start when they're about to go to prison. You start they're three, four, five, six, ten, thirteen, fourteen, in their early learning years on how to be a good citizen, on how to be a good person that lives within their school and and I certainly don't think that this is an their state, effort to do that. You're... you're trying to close the door after the horse has been stolen."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor said it takes fourteen thousand dollars a year to keep a man in prison. You turn the guy loose and he'll rip the public off for fifty thousand dollars, not fourteen. The reason the prisons are crowded is not because they're really crowded, but because the courts have got in and said, 'You've got to have so many square feet per inmate. You have to do this and do that'. If the courts would get off our back and let us double cell, as we did for years, we wouldn't be overcrowded."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "I wasn't seeking recognition, Bus."

Speaker Yourell: "Represen... the Gentleman from Champaign,
Representative Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, like... like Representative Brunner, over the course of the seven years that I've been here, I think that no one would say that I have not been generally supportive of the efforts of this Legislature to crack down on crime... violent crime in But I think sometimes we have gone to such an Illinois. extent every time a Bill comes in to increase spitting on the sidewalk to a Class III felony ten or twelve people jump on it, and then it flies out of the House. we've really gone overboard in some respects in what we're doing sentencing wise. And I think if we're going to have a meaningful per... perspective on what sentencing is and what that's going to do to the taxpayers of Illinois, this is the way we do it. I think that Representative Stearney and others used to suggest that the best thing to do around here is to just classify something Class X, or Class Y, or

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Class Z. and you get sixty-five or seventy votes on it. Nobody's saying we ought to put violent criminals on streets, and nobody's saying that we shouldn't have a tight justice system. What we are saying is when we're criminal spending taxpayers dollars in terms of... in terms of prisons and otherwise, we ought to know back in the beginning of the legislative process what we're going to do in that whole... that whole procedure. This is common sense Bill. It doesn't cost money, and in the long run I think it not only saves money, but it saves a lot of in... indirectly a lot of property and lives in Illinois in very real sense. I think it's a good Bill, and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Clerk... take the vote, Mr. rec... Clerk. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye' 45 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 886. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 922. Bead the Clerk... read the rec... read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 922, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis." Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 922 amends the It's a product of the... of the Insurance Code. Legislative Audit Commission package, and it simply requires that... that the Department of Insurance annually audit insurance companies that are in rehabilitation, are in Chapter 11, or actually in bankruptcy. It has a threshold in it recommended by the Department of Insurance that the company must have over five hundred thousand

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

dollars in undistributed assets to trigger in that audit function. We think it's a very good Eill. The Department of Insurance now supports it, and of course, the Legislative Audit Commission supports it. It also contains an Amendment that was adopted on the floor to allow domestic insurance companies to sell preferred as well as common stock, and that's the summed substance of the Bill. And I move for its passage."

- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in opposition to the Eill. I
 would like to be recognized for a point of order after the
 Bill has passed."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Yes, I know we're on Short Debate, but I do have one question that concerns me on the Bill. May I present it, Sir? Representative Davis..."

Speaker Yourell: "Questions are allowed."

Mautino: "Representative Davis, in the liquidation of bankruptcy proceedings... excuse me, fellas... WE had the *Kennelworth* case in the State of Illinois. And in that case, you're saying that the Department of Insurance should do that investigation. That I agree... I agree should be My concern is the fact that we had about eight done. hundred thousand dollars worth... of attorneys' fees on that particular situation, and I think that if that's what you're addressing in this case, that the Department do it, rather than a contractual services under attorneys* fees in those large cases, I think it's a good Bill. If that's not what you're doing, then I question the validity of having this done."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Will to close, Mr. Davis."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Davis: "Well, unfortunately, Representative Mautino, it does not refer to who is doing the attorneys leg work and... and... and money work on these Fills. This only relates to an audit function, so we know what's going on. When some of these things go belly up, they remain unaudited and nobody knows who done... who done what to whom, if you will. It's just an audit function is all."
- Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. The Gent... Bepresentative Mautino."
- Mautino: "It's an independant audit that you're going to provide.

 If, in fact, the company is bankrupt or under liquidation,
 how does the independent auditor get paid from a
 bandrupt..."
- Davis: "Well, from... from the undistributed assets of the company, if... if they have assets over five hundred thousand dollars."
- Mautino: "If they don't what happens? If they don't what happens then?"
- Davis: "If they don't, they're not audited. There's no sense spending the money for an audit for an company that's just about to check out anyway. That's why the threshold was put in there."
- Speaker Yourell: "Have you concluded, Sir? The question is,

 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will signify
 by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take
 the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, 110 voting 'aye',
 none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The
 Gentleman from St. Clair, Representive Flinn on a point of
 order."
- Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, our rules calls for a one minute allowance for explaining our votes. Next week is the last

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

week for passing a big pack of Bills we have in front of us, and I know that one minute light is cruel when it shuts it off, but I would ask that for the rest of the day at least that we use the one minute timer on explanation of votes. As you know in the Senate, they're not faced with that situation. Once the board is lit up, that's it, and which... which is the way it ought to be here, but at least we should abide by the rules for the balance of the day. You and all the other Speakers have been very liberal in people explaining their votes. I think it's time to apply the rule. I would ask that you do so."

- Speaker Yourell: "Your point is well taken, Representative Flinn.

 From now on, the expla... explanation of votes will be
 limited to one minute. Please adhere to the rules.

 Appearing on the House... on the Calendar Third Reading
 Short Debate is House Bill 924. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 924, a Bill for an Act to transfers
 money from the Communications Revolving Fund to the General
 Revenue Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 924 would allow a one time transfer of a million five hundred thousand from the Communications Revolving Fund to the General Revenue Fund. The Department of Central Management Services is in agreement. This is so that the Revolving Fund, which apparently has been overcharging some of the state agencies for communications services, they have accumulated 5.3 million dollars that is an excess amount. We are transferring off what is not needed to general revenue with their agreement. I would ask for your 'aye' vote on House Bill 924."

Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'.

All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote
'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this
question, 111 voting 'aye', no voting 'no'. This Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Appear... appearing on the Calendar on
the Order Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 926.
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 926, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Antitrust Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe." Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the intent of House Bill 926 is to create an exemption for export trading companies within the Illinois Antitrust Act which identical to the exemption contained in the Federal Export Trading Act of 1979. The Federal Export Trading Act of 1979 exempted export trading companies from virtually all federal antitrust provisions: however, federal antitrust statutes have concurrent jurisdiction with the Illinois Trust Act... Antitrust Act, and thus, despite the federal for export trading companies exemption antitrust prosecution of these companies is still possible under Illinois law. So all we do really is conform this with the federal law, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there any opposition? No opposition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill... on this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', no voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Greiman in the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Chair.

- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of House Fills Third Reading Short

 Debate appears House Bill 952. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 952, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Optometric Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ebbesen."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to take House Bill 952 back to Second Reading for purposes of a noncontroversial Amendment that's been agreed to by the Chairman and the Spokesman..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, let me... let me... let's take it back and then you can make that presentation. The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 952 to the Order of Second Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave and Hou... and the Bill is now on the Order of House Bills Second Reading."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me... just... Mr. Clerk, are... the Bill
 has been read a second time. Are there any floor
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment \$3, Ebbesen, amends House Bill 952 on page two and so forth."
- Speaker Greiman: "Now, Mr. Ebbesen."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

 I would like leave to table Amendment #2 which will be
 incorporated into the Amendment that we will adopt."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #2

 to House Bill 952. Does the Gentleman have... have leave?

 Leave having been granted, Amendment #2 to House Bill 952

 is hereby tabled. Further Amendments?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker..."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Ebbesen, amends House Bill 952..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, I'd like leave to withdraw Amendment #3. It's defective."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3 to House
Bill 952. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Ebbesen, amends House Bill 952..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #4 combines the Amendment #2 and 3, and it
provides for immediate effective date, as far as the Bill
is concerned, and inserts into the Act clarifying language
related to the manufacturing of ophthalmic lenses, and
prism, and the fabrication of contact lenses, and I would
move for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 952. Is there any discussion? There being none, the guestion is, "Shall Amendment #4 to House Bill 952 be adopted?". All those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed "nay". The "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to suspend the appropriate rule to hear this on Third Reading right now?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate rule, so that House Bill 952 may be held... may be heard immediately. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 952 Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 952, a Bill for an Act to amend the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Illinois Optometric Practice Act. Third Reading of the

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Ebbesen. Just... does the Gentleman have leave to keep House... this House Pill on the Order of Short Debate? The Gentleman has leave. Mr. Ebbesen. now."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 952 is a Bill that was requested by the Department of Registration and Education and, basically, the thrust of the Bill is to increase the penalty regarding people who are not authorized in the fitting of contact lenses. And it increases the penalty from... from a petty offense to a Class A misdemeanor, and if they're found guilty the second time, it's a Class IV felony. And I would move for the adoption of House Eill 952."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 952. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', one voting *present*. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Short Debate Third Reading appears House Bill 985. Ou... out of the record. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Fill 996. Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 996, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to county and multicounty public health

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

departments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bonan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 996 very simple concept, it amends the County Fublic Health Department Act and provides that a county with a population of at least two hundred seventy five thousand inhabitants, which does not have a county health department, allows the the county hoard to establish a board of health to be managed by the county board. Basically effects Kane County. I've been working with the Legislators from that area and the Illinois State Medical Society in order to secure passage of this Bill. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
Bill 996. Does anyone stand in opposition? Being no one,
the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in
favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'.

Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill,
there are 103 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none voting
'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House
Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1020.
Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1020, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Matijevich, the Gentleman from Lake."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House,
House Bill 1020 is a Bill similar to the Bill sponsored
last Session by Representative Oblinger which passed
overwhelmingly from this House. It authorizes
municipalities which operate electric utility systems to
form joint municipal electric power agencies for the joint
planning, financing, owning, and operation of facilities

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

relating to electric... electrical energy. The Bi11 provides a reasonable approach to electric rate increase control, by permitting munic... municipal... municipality agencies to join together to acquire power for their municipal users without extending coverage beyond the munic--municipal limits. Ιt provides a realistic mechanism to help investor-owned utilities eliminate their substantial overcapacity through municipal purchase, and it provides for the Illinois Commerce Commission approval over the acquisition of land and construction of power plants. The Bill is sponsored... I mean supported by the Illinois Municipal League, and I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved for the passage of House Bill 1020. Does anvone stand opposition? There being no one, the question is, this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed vote 'nav'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. And on this Bill, there are 111 voting take the record. 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1051. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1051, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity

Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1051 allows local public entities to levy a tax for risk management programs to take the place of insurance policies. What this does is allow them to hold

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

their cost down for these kinds of efforts, and the cost to units of local government under this program will be substantially less than if they were able to go out and purchase insurance instead of going into the that concept, a lot of program. Under management noninsurance techniques are first employed for use t o prevent or reduce losses and in some cases to assume other losses, and then to use the insurance as a buffer against the more catastrophic loss exposures which cannot be handled safely from... fro... through the use of the financial resources. The Illinois Library entities Association, the Illinois Park and Recreation Association supports this legislation, and they be ... will believe it will sa... sa... save local public entities substantial amounts of money. I would ask for your affirmative vote on House Bill 1051."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1051. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 88 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And on the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1052. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1052, a Bill for an Act to amend certain

Acts in relationship to the selection and use of library

materials. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1052 requires library boards to establish

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

a written policy governing the selection ο£ library and prohibits dismissal or disciplining of materials employees based on a good faith selection of library materials in accordance with that established policy. that's provide for in the Bill. The written policy concerning this selection and the use of those materials and facilities would have to be reviewed at least once every two years. The Bill applies to not only municipal but township and district libraries as well. I would ask for your favorable vote on House Eill 1052."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman's moved for passage of House Bill 1052. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Vinson: "Representative, currently is there anything in the statutes that regulates personnel of this sort?"

Yourell: "Not that I'm aware of."

Vinson: "So this would be the... the first step by the Legislature to regulate civil service in the library field."

Yourell: "No, it does... it prohibits the dismissal or the disciplining of those employees based on a good faith selection of those materials and the dispensation of those materials, nothing to do with your civil service status except to give them a certain degree of protection."

Vinson: "Why should the General Assembly legislate in this field?"

Yourell: "Well, I think that because of the efforts that have been recently displayed in this area that some protection have... have to be afforded to these individuals."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Davis: "Well, I'm not... will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."

Davis: "I'm not necessarily in opposition. Representative I just want to ask a question. I don't have the Yourell. Does this Bill Bill in front of me, only the analysis. then require the... the board of trustees of whatever library we're talking about to adopt community standards for things like obscenity and ... and pornography or whatever? Does it require them to publish a list of standards or to develop a list of available standards for that library in order that the community know what's qoinq... or what sort of things are going to be approved for the selection?"

Yourell: "It requires the library boards, which are elected public officials, to establish by a written policy governing the selection of those materials, so that the community, if that's the word that you want to use, knows exactly what that policy is."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There...

there being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill

pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those
opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the
record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 3 voting

'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the
Order of House Bills Third Beading Short Debate appears
House Bill 1085. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1085, a Bill for an Act to create the
Illinois Impoundment Control Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann, the Gentleman from Cook."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Assembly.

This Bill creates the Illinois Impoundment Control Act. It prohibits the impoundments of funds by the executive branch except as authorized in this Act. It... what it does, it will make the... or require the executive branch to be more responsive to the Legislature. This Bill passed with bipartisan support out of the Executive Committee 15 to nothing. I encourage the continuing bipartisan support on the floor and hopefully have passage of House Bill 1085.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1085. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill, there are 90 voting "aye", 18 voting "no", 1 voting "present", and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1090. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1090, a Bill for an Act to define Self-Service Storage Facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Fierce, the Gentleman from Lake."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 1090 establishes the Self-Service Storage Facility
Act. The self-storage facilities are something relatively
new on the horizon, but they re quite common around our
state now. They re not public warehouses by any means, and
this Bill makes it clear that they re not public
warehouses. But it does give a lien to the owner for

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

personal property once it's received and stored for charges for storage and maintenance of the property. The lien by Amendment #1, we make clear, is not superior to prior liens that have been perfected by filing. Prior liens are superior to the lien created by this Act, but it does make it clear that while in storage, the personal property is subject to a lien. And I think it's noncontroversial. No one appeared in opposition to it in Committee, and I, therefore, urge passage of House Bill 1090."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1090. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I just have a quick question, Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."
- Cullerton: "... for the purpose of the legislative intent of the
 Bill. Is it your under... is your purpose, is it your
 intention that the lien should only last while the property
 is located at the self-storage facility?"
- Pierce: "Yes, the Section 3 provides that the... that the lien of the owner is upon all personal property located at a self-service storage facility, and so it is my intent and the intent of this legislation that the lien exist only while the property is located at the facility."
- Cullerton: "All right. One guick question, one more question then. If a bona fide purchaser purchases the property while the property is still at the self-storage facility, there wouldn't be any notice for him to know that the lien attached?"
- Pierce: "The owner would have notice. They're required to give notice to the owner, and I think it would be for a court to determine whether a purchaser of property would... that was located in self-storage facility would have to make inquiry

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

as to whether there was a lien by the self-storage warehouse on that property, just as he would if it were located in a public warehouse.

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the ... would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."

Friedrich: "My analysis says that this lien is a superior lien over any other lien. Does that mean that if a furniture store sold a house full of furniture to some fella, and for some reason he put it in storage that the... the storage facility would have a superior li... lien over the conditional sales contract?"

Pierce: "You're right under the original Bill. That was a serious flaw in the original Bill which I discovered after the Bill was introduced. But in Committee Amendment #1, Representative Friedrich, I hope entirely cleared that up, because it says, "It shall be superior except for statutory liens perfected prior thereto by filing"."

Friedrich: "Okay. Thank you."

Pierce: "If you get... and it recognizes contracts through agreements effecting or impairing other liens in common law or equity, but it really provides... I'll read the exact terms. 'It shall be superior to another lien except for a statutory lien or security interest, which is perfected through filing and has been perfected prior, thereto, through proper filing.' In other words, has there been a UCC filing..."

Priedrich: "Right. Thank you. That's ... "

Pierce: "... by the store, Amendment #1 takes care of that inadequacy in the original Eill."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentlemen from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Move the previous question."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, we don't have to... no one is seeking recognition. No one is standing in opposition. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 101 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1101. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Beading of the Eill."
- Speaker Greiman: "And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Levin: House. House Bill 1101 simply puts into the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act the requirement that when we pass legislation, here in the General Assembly, that may require implementing rules and regs that the agencies with that responsibility must promulgate those rules and regs in a timely and expeditious manner. This is something which, I think, is beneficial to us and to the public. After we fight to get our legislation through, where agencies just take their time in... in promulgating the rules and regs to put that legislation into effect, this would put in a... a policy requirement for them to move as expeditiously as possible. Former Representative Hallstrom and myself had a situation where we passed a couple of Bills two years ago and one of the agencies literally put a freeze, put a hold, for eighteen months on promulgating any rules and regs. were various communications from the relevant There

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Committees, and it finally, within the last two weeks, legislation that passed in September and was signed by the Governor in September of 1981, they finally implemented rules and regs. The... I would urge the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption... for the passage of House Bill 1101. And on that, does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Question, Mr. Speaker. If an agency refuses to promulgate regulations in the time and expeditious manner, what penalty will they suffer?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Yeah, in response to the Gentleman's question, there is no direct penalty, but by putting into the statute a mandatory obligation, it does make it possible for those that are interested, under the current procedures to go in and purpose a reg, and if the agency does not adopt the reg, it gives them the opportunity to go to court on a mandamis."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen to the Bill,
I don't want to take much time of the Body, but I... I
think if we're going ask an agency to do things quickly and
there's no penalty, all they are being asked to do is what
we in the public would like them to do now, and they can
chose to act promptly or not, and there's no penalty. This
Bill will just clutter the statute books, and I think we
ought to defeat the Bill, just to do what the public wants,
to reduce the number of laws on the books."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert,
has a problem with his switch, and that has been brought to
the attention of the electrician; however, one of the... it
works on a hit or a miss basis. And we would appreciate it

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

if you would not hurry the Roll Calls on these, because sometimes he's got to hit... hit it a couple of times."

Speaker Greiman: "Sure. I will pay... try and pay some special attention to that, Mr. Vinson. Now, on House Bill 1101, is anyone... here else stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Mr. Hastert's switch appears to be Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who working. wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on this Bill, there are 94 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And on the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1111. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Beading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Bill 1111 would amend the Civil House. House Administrative Code. It would prohibit the use of state owned or operated aircraft to be used for political purposes, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote on the Bill." Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of And on that, is there anyone standing in 1111. opposition? There being no one, the question is, this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "nay". Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all vote who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the... take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1117. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Construction Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. amended House Bill 1117 merely transfers thirty million dollars in surplus debt service bonding authority in School Construction Bond Act and transfers that to the school construction authorization category. This authorization is necessary because there is a need for additional funds for some new building construction. for the most part building rehabilitation. And this is a matching fund program, so local school districts, in order qualify for any funds, would have to come up with matching portions. I would appreciate an *aye* vote on House Bill 1117."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is... no... the Gentleman moves for the... the passage of House Bill 1117. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook... the Lady from... the Lady from LaSalle, at the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton's seat."

Breslin: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

Breslin: "How many votes does this Bill take for passage?"

Speaker Greiman: "This Bill increases the bonding authority, and under the Constitution requires an extraordinary majority of 71 votes. Mr. Steczo, did you care to respond to my ruling?"

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, just for a point of order, please. The
Bill as originally amended requir... authorized additional
bonding authority. As amended, simply is a transfer of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

current bonding authority, and I was wondering if the 71 vote requirement would still stand."

Speaker Greiman: "We will examine that aspect of it, Mr. Steczo.

In the meantime, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask the Sponsor a clarifying question, whether this increases..."

Speaker Greiman: "Surely, proceed."

Pullen: "... the general obligation bonding authority?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, he seems to have responded..."

Pullen: "And he seems to have answered that."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. All right. Thank you. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will. I just wanted to note that a former Member of the House, Eill Harris, is here with us, lurking in the back there. Hr. Vinson, I'm sorry.

Proceed."

Vinson: "Would you explain the Bill again, Sir."

Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Vinson..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "First, let me take it back to the way it was when it was originally introduced. In order to provide for a lot of the rehabilitation on school buildings that were... that were built previously, it was thought that there would be a need to have additional bonding authority for that purpose. We realized after... after the Bill was introduced that there was a thirty million dollar sur... surplus in present bonding authority in the debt service category. So simply, we're taking that thirty million dollars of surplus in debt service, we're transferring that to school authorization. So in case school districts have the revenues, and they would wish to have a... if they had a rebabilitation

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

project that they might need, and they can come up with the matching funds, and they would qualify for this additional or portion of the additional thirty million which we're transferring from one category to another. But this is no... this is no new bonding authorization."

Vinson: "The effect of the Bill then is to say that this money could be spent on rehabilitation, rather than construction?"

Steczo: "Rehabilitation or construction, but the intent really and the necessity of it, is that there is a great need for rehabilitation. And at the present time, we are really not in a position to be able to, even if the school districts could come up with the matching funds, to be able to provide those monies necessary."

Vinson: "Yes, but what ... "

Steczo: "The major thrust would be toward rehabilitation."

Vinson: "... what are we take the money... what are we taking the authorization away from?"

Steczo: "From debt service, because it's a surplus, and it's no longer needed. The debt service bonds, I'm sorry."

Vinson: "What's the... what are the... what is the function of the debt service bonds?"

Steczo: "The function of the debt service bonds, I believe, is to pay off the debt service on the bonds that were issued.

But it's my understanding from the... and... from talking to the Office of Education that there is... this thirty million is a surplus in that category, which is no longer necessary."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Response to Representative Steczo's point. The point is well taken. The Amendment restor... does not... the Amendment changes the Bill, so that it does not, in fact, increase the bonding authority of... of the state,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

but rather, merely reallocates already authorized bond authority. Accordingly, an ordinary majority of 60 votes will be necessary only. Now, the Lady from DuPage, Ms. Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill and to collaborate what Bepresentative Steczo has explained, and what the speaker has just gone through."

Speaker Greiman: "The Bill... yes... thank you. The Bill is on Short Debate, so that's not necessary. Now. does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those oppo... by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Voting is now open. Voting is now open. Have all woted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the reco... Mr. Clerk, take the record. Slape 'aye'. No, I didn't declare the vote. Mr. Hastert. Mr... Saltsman 'ave'. The question, Mr. Hastert, I have been watching your switch very carefully. The question is, when I have... when I have announced the Roll, I can no longer add you on. That's the problem, Sir. Hoffman 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none received voting 'present'. This Bill, having Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. the Order of House Bills Second (sic - Third) Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1130. And on that, Mr. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, it's Third Reading not Second Reading as you mentioned."

Speaker Greiman: "I stand corrected. Third Reading."

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

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

House Bill 1130 amends the Liquor Control Act to permit the sale of alcoholic beverages at the Chicago Civic Center. Under current law, it provides that no alcoholic liquor should be sold or delivered in any building owned by or under the control of the state or any of its political subdivisions; however, current law also contains numerous exemptions to that provision. Specific exemptions have been granted to airports, state parks, universities. and county fairs, certain recreation centers. state centers, aquariums, museums of the park district, course, restaurants and forest preserve districts, cetera. This Bill will permit the sale of alcoholic beverages at the Chicago Civic Center, if the Chicago Public Building Commission which administers the Civic Center files written consent with the State Liquor Control Commission. Number two, the liquor is sold or dispensed only in connection with planned, organized functions at least twenty-five persons held in special occasions. Three, the facility selling or dispensing the liquor has maximum Dram Shop liability insurance. And number four, all applicable local ordinances are followed."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 1130. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Hastert: "Under pending legislation that we have in the House at this time, if these organizations sold liquor, things like scotch, and gin that's made in England, French wines, the martini mixes and the Manhattan mixes that are blended in Italy, could they be sold under the 'buy American' situation?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nash."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Nash: "I will defer that question to Mr. Fanayotovich."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Fana... Panayotovich."

Panayotovich: "I'm sorry... would you repeat the question, please? I was busy here in conference."

Hastert: "Well, I had a question on this, under pending legislation that we have in this House, and we're asking to sell liquor in... in public and state organizations and buildings, could we sell things like...oh, gin, that's made in England, and Ouzo that's made in Greece, and you know, scotch, and Canadian whiskeys, French wines, the things that we make, vodka, Polish... good Polish vodka, things like we make, for instance, the mixes like..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your list to a close."

Hastert: "... martinis, Manhattens, those type of things that are made in other countries, 'Suntory' whiskey..."

Nash: "I... I understand you must be a very good drinker. The understanding that I would have is being a gin drinker, I used to drink Beefeaters, but now I drink Fleischmans, and we drink American on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Greiman: "Does anyone stand in opposition."

Hastert: "I don't know if my question was answered? Could they sell that under this or not?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Nash, I have a sense that Mr. Hastert is asking a serious question dealing with legislative intent, and you... you might want to consider an answer."

Nash: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, who
can advise... Commission that administers to the Civic
Center they notify their 'provenders' that they must only
sell American products."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fanayotovich.

Now, I would remind the Body that we are on the Order of

Short Debate, and I returned to Mr. Nash because there

apparently was a matter of legislative intent involved.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Mr. Panayotovich."

Panayotovich: "I understand that, Nr... Mr. Chairman, but I would like to clarify one... one thing for Representative Hastert. We have some products that are not made in American, such as the alcohol of scotch, so being it is not made in America, being it is not available in America, which going back to the buy American Eill, which would not be included here, we have to buy scotch where it's made. And it's made in Scotland, so we have to buy it there. So we're talking about a product that if it is not made in American, the buy America Bill does not cover it, and they would not have to worry about it. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a bumpkin from downstate, but I might want to go to a Civic Center in Chicago sometime, and if I ever get to the big City, I'll feel very cosmopolitan, and I might want to drink some scotch, whiskey, or some Beefeaters Gin, so I would just like legislative intent to show that if any of us... any of us from downstate ever do get to the big City, we want to do everything the people do the big City, including drinking Ouzo, and *St. in Pollygirl Beer, and Heinekens, and scotch whiskey, and Pleischman's Gin or Beefeaters, whatever we chose. So I think we ought to make the record clear here that if this Bill passes you can sell whatever kind of boozo you want in the Civic Center in Chicago."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, could you let me know, where is the Civic Center located?" Where is there a Chicago Civic Center located?"

Nash: "Mr. Terzich, if you're from Chicago, you know where the Civic Center is located."

Terzich: "I know where the Daley Center is located ... "

Nash: "It's bound... it's bounded by ... "

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

Terzich: "... not the Chicago Civic Center."

Nash: "... Clark Street on the west, Deerborn on the east,
Randolph on the north, and Washington Street on the south.

Terzich: "I thought that was the Daley Center."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, all right. Does anyone else stand in opposition? There being no one, the guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Hastert 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, Mr. Hastert is 'aye'. I think his switch is not going to be working for a little while. On this Bill, there are 104, no, 105... 105 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1142. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to registration of certain professions.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Dunn, the Gentleman from Perry."

Dunn: "Fine, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the Bills I'd... I'd like to see you vote... pass for us. It's to repeal the Tree Experts Licensing Act. This is one of the things we've been talking about that the state needlessly licenses. It doesn't protect the health and welfare of the public. Consequently, why, they've had a lot of trouble trying to enforce it. State's attorneys and people that enforce the law in local governments and counties have a lot more to do than to... than to try to get somebody for trimming their neighbors' trees. So I'd urge an 'aye' vote. I'll be glad to answer any questions about it. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from... well... the Gentleman

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

from Perry has moved for the passage of House Bill 1142.

Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Macon,

Mr. Tate."

- Tate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...

 I rise in support of the legislation. The department presently only has one inspector and can't do an adequate job..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr... Mr. Tate, we're on Short Debate, but we thank you for the encouragement in any event. Does anyone stand in opposition? Being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? .. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Hastert is... is it working? You're working. Okay. Have... Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 104 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill. having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Se... Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1143. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Fill 1143 clarifies...
it's only a clarification of presence... the School Code.
Under the present law, there's a restriction that interest
earned from any monies of a school district must be placed
in the fund that is in most need of interest income. And
all this Bill does is say that this does not apply to
interest earned from bond proceeds, which has been
earmarked. So it takes out the bonding. It says that the
board cannot specify that bond interest go other than to
what the bond covenant says it should do. I'd ask for a

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the passage of House Bill 1143. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1161. Mr. Clerk, read the the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Feading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As amended House Bill 1161 would allow the county clerk, at his or her discretion, to provide for absentee in-person voting to be conducted by a municipal township and road district clerks in the even numbered years, which would be the primary and general elections. Currently, this is mandatory in the odd numbered years. This Bill would encourage greater participation in the election process, and I urge your affirmative vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved for the passage of House Bill 1161. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill', there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Rea... Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1165. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill reduces the paper work

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."

ге... level that we put on the Comptroller. Basically, the Comptroller when he disapproves a voucher must return the voucher, under present law, with a written statement of the reason for the disapproval. Then he must also keep the copies of the disapproved voucher and a copy of a statement of the reason that he disapproved it. Most vouchers are rejected due to technical mistakes. The clerk in making... the secretary in making them up has made some type mistake, and not... they re not made because of any impropriety. Under this Bill, the Comptroller would still retain a copy of any voucher that is fraudulent otherwise illegal. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call." Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 1165. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we will now change the Order of Business and go to the Speaker's Table on page forty-one, and we will take up the subject of rules changes. And on that, Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 278."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 278, sponsored by Representative Madigan and Daniels."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hadigan."

Madigan: "Nr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the Resolutions?

There are three Resolutions 278, 279, and 280."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan, do you wish to take the... all three of these in a single Roll Call?"

Madigan: "I would suggest that."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave to consider House Resolutions 278, 279, and 280 together. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave, and leave is granted.

Mr. Clerk, read the Resolutions."

Leone: "House Resolution 278, resolved, by the House of Clerk Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that Rule 65 of The Bules of the House of Representatives be amended to read as follows: All person shall observe the following Decorum in Debate. rules of controversy (sic - courtesy) during debate: While a Member is speaking, no person shall pass between a Member speaking and the Chair or other wise disturb the Members of the House. Whenever a Member is about to speak on any matter, that Member shall rise and respectfully address the Chair as 'Mr. Speaker.'. When recognized by the Chair, the Member may then speak to the question under debate, avoiding personalities, names and discourteous language. No Motion is in order unless the Member so moving makes it from the Member's own seat. When two or more Members rise at once the Speaker ... "

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "We like to listen to Mr. Leone, but maybe he could just read the new language."

Clerk Leone: "I'd be happy to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman asks leave to

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

read merely the new language. Mr. Clerk, proceed."

Clerk Leone: "New language. Section J. Becognition of guests by any Member is prohibited under the... that the Speaker may recognize an honored guest in conjunction with a special occasion."

Speaker Greiman: "The next... the next..."

Clerk Leone: "Deleting... deleting, only the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader may introduce or recognize quests in the House area or in the balconies and no such introduction or recognition shall occur while any other matter is before the House. House Resolution 279 Section 68, absences. The switch to the electrical Roll Call re... recording equipment located on the desk Member who has been excused shall be locked doorkeeper and there is an Amendment that says, doorkeeper or assistant doorkeeper and shall not be locked (sic unlocked) until the Member returns from such excused absences and the presence of the Member is recognized by the Speaker... shall not be unlocked until the Member's And House Resolution 280 adds Section (e). return. Clerk shall complete the tabulation of all re... record votes including any changes in the electrical Boll Call as directed by the Speaker prior to advising the Speaker of The Speaker shall therefore declare the the results. result."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the adoption of House Besolutions 278, 279, and 280. And on that, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
House Resolution 279 and House Resolution 280 are in
response to an incident that occurred on the floor of the
House a few days ago, and in response to Representative
Daniels letter to me. House Resolution 279 would provide

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

that if a Member is excused from attendance on a particular day, that either the doorkeeper or the assistant doorkeeper immediately remove the key from the voting switch and put that key in the drawer of the Member, so that during the day when the person is excused that voting switch will not be operated; and, therefore, there will not be recorded in the name of the person who has been excused. House Resolution 280 will provide that when there changes of votes that the Boll Call can not be announced by the Speaker until the Clerk has finalized the tabulation of the changes on the master Boll Call maintained by the This would prevent a situation as occurred earlier where the master Roll Call contained one number relative to votes, and then a later Boll Call showed additions. And then lastly, House Resolution 278 is in response what I consider to be an unwarranted number of The rule today introductions by Members of the Body. provides that introductions can be done by either the Speaker, the Majority Leader, or the Minority Leader. Му experience, when I was the Majority Leader, was that it became a very burdensome chore for the Majority Leader Minority Leader to be given these requests the introductions during the day, especially during the month of June, when there are so many visitors in the gallery. This rule change would provide that there shall introductions from the floor of the House and that the only introduction that can occur would be a special quest who would be taken to the podium by the Speaker, introduced, and then permitted to address the Body. We've had a limited number of those occasions. I recommend these changes to the Body. I think they re in the best interest of the management of the House of Representatives. supported in these purposed changes by Representative

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Daniels."

Speaker Greiman: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do endorse the adoption of House Rules (sic Resolutions) 278, (sic - 279), and 80 (sic - 280), and in commenting on the presentation of these rules to you I have synopsis of them to Members on our side of the aisle, and would like to, first of all, commend the Speaker for addressing the issues that were raised as a result of the unfortunate instances on House Bill 659, and the Boll Call incident there where a Roll Call had been changed at a date after it left the Well, as well as, the acceptance of some Motions which, it's our opinion, were totally out of order. There are additional changes that, of course, should be made, and the House of Representatives is going to address those at a future date, I'm sure, as they But we are attempting to resolve problems as themselves. they are presented. And these are changes that I think will, one, in the instance of House Besolution 278, give us a little better flow of infor ... of routine matters and of the orderly business of the House, and as to 279 and 280, attempt to correct some problems that came up in the past, so they do not occur again. And I join the Speaker in soliciting your support for these Resolutions."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, just a comment... a question, Mr. Speaker, thank you. The Speaker indicated that the month of June is the busiest time for us here in Springfield. Well, that's very true, but by the same token, it's a time of the year when we get our constituents down here on a very regular basis, and most of those people, as you know, are school children.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

And I just feel, I have mixed emotions about this, because those people are here. A lot of times they spent a lot of money to... to make these trips down here. They're not looking for the recognition, but I think it's... I think it's kind of nice to acknowledge them. It doesn't take that much time. It only takes a couple seconds, and I think most of us try to work it in sometime between Bills, or whatever the case may be. So Mike, are you saying that there will be no more introductions of this type?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "The answer is yes, and the reason is that inevitably, these announcements occur not inhetween Bills, but during the actual consideration of a Bill. And I know that when I've been in the Chair, I've been required to ask the Clerk what the Order of Business is at different times, because I've forgotten, so that the same thing occurs to every other Member."

Mulcahey: "Well, okay. Thank you. I know it's going to stand,
but I, again, I don't know what we mean by special guests
and who determines what special guests are, but I think...
I think special guests are special to us to. I know you...
I understand the Speaker's going to make that
determination, and I... I disagree with you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These particular rule adoptions, I think, are important. The fact of the matter is that they're... the rules were already clear who had the right to introduce the guests. We adopted these early on. I would also not only endorse the adoption of these rules, but I would also like to take this opportunity to call your attention to House Rule 63 which refers to excess on the floor of the House, and I believe that the Speaker, and the Minority

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Leader, and all of us have a responsibility as we move into the heavy times that we find ourselves in, to abide by the Rule 63, and to see that it's enforced. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, only so that if we're going to do this on the record that the ... on one record Roll Call that record be that on House Fill ... House Resolution 279 that the Motion be. 'do adopt as amended'. rather than 'do adopt*, because that was amended in Committee. And a final to all the Members. We have tried this note • BO introductions' before, and it's going to the cooperation of everybody, because the Speaker doesn't know what you want to say when you want recognition. And I can just see somebody, even though we've got this rule, getting up and introducing somebody. And I would hope nobody does that from hereon."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Priedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, as... as Minority Spokesman on the Rules Committee, and also as a Minority Member on the Journal ... approval of the Journal, I think these three things... the last two are really important. No fault of the Clerk, but when those switches are being voted, we're still spending time trying to clean up the Journals from those times those keys were not removed, and I think both of those are necessary. On... on 278, I think a lot of Members compelled to introduce the groups because the school says, Well, you introduced the group before. Why don't you introduce mine? And I think that we can't afford the time from now until the end of June to spend the introducing groups."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I certainly want to support these three Resolutions: however. and Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend you for the in which you have conducted the procedures of this chamber. think you have done an excellent job, but let me add. I think, too, that we ought to give due recognition to people who are attempting to learn about government and to knowledgeable about what goes on within this Body. It was so vividly exemplified the other day when we had the Ukranians down here, and the gallery was filled with young people who I was proud to have them be claimed as Americans and citizens of the State of Illinois. And not to have had the opportunity to introduce that excellent group of people, that had come down to see their government in operation, would have been, in my judgment, a disaster really, because these people certainly exemplified what I think we are all attempting to do in passing legislation that provides good things for all citizens of this state. This very morning, during the pledge, and eloquently did it and even exceeded the Nembers of this chamber, was a group of students who were seated to the rear, up in the balcony. To me, these things that give credibility to good government should not necessarily be voided from being introduced. And certainly young people, particularly those who are involved in youth activities that are honorable, that are good, and just, and right, and people who are involved in schools and their paung educational process, I would hope there might be some consideration that on times they might be introduced, because I think it's important to recognize the good things that young people are doing. And by passage of this Resolution, we would exempt that and not do it any longer. I would hope that even though I will probably support

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

three of these, I think there might be times that we want to give consideration to introducing and recognizing those people who have done outstanding things, even so far as being a good student coming down to view their government in operation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction."

Speaker Greiman: "A historic one and maybe the least."

Dunn: "I live nearby here and I probably have as many school groups come as anybody, and I would just like to rise in support of the Resolutions. I think the youngsters are thrilled to be here. They like to watch us in action, and... and they would be more impressed if we'd be a little more orderly. I think that would be the best thing we could do to make a favorable impression upon them."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, Nr. Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate my support for the adoption of the three Resolutions. I do think that they are in the best interest of the housekeeping and management of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall these Resolutions as amended be adopted?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and these Resolutions, having received a Majority, is hereby... are hereby adopted. Now... returning to the... to page eleven of the Calendar House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1167. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act in relationship

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

to inheritance and transfer taxes. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mrs. Pullen... Ms. Fullen. Do you wish to proceed, Ms. Pullen?"

Pullen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me. I was not aware that my
Bill was next, and the board did not indicate my number at
the time you called me."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "House Bill 1167, and now my phone is ringing, would correct some..."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Pullen, we could take that out of the record if you want and come right back to it. We did sneak up on you, sort of, it you want."

Pullen: "No, it's okay."

Speaker Greiman: "All right. Proceed."

Pullen: "Thank you. House Bill 1167 relates to the Illinois inheritance and transfer tax law. It changes that to the Illinois estate tax law, because there is no longer an inheritance and transfer tax, and it makes other fairly technical changes in that law. A couple of the changes are somewhat substantive to carry out intent of the Legislature when we repealed the inheritance tax Section of the law last year. For example, we passed a law a couple of years ago that allowed for a tenure phase pay period for Well, the only death tax that is left inheritance taxes. in the law now is the estate tax, which equals the federal credit on the federal estate tax. But that particular Section of the inheritance and transfer tax law did not provide for the tenure pay, so this Eill would provide for that, which is in keeping with the intent of the Legislature in the original Act in providing for tenure pay out on the inheritance tax. It also cleans up a few things related to the tax liability within... for taxpayers that

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

may have had property in one state and be resident of another. And that sort of thing, it's really largely technical, and I'm sponsoring it on behalf of the Chicago Bar Association. And I urge its adoption at this time."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 1167. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from... the Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."

Braun: "Not in opposition, but will the Lady yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "She indicates that she will."

Braun: "Representative Pullen, will this in any way impede law enforcement or auditors from getting into the boxes of... into the safety deposit boxes?"

Pullen: "No, it does not relate to that."

Braun: "It does not. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Nr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "She indicates that she will."

Preston: "Representative Pullen, changing the ... the name of the Act from the inheritance tax to the Estates Tax Act, difference. there's a significant There has heen historically, a significant difference between the two. The federal estate tax has been a tax on the estate that is left by someone who dies: whereas, the Illinois inheritance tax, unlike that, has been a tax on inheriting money. One is on what ... on the property that is left by the decedent, and the inheritance tax is on ... is a tax that has to be paid technically by the person who receives money from a decedent. Does this Bill change the character of the... what has been previously known as the Illinois inheritance tax?"

Pullen: "No, last year's Bill changed the character by repealing

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

the Illinois inheritance tax. The only thing left in the law is the estate pick up tax, which is totally related to the federal estate tax. It equals the amount of credit that the federal estate tax law gives the taxpayer for state death taxes."

- Preston: "Well, who under this Act is required to pay what will hereafter be called the, I suppose, the Illinois estate tax? Is it the person who receives funds from an estate or the estate itself?"
- Pullen: "It is... it is the same taxpayer as pays federal estate
 tax, so that we effectively have left only an estate type
 tax in our law when we repealed the inheritance tax
 Sections."

Preston: "I see. Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 99 voting "aye", 10 voting "no", 3 voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And on the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1170. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1170, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1170 eliminates the requirement that the...Secretary of State's Office hold a formal hearing for every financial responsibility suspension, unless the...it is requested by the person for which the suspension would apply. Last

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

year, the figures on the suspension hearings indicated that of the 45,000 safety responsibility hearings scheduled, 41 were actually held, of which 25% resulted in default because the people didn't even show up. Purpose of this Bill is to try to get affirmative response from the people who this would apply to and then schedule the hearings accordingly. It should save dollars, and I urge its adoption...its passage."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1170. Does anyone stand in opposition. There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Eill pass?'. A11 in favor, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed, vote *no*. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting *no*. *present*. This Bill. having received voting Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1196. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1196, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Barber Law. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mrs. Oblinger, the Lady from Sangamon."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I have permission to bring this back to Second Reading for an Amendment by Mr. DiPrima at the request of the Department of R and E."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Does the Lady have leave? Lady has leave. The Bill is now on Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, DiPrima, amends House Bill
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DiPrima."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr...Mr. Speaker. This Amendment put in at the request of the barber industry, the beauty culture industry and the Department of Registration and Education solves a problem in...in the present Act which prohibits barbers and beauticians from practicing in the same shop...same shop.

 Currently, the Department must require a wall between barbers and beauticians. This Amendment takes down the wall. I...I am not talking about the Eerlin Wall. I would appreciate a favorable vote for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook moves for the adoption of
 House Amendment #2 to House Bill 1196. Is there any
 discussion? On that, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr.
 Curran."
- Curran: "Yes, Representative, just a point of clarification. I understand there was a minor problem with the Barbers' Union. Will this Amendment take care of the...the Barbers' Union problem? They be for that Bill now? Good. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman indicates 'yes'. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

 Van Duyne: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

 Speaker Greiman: "Be indicates that he will."
- Duyne: "Representative DiPrima, what...does this have any Van change in the licensing and the hours of...training and the difference between apprenticeship and so OD'. beauticians and barbers, and would it allow beauticians to cut hair the same a barbers, and would it allow barbers to marcel and...and do the same thing that beauticians do? I...well, I realize that, but when you tear down...when you take down the wall, when you make them have their separate entities, does it also obviate some of the differences that are inherent in the present barber law?"

DiPrima: "Absolutely not."

49th Legislative Day May 20, 1983

Van Duyne: "And you know that for sure?"

DiPrima: "Absolutely."

Speaker Greiman: "Is there any other...any further discussion?

Any further...there being none, the Gentleman from Cook

moves for the adoption of House Amendment #2 to House Bill

1196. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye". Those
opposed, "no". The "ayes" have it. The Amendment is
adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Lady from...does the Lady have leave...for this Bill to remain on Short Debate?

 Leave is hereby granted. The Lady from Sangamon, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, I would request the appropriate rule be suspended so that we could hear this on Third Reading at this time."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon moves...the Lady from Sangamon asks leave of the House to keep this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and allow immediate hearing of House Bill 1196. Does the Lady have leave? Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1196, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Barber Law. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill was requested by the barbers, by the barber schools, by the students and by the Department of Begistration and Education. It reduces the age for apprentice barbers from 17 and a half to 16 years. Permits a barber to...a young person who has not yet passed the exam, but completed the courses to have a temporary work letter until it's time for them to take the exam, and it changes the fees. And I think you will be interested to know, it will bring in an

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

additional \$369,00 biannually. I request the 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon moves for the passage of House Bill 1196. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'.

All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed, vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received...Mr. Nash?"

Nash: "I hit the wrong button."

Speaker Greiman: "Nash, 'aye', Olson 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 114 voting "aye", 2 voting 'no', none voting "present". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, declared passed. On the Order of House hereby Alright. We will...to correct the Bills...alright. record, there is a single 'no' vote on the last Bill, so that it is now what? 114 voting "aye", 1 voting 'no", none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1201. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to amend the County Auditing Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I would ask, respectfully, to have House Bill 1201 tabled."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry, Mr. McGann. Would you repeat that?

Gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 1201. Gentleman have leave? Leave is hereby granted. House Bill 1201 is hereby tabled. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1202. Mr. Clerk,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1202, a Bill for an Act to amend the township law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Assembly.

House Bill 1202 is a Comptroller's request. It seeks to
eliminate an inconsistency between Chapters 85 and Chapters
139 in regards to auditing. 'Also, the dates that...audits
should take place in the townships. There has been no
opposition. It passed out of Committee 13 to nothing, and
the township people have no opposition to this House Bill
1202, so I respectfully ask a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1202.

Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed, vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1213. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1213, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House
Bill 1213 simply permits bicyclists to ride two abreast in
a single lane, making use of the designated bike paths, an
optional provision. The reason for this is because of the
depletion of highway funds, bicycle paths have deteriorated
considerably, making them unsafe to travel. It's been also
found that by allowing bicycles to travel two abreast in a

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

single lane reduces passing time by other motor vehicles by approximately 60%, an I'd simply ask favorable consideration of the Assembly.

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1213.

Does anyone stand in opposition? Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Wonder if...could you explain two abreast, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman indicates that he will respond to a
question."

Cullerton: "Could be explain two abreast?"

Wolf: "Are you talking about bicycles, Representative?"

Cullerton: "Well, yes, that's why I got confused. I didn't know what you meant."

Wolf: "That means that two bicycles riding side by side, can ride side by side in a single lane. At the present time, this is not permitted."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "For those downstaters who may be concerned, side by side means side by each."

Speaker Greiman: "Upstate, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just really happy at this point in time that we adopted those three Besolutions about fifteen minutes ago. If we hadn't done that we would have interrupted real important business like this. It's really good we did that."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Does anyone else stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor, signify by voting "aye", those opposed, "no". The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 102...103 voting

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

'aye', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 1225. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1225, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask leave to return this Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 1225
to the Order of Second Reading. Does Gentleman have leave?

Gentleman has leave and the Bill is now on Second Beading.

Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Br. Cullerton, on Amendment #2."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask leave to withdraw Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments #2 and 3.

Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton on Floor Amendment #4."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill, which is an excellent one, requires lenders who receive assessment changes to mail a copy of that notice to the borrower. This would...Amendment says that trustees of, in many cases land trusts, would also have to mail the assessment change notice to the borrower, or the beneficiary in this case, so I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves...moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 1225. Is there any discussion?

There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 1225, signify by saying 'aye'.

Those opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Yourell. Gentleman have leave to keep House Bill 1225 on the Order of Short Debate? Gentleman has leave. Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now ask leave to have House Bill 1225 considered on Third Reading."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate rule in order to hear flouse Bill 1225 on the Order of Third Reading immediately. Does Gentleman have leave? Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1225, a Bill for an Act to amend

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

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1225 as amended provides that mortgagees who receive assessment notices in Cook County, to mail a copy of that notice to mortgagers within fifteen days of the receipt of that information, and with the Amendment, of course, includes the trustees where title of property is held in a land trust. It also requires that the address of a mortgage lender or trustee where the title is held in a land trust to be included. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 1225."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1225.

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

Does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed, vote 'no'. Mr. Clerk, take the...take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears House Bill 1226. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1226, a Fill for an Act in relation to the deposit of certain funds. Third Beading of the Bill." Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last year the Illinois Bouse and Senate passed HB 1019, which became Public Act 82-558. That Bill made clear what was present practice in the state, that public funds could indeed be deposited in savings and loans as well as banks. This Bill goes on as sort of a follow-up measure to make sure that many other statutes that refer to reposits in banks are compatible with that Public Act. It is repetitive in many sense in that it adds the words 'and savings and loans' over and over again. I know of no opposition to it, but would be glad to try and answer any questions anybody might have."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 1226. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor, signify by saying...by voting 'aye', those opposed, vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional

49th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1983
- Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Yourell in the Chair. $^{\circ}$
- Speaker Yourell: "Appearing on the Order of Third Beading Short
 Debate, is House Bill 1230. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1230, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

 Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Two years ago, we passed House Bill 1409. This is a cleanup for the Department of Law Enforcement State Police. It would provide exemptions to the Interstate Carrier Act that we passed at that time. It deals with driver inspection reports and also the content of the report. There was one Amendment which was technical in nature, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1230."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there opposition? There being no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. A11 in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, who wish? there are 113 voting 'aye', no voting...none voting This question, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate Calendar is House Bill 1231. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1231, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Beading of
 the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

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

 House. House Bill 1231 codifies existing case law and

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

United States Department of Labor interpretation of ARISA standards into the fiduciary standards of pension fund trustees to interpret the prudent man rule to embrace the entire portfolio rather than specific investments. In the Committee, in response to a request from the State Employees Retirement System, I had an Amendment adopted which makes it clear that this does not provide specific authorization for any specific investment, and that was the extent of the Amendment, but with that Amendment, it has the support of the State Employees Retirement System. And I know of no opposition to the legislation. I move for passage of House Bill 1231."

- Yourell: "Is there opposition? There being Speaker пo opposition, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". A11 in favor will vote 'yes', those opposed will vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Beading Short Debate is House Bill 1235. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Fension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this will require that participants in the system go in on the first day of employment, rather than having an option at the current time for a three year opt-out. What we hope that this Bill will accomplish will be to capture federal dollars that are forfeited if the employee is not participating during this period. I know of no opposition

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

to the Bill and urge your support."

- Speaker Yourell: "Is there opposition? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate. Opposition has been withdrawn. The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion 110 voting "aye", 2 voting "no". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate, is House Bill 1245. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of
 the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was amazed, I guess, a few years ago to find out that what I thought we had uniform speed limits throughout the state was untrue. There is a certain provision within our statute that says that trucks that weigh in excess of four ton or eight thousand pounds on secondary roads are required to go only 50 miles an hour. This does have a tendency to cause ununiform speeds and causes accidents to occur more readily than if we have a uniform speed. This Bill raises that 50 to 55 so that throughout the State of Illinois, outside of cities, we have uniform speed limits of 55 miles an hour. I urge your favorable support."
- speaker Yourell: "Is there opposition? Being no opposition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in...All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, 107 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no'. This guestion...This

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Vinson on the floor? Representative Vinson, a request has been made to return to House Bill 506 that was taken out of the record. Do you object? Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate is House Bill 506. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 506, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is one of the Bills in the legislative audit package. A similar Bill was passed last year by both Houses and vetoed by the Governor. I think we have...are able to meet the objections of the Governor. At the present time, one of the bond councils objection. We have questioned them says they have an about it. They can't tell us really what their objection is. We offered to them that we would amend the Bill ... Bill if it created any problems. We offer now to accept an Amendment in the Senate if they can come up Amendment which would solve their problems. What the Bill really does is define, once and for all, public funds And it is important to the audit of nonpublic funds. public funds in this state which are the taxpayers money for which we are responsible. As far as I know, that those are the objections that have been pointed out. ₩e think it is very much needed to settle, once and for all, what public funds are and which are subject to audit and so It does not deal with appropriations, and it would not used bу the generally affect the present system Comptroller."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this off of the Order of Short Debate and hope that I have some folks who will join me."

Speaker Yourell: "Is the Gentleman joined by seven others? It appears he has. The Bill is now on regular debate.

Continue, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you. I support, generally, the careful, work of...the Auditor has provided us with good effective fiscal auditing, but I must look at this Bill in terms of what it says. Often we have a one sentence job, a one sentence Bill, that looks simple on its face and that we say, 'Well, it couldn't cause too much trouble." And often that one sentence has an incredible impact. This Bill doesn't merely say that the Auditor General can This Bill talks about a state entity and this or that. then seeks to somehow describe public funds and funds of the state, but not exactly a state entity, receiving and holding funds. What that question is then, when it receives, when it holds proceeds of bonds, which it often does, is that ... what is that subject to? What does that mean when that agency receives, or holds, expends or uses funds? Are they public funds? not public funds? Are they subject to this? Are they not And if they are subject to this, does subject to that? that mean that somehow all of the bonds, even revenue bonds and not public general obligation bonds will become general obligations, of the state? Those are obligations, issues which I think are important to decide, and those are issues which I believe could impact on our whole bonding We would find, from this one simple sentence, situation. hold, recede, expend the possibility of confusing and destroying, possibly, with an adverse judicial decision, the whole complex law of bonding as well as the complex

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

problems of whether or not bonds are...the proceeds of bonds, because of this Section 0.2, would somehow make the state liable for the general...all bonds as general obligation bonds. There are other problems..."

Speaker Yourell: "Excuse me, Sir. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, arise?"

Keane: "I thought the Gentleman had finished. I was going to answer his questions."

Speaker Yourell: "I didn't hear him ask...did you ask a question,
Bepresentative Greiman?"

Greiman: "I did not ask a question. I was speaking to the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Proceed, Sir."

Greiman: "I assume the Gentleman can close later on. There is references, for example, like the outgrowth. I refer to...line...line 20 talks about Circuit Courts, any officers or outgrowths. I don't know what an outgrowth is. No place is outgrowth described. There are, of course, many humorous provisions that one could think about, I'm not sure what an outgrowth, when used in a Bill passed by this Legislature, would mean. It seems to me that, too, is an ambiguous statement. So the question isn't that this is necessarily a bad concept. I subscribe to the Auditor General having a very thorough opportunity to go into state agencies generally. But certainly this Bill, I think, may be more dangerous than appears. And I think it may open up some things that we are not sure about and would put our bonding rating at risk. I am also ... I also note that Amendment 3, I believe it was, took off the words 'by law. And that is, theoretically, I guess, to accommodate, you know, flower and get well funds and things like that. But there may be many, many funds that are kept the same way which may be trust funds of some kind that have not had the benefit of a Resolution. And suddenly those, as well,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

would be under some kind of special scrutiny that...and would tap the resources of the Auditor General as well. So for those reasons and the reasons already stated, I would tend to vote 'no' on this Bill, because I am fearful that it has material in it that would be...just would be too vague and too unknown, and I am not willing at this time to step into the paths of the unknown. Thank you. I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "The Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Cullerton: "Representative Friedrich, is the purpose of this Bill
to address the issue of the monies in the Attorney
Registration and Disciplinary Fund and whether or not the
Auditor can...Auditor General can audit it?"

Friedrich: "Can I...That's one of the areas of concern. The
Supreme Court is claiming that the money that an attorney
pays in for fees is not public funds. They admit right up
front that the money a plumber pays in is public funds, and
so they refuse. They say that this is not public money.

I'm not sure whose money it is, or if it's...if it's not
the Supreme Court's, what are they doing handling it,
because they are a public body under the Constitution."

Cullerton: "Okay, but that's the purpose of the Bill though, to allow..."

Friedrich: "No, there are others...there's others that we've had some problems."

Cullerton: "So if the Bill passes, then there would be no question that..."

Friedrich: "It would address that."

Cullerton: "Right. Fine. Thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Yourell: "Have you concluded, Sir? Representative Vinson."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I rise reluctantly to oppose this Bill. I would agree with the Sponsor's comments that he has made efforts, serious efforts, to try to work cut the problems with the...some of the agencies affected by this Bill. worked very closely with me personally to try to work those problems, but in my judgment, I still have to oppose the Bill, because I don't believe, at this point, problems can be resolved. The effect of the Bill, one of the effects of the Bill and the one that I am most concerned about, is that with the Bill, we place a number of bonding agencies in the position where their bond funds would have to be appropriated and in the position where certain other consultant funds would have appropriated. Normally that would be a good principle; however, we are talking about revenue bonding agencies. And when we talk about those revenue bonding agencies, they are not selling those bonds really for the state or nor should those funds be regarded as public funds. funds are sold for private entities: hospitals; in some cases, perhaps nursing homes; in other cases for private housing developers; in other cases, for private educational If you subject those bonds, those bond facilities. proceeds, to appropriation, one of the things that may result is the impairment of all of those bonding covenants. One of the things those agencies are required to do, in the event of a potential default, is to insert consultants and excess proceeds into those private facilities to try to protect their liquidity and their solvency so there is not a default on the bonds. That is mandated bν statute. agencies were created and set aside and are These nonappropriated for specific legitimate causes, those bond proceeds, so that those bonds, can be used in an

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

effective fashion. I don't believe anybody on this House floor would want to run the risk that your local hospital, which may have been helped by the Health Facilities Authority, that a private housing project, that educational facility, would be placed in the position that the bond owners could actually foreclose on them, we have gone to the extent of passing this kind of Bill. I understand the Gentleman's major motivation in going at this issue, and I don't disagree with his major motivation. But I think there...these unintended effects on the bonding agencies could put us in a position where those bonds defaulted upon, where the Legislature has impaired the validity of contracts. We ought not do that, and so I would urge a *no* vote on House Bill 506."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank Speaker. We agreed with what you. Mr. Representative Vinson has just said, and we've told bonding companies that we would be happy to accept an Amendment to this Bill, if they felt that the Bill endangered their bonding process in any way. We do not think that it does. When we talked to the bonding companies, we said, 'Develop an Amendment', and they said...we said, 'What do you want us to change?' And thev said, 'Well, we really don't know what we want you to change. But it is sort of a touchy feeling that we that this is not good for us. If you look at the Bill, the Bill says - and those of you who have a Democratic analysis - the comments say, 'The ultimate result of House Bill 506 will be to allow the Auditor General to audit state agencies as defined by the Bill which receive, hold and/or expend nonappropriated funds.* If there is a bond that has been issued, and we do not audit it, and someone takes off or goes south with the auditing...with that...the funds,

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

one of the bond pots that the money should have been into, we will only have ourselves to blame. And the people who have lost money, the bonding people, will come back to us and say, 'This is really a state obligation, especially it's part of the Illinois Housing Authority Group. you read the Bill, it does not have anything to do with the appropriation process. What we are doing is we are looking at the auditing process, and we want to let the Attorney General...or the Auditor General go in and audit funds that may be in a bond...a bond pot that would be covered first and foremost by the bond covenant of that bonding I think those of you who are lawyers on the floor know that the bonding agreement takes precedent and, therefore, we have really no problem with that. Again I say to those who are worried about the bonding, if you have a problem - none of us feel that there's a problem - but if you have a problem, we'll be happy to take care of that the Senate. In terms of a previous speaker who said he didn't know what the word 'outgrowth' meant, the word outgrowth are used in the State Purchasing Act and in the They are terms of ... of note and of State Auditing Act. record. The term 'outgrowth' has ... definitely has validity and has usage. Again that Speaker felt that he couldn't really put his finger on what was wrong. Basically, what's happening with this Bill is that the bonding people have said they don't like it. They refuse to work with us to amend it, but we have to. We have to to fulfill our constitutional...when we take our...swear to uphold the Constitution, we have to support the Auditor General in going in and auditing those funds to make sure that there's no hanky-pank, no hanky-pank going on. And that's our great fear, that if we don't audit these funds, we'll have another scandal such as the one that occured at the U of I

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

not too recently. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Yourell: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to close."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the opponents of this Bill are looking for problems that don't exist or trying problem. I don't know which. We talked to the create a two attorneys down here who represent Bond Council. We ask them what their problem is, and they said, *Well, we really don't know. They (sic - We) said, 'Well, you tell...if you have a problem, we'd like to know what it is, because we'd like to resolve it. And second. if you have an Amendment that cures the problem that you think might exist, tell us about it, and we'll draw Amendment to do it. They said, "Well, we're not in the position to do that. We just think one might exist, we're not sure that it is. Well, the truth about it is the Bonding Act, itself, covers all the objections that have been raised by both these Gentlemen who spoke so There's already been a Supreme Court lately on this. whether or not federal funds can be spent decision on without authority, and I can tell you in advance this does not affect bonding of municipalities. Now those questions have all been raised. I think mostly it's just to confuse you about what this Bill does. So don't be confused. you really believe that public funds should be audited, then vote with us. If you think that they ought to be allowed to lurk around and spend their money without being audited, then maybe you ought to oppose this Bill.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

certainly the Bonding Act, itself, and each Bond Act provides how that money can be spent and how it's to be retained by the bonding companies. So I just urge your support. It's good legislation for good government, and you ought to be for it."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "How about the Roll Call first."

Speaker Yourell: "Oh, yes. Okay, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a problem when sometimes you want to get at one problem, and you try to have legislation that can cause other problems. I would urge the Members to vote 'no' on this Bill. I know that the Sponsor has tried to get after the funds of the Lawyers * Registration Program and has had a running battle with the Supreme Court over that, but this Bill could be dangerous, I believe. You know, we really have to, as far as I'm concerned, be accountable with regards to public funds. talking about nonpublic funds, and we may, as others have said, jeopardize some bond programs which, in the end, will jeopardize our...our governments. A similar Bill was defeated last year, but they now exclude local governments from it. I think it's still dangerous, even though local governments are excluded, so I would urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In contrary to what the previous speaker just said and to Representative Sam Vinson, all the legislation creating bond authorities clearly spells out

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

exactly what those restrictions should be. The community should have no problem with this particular Bill. All funds are continuously appropriated and the Acts themselves always provide for those kinds of appropriation facilities, and the General Assembly need not do that. Webster's International Dictionary defines public funds as monies belonging to a government or any department of it in the hands of a public official. Now, by George, that's what this is all about. You either want to audit these funds which are vast sums in some cases, and we know the They were apparent in the University of Illinois abuses. case. You either want to audit public funds, or you don't want to audit public funds. The running battle that Representative Friedrich has with the Supreme notwithstanding, that's only a corollary to the main issue of, should all public funds held by public officials audited? This is an excellent Bill. I don't know what the Democratic side's problem and Leadership's problem with this kind of Bill is, or I don't know what Representative We know what the Governor's is, but that's Vinson's is. not the problem here. The problem is one of right. Do you audit, or do you not audit? I say you audit, and it ought to get a green vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Leverenz, to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Well, following up what Representative Davis said and he's right on the mark - the problem is some of those
people voting red are going to have to go across the street
and practice, perhaps, in front of the Supreme Court one
day, and they don't want to be on the wrong side of this.
And they perhaps get some points if they stand up to oppose
it. The fact is the Disciplinary Commission or the
Judicial Inquiry and Disciplinary Board at the Supreme

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Court is the only part of State Government that has a profit-sharing program. And there's no place in State Government for a profit-sharing program or unaudited state funds. The Bill that the distinguished person on our side of the aisle referred to was passed in the House. I'm the quy that passed it. We've passed this a couple of times. It won't hurt anybody. The bond type issues that are thrown up are phony issues, generally supported by people that are also signed up at \$40 a whack. Imagine the amount of money over there. \$40 for each of 35,000 just for the privilege to appear before the Supreme Court. That's the real issue. Thank you."

- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff, to explain his vote."
- Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there's some confusion in this legislation. I think many of us are quite confused. For all we're doing here...the Bill's pretty well been explained, and all we're doing here is saying that funds belonging to a public entity is public funds and subject to laws of the public funds. I would hope we could get more green lights up there. Thank you."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my "aye" vote, I just want to remind everybody about Robert Parker, who is an employee of the University of Illinois Foundation, who stole hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Foundation and spent it at the Club "Terrae" in the Chicago area, and that wouldn't have happened if the University of Illinois Foundation had been regularly audited by the Auditor General. But because that Foundation was a corporate outgrowth, because the monies were not technically public

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

monies, the audits did not take place. And I think that we need to pass this legislation to prevent the kind of abuses of the...that we have seen in the University of Illinois Foundation and prevent people from literally embezzling hundreds of thousands of dollars. I don't care whether you call them public dollars or private dollars. Those are state agencies, and people should not be ripping off the state like this. I think we need an "aye" vote on that."

- Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 67 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Beading Short Debate is House Bill 1249. Bead the Eill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1249, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

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

1249 is simply permissive in nature and allows for state
employees to request a...an unpaid leave of...a family
responsibility leave. The state would not, of course, have
to grant the leave. It simply sets up a procedure for if
the state would want to grant it, for them to do so.

Amendment #1 clarifies the fact that their seniority would
not be affected, but they would get it back at the end of
the leave, and to assure that medical insurance coverage
would be paid by the employee in the case that a leave were
granted. I would ask for your support on this Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Does anybody stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Macon, Bepresentative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Yourell: "Sponsor indicates she'll yield."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Dunn: "Our analysis indicates that one of the circumstances which would constitute family responsibility justifying a year's leave of absence would be the responsibility to provide, quote, "special guidance, care and supervision to a member of the employee's household or family". What does that mean?"

Zwick: "Thank you. The issue that that addresses is something that came up in one of our hearings that that this recommendation came out of, and that was the fact that on several occasions employees might have an elderly parent living with them who has, perhaps, a terminal illness, or a child who is sick and they would, perhaps, want to take up to a one year leave of absence to stay home with that person and care for them."

Dunn: "Is...this is confined to elderly parents then, or..."

Zwick: "No, no, any member of the family who might have some illness, and, of course, this would be laid out in the request."

Dunn: "Oh, well, what is...what is special care, guidance and supervision? I...what does that mean?"

Zwick: "Well, it means that they would want to stay at home instead of hiring a person...another person from outside the home to come in and take care of the relative, the child, the elderly parent, the husband, the wife who might need special care."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill is well-meaning, certainly, but I don't think there are any of us who have had teenage children who would disagree that those teenage children all need special guidance, care and supervision during their teenage years, and if this is one of the standards for taking a year's leave of absence, I think every state employee who is the parent of teenage children would be entitled to one year's

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

leave of absence, and I don't think that is what we intend to do in these difficult times, so I think we should rework this Bill."

- Speaker Yourell: "Alright, Representative Dunn stands in opposition. For what reason does the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, rise?"
- Ropp: "I guess, Mr. Speaker, I had several guestions, and I guess
 I'd like to just ask leave to take it out of Short Debate
 for a couple extra questions. Gentleman joined by seven
 others? Gentleman...the guestion is now on regular debate.
 Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Okay, Representative, does this mean then that this person's position might be replaced by another individual so that on a head count, we'd still count them?"
- Zwick: "No, I don't believe it does. All it says is that when they would come back from the one year leave of absence, they would be entitled to be placed back in the same position that they were in when they left. In certain..."
- Ropp: "So...so then you would have to fire that person then again, they'd only have a one year...there'd be no opportunity to be able to be fully employed within that agency?"
- Zwick: "Okay, I think in most cases where the state would agree to grant such a leave, would be a case where that person might be in the process of being laid off anyhow, or perhaps we were trying to lower our head count for at least a one year period, and rather than having to fire that person, they could grant the person a one year leave of absence. Perhaps it would be because of an economic shortfall...a fiscal shortfall in the state, and it would give the state also an option, and, of course, the leave would not have to be granted. It is extraordinarily permissive in nature, in that all this does is say that the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Department of Central Management Services would establish some rules to deal with such a request. There is no...no statement in there as to whether or not the leave has to be granted. It simply sets up a way to apply for a leave."

Ropp: "Would this person, by chance, be eligible for either unemployment or public aid should they not be working and not meet some financial qualifications that now..."

Zwick: "No, they wouldn't be, and in fact, they also...that was what we dealt with...part of that was what we dealt with in Amendment 2. We thought we did not spell it out clearly enough, that they would have to pay their full...the full price of any of their benefits, such as medical benefits, so that is incorporated into the Bill through the first Amendment."

Ropp: "Thank you."

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

Curie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This looks like an excellent piece of legislation to me. The question whether the fact that one has a teenager at home might entitle one to a family responsibility leave, I'm sure is the furthest thing from the Sponsor's mind. I'm sure she will make it clear in this record that the point is that if a family responsibility develops or substantially changes, and I think we are talking about new babies, elderly disabled parent, a sudden illness in the family and someone needs to stay home for a year, that possibility can be envisioned by rules and regulations promulgated by the All this Bill says is the Department shall Department. establish appropriate guidelines for figuring out when a family responsibility leave is appropriate. I'm sure the Sponsor doesn't intend that to mean that the fact that somebody has a teenage kid at home shall count, and I'm sure she will make it clear that what we are talking about

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

in this legislation is the notion of some additional or substantial responsibility that might encourage a present employee of the State of Illinois to find that that year is better spent at home. The state loses nothing by this proposal. What it does do is insure that somebody with a new baby or somebody whose husband or wife is seriously ill or suddenly is faced with the responsibility to care for an aged, unwell parent, that that individual can take that opportunity without any cost to us, without any opportunity to accrue seniority during that period. This seems to me to be a very responsive piece of legislation to real problems in every individual family life. It is cost free to the state, but it is good social public policy. I hope we will have lots of 'yes' votes on House Bill 1249."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Zwick to close."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...this fill is really aimed a something that is a term that we hear around here frequently called family stability. We are often talking about keeping families together in times of trouble, when there is an elderly member who is sick, being able to stay home and take care of that person yourselves, when there is a newborn infant at home. It addresses...it gives another option to both the state and the employee that is not really mandatory on anyone. It just simply adds an option, and I would ask for your support on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor will vote "yes". Those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Representative Davis to explain his vote."

Davis: "Well, I think...to be kind to the Sponsor of the Bill, I

put an Amendment on this Bill and she allowed that to

happen, and I told her I would explain the Amendment. It

simply allows former House employees who go to work in

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

State Government to transfer their seniority that's accrued in the House on this particular Bill. That Amendment is on the Bill now, and I thought you should know that. I told the Sponsor I would explain that Amendment. Bodney Thompson."

- Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 102 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading Short Debate, is House Bill 1261. Read the Fill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Third

 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1261 amends the Metropolitan Civic Center Act to provide tax exemption to the DeKalb County Metropolitan Exposition Auditorium. Actually, what took place here, the...there's an Egyptian Theater, was built in DeKalb about 1925, of which there are only two others in the United States, and it was deteriorating very badly. And it was like white elephant, had no value, and not in use, and the Authority purchased that. And they are renovating it, and this provides tax exemption for them. Appreciate consideration of your favorable support."
- Speaker Yourell: "Does anyone stand in opposition? Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Yourell: "Spensor indicates he'll yield."

Tuerk: "Is not your property now exempt?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Ebbesen: "No, it is not."

Tuerk: "It is not? Wouldn't it be a unit of local government property belonging to the unit of local government?"

Bbbesen: "You mean the taxes?"

Tuerk: "Well, the property that you are trying to exempt now."

Isn't it exempt now? You say ''no'?"

Ebbesen: "No, that's why we...that's why we need the Bill."

Tuerk: "Well, does this affect the other civic center authority?"

Ebbesen: "No, this is...the only one that if affects is this particular one, and the reason for that, the Authority was created under the county procedure, and that was different...different section of the statutes. I think DeKalb Authority is probably the only one in the State of Illinois that...that came under that..."

Tuerk: "Oh, really? When was it formed?"

Ebbesen: "Oh, maybe 1979, '80, something like that."

Tuerk: "Well, I just wanted to clarify the point because if you are saying it's not now tax exempt, perhaps we need something to exempt the others by law, but I...I was under the assumption that since the property was under the jurisdiction of a local unit of government, it would be exempt just like any other governmental property."

Ebbesen: "If that was the case, I wouldn't have the Bill."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand that, but there are Bills that are unnecessary from time to time in the Assembly, but I have some questions about it, frankly."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hastert: "Representative Ebbesen, there is some concern that the presence of this piece of legislation will automatically open up some tax liability for other such centers

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

throughout the state. My question is, 'Would you be amenable to work with other people in the Senate to make sure this takes care of other centers if they are threatened?'.

Ebbesen: "Absolutely."

Hastert: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, for a question."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ebbesen, just what taxes would they be relieved of?"

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

Van Duyne: "Thank you. Amusement tax, sales tax, what? Well, surely you're..."

Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, I can't hear. I didn't hear the guestion."

Van Duyne: "What taxes are they being..."

Ebbesen: "The property taxes."

Van Duyne: "Well, the property tax is paid to the county."

Ebbesen: "Well, let's...let's look at the Eill, and it's very simple. It's one line. "All property of the Authority shall be exempt from taxation by the state or any taxing unit therein." That's what it says."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hallock: "I have two questions regarding legislative intent.

First of all, special assessments, as regarding per chance
a sidewalk in front of the center, would that be tax exempt,
or would that be separately treated?"

Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said."

Hallock: "A special assessment for such purposes as perhaps a sidewalk in front of a center, would that be exempt from

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

the tax?"

Ebbesen: "Well, a special assessment, that might be something a little different. I can't answer that."

Hallock: "He sits behind me and I couldn't hear what he said.

Could you repeat that, please? Okay, he answered the question. I couldn't hear. Representative Cullerton was yelling from across the aisle. The second question was, in terms of legislative intent, I want to make sure that by omission, by not enumerating the other centers, that you are not saying that they, in fact, should be taxed. You are just specifically speaking to DeKalb only, but not by omission saying others can be taxed, is that correct?"

Ebbesen: "For legislative intent? Your point is well taken."

Hallock: "Yes, does that mean yes?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, yes."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Satterthwaite: "Joe, if there were food being sold within this property, is it your intent by this legislation that that sale of food items would be tax exempt?"

Ebbesen: "No."

Satterthwaite: "If there were performances that otherwise would have an amusement tax, would that be exempt?"

Ebbesen: "'All property of the Authority shall be exempt from taxation by the state or any taxing unit therein', all property of the Authority. I assume that means real property. It's not...it's not the intent of this legislation to accomplish what you are saying."

Satterthwaite: "As long as you are limiting it...okay, but you are saying it's real property. It's not just something

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

that the Authority acquires and then resells?"

Ebbesen: "No. that is correct."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". A11 those in favor will vote 'ave', those opposed will The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? *no*-Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 104 voting *ave*, 2 voting *no*. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 on the Order of Second Reading, there appears House Bill 3. Out of the record. On Second Reading, there appears House Bill 16. Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading, there appears House Bill 207. Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading appears House Bill 252. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 252, a Bill for an Act to create the Citizens' Utility Board to represent..."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Yourell: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Yourell: "Any Amendments from the floor."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment 2, 3, 4 and 5 to this Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Amendments 2, 3 and 4 and 5? Withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Mulcahey."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Mulcahey on Amendment #6."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 is..."

Speaker Yourell: "Excuse me, Sir. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, rise?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Levin: "Inquiry. I question the germaneness of Amendment #6.

The underlying Bill establishes a Citizens' Utility Board in a new Act and is not an Amendment to any existing Act. Amendment #6 is an Amendment to the Public Utilities Act and relates to an existing governmental body, the Illinois Commerce Commission. I do not believe that Amendment #6 is germane to the underlying Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Levin's point is well taken.

Amendment #6 is not germane and, therefore, out of the record. Are there... On that question, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not really surprised.

Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Levin."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #7 is the agreed Amendment that makes House. modifications in Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, which became the Bill. The changes are fairly minor. Let me take a couple of moments to go through some of the changes that are made in Amendment #7. definition of a public utility, and that is who is covered as far as bill inserts, is changed to exempt municipal corporations as well as electrical co-ops. The reference to a fixed amount of dues, five dollars a year, is removed, and the authority is given to both the interim and the permanent Board to establish appropriate dues level. Amendment, moreover, prohibits utilities from making any gifts to the Citizens* Utility Board and gives the interim Board the authority to determine a scheme of when the different Congressional Districts, from which the elections of the Board members occurs, will take place. The terms of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

office would be four years, four years and two years under this Amendment for the Board members of the Citizens* Utility Board. In addition, the quorum requirement for the Board meetings is reduced to one-third for a regular meeting, while being maintained at a majority of the members of the Board of CUB where there is meeting. The Amendment also provides that there shall be local meetings of CUB, at least annually, so that the local membership has the opportunity to participate in the organization. The Amendment also provides for a mechanism for a message to appear on a postcard bill insert. Additionally, the Amendment provides that the interim Board of CUB shall be appointed, three by the Governor and two each by the ... the Leadership of the House and the Senate, Democrat and Republican Leadership in equal numbers. Finally, the Amendment provides for preemption of the establishment of CUBs by local jurisdiction. So, there would only be one CUB state-wide, as opposed to a situation where a different local jurisdictions can have CUBs and be trying to interfere with the utility mailing at the same time there is a state organization. If there are questions, I'll be happy to answer them. This is an agreed Amendment, agreed to by both sides of the aisle, and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, on the Amendment."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman indicates that he'll.."

Preston: "Representative Levin, you indicated that this was an agreed Amendment. Now, I spoke to you myself about the Bill on more than one occasion. I discussed some Amendments with you. I know Representative Roman has

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

worked hard on similar legislation, as has numerous other people in the House. I didn't agree to this Amendment. You didn't even bother to talk to me about the Amendment at all, even though, on more than one occasion, I approached you concerning suggestions, and you told me, no, you'll get back to me on it. My guestion is, who agreed to this Amendment besides they?"

- Levin: "There's been input by, first of all, both sides of the aisle, the Leaderships of both sides of the aisle and the various organizations that have been interested in a Citizen Utility Board, including the Labor Coalition of Public Utilities, Business and Professional People for the Public Interest, Pat Quinn's organization, the utilities and various others that have been interested. There are provisions in here that were included in the earlier Amendments that were filed by Representative Ronan, for example."
- Preston: "Did you discuss this Amendment with Representative

 Ronan or other people who had sponsored similar

 Amendments?"
- Levin: "Yeah, Representative Bonan was made aware of what is in this. It contains several provisions that he specifically requested."
- Preston: "I have a... You indicated that the membership... the five dollar membership fee has been eliminated, and the amount of the membership fee will be set by the Board.

 Does the legislation contain any limit on how high that membership fee can be, or can the Board decide to set a hundred dollar membership, thus excluding seniors from joining?"
- Levin: "The intention is that the membership dues be sufficiently low as to encourage as wide a membership as possible and, at the same time, to provide the Citizen Utility Board with

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

the resources it needs to meet its mandate."

Preston: "Does that mean there is no limit on how high that membership fee can be?"

Levin: "There is no specific limitation. I'm, however, by the statement, making some legislative history in terms of what the intention of the Sponsors are, as far as how the dues should be set."

Preston: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bonan, on the Amendment."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to let Representative
Preston know he's got nothing to worry about. I support
this Amendment. I received a message from God the other
day, and that gave me the indication that it made sense to
support this fine Amendment."

Speaker Yourell: "Being no further discussion. Representative Levin?"

Levin: "Yes, it was just pointed out to me that there is one typographical error which I would ask leave that it be corrected on it face. On page eleven, line eight appears the word 'may' and it should be 'shall'. I would ask leave to correct that on its face."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman asks leave to correct Amendment #7 on its face. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Objections have been heard. The Gentleman now moves to waive the appropriate rule to amend Amendment #7 on its face. The Gentleman has moved to change the Amendment on its face, and this Motion requires... a simple majority. All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". And on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Bepresentative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, according to Rule 36(b), *a Member desiring to offer an Amendment on the Order of Second

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Reading must submit it in writing to the Clerk. The Clerk shall have the Amendment printed... shall have it printed and place a copy on the desk of each Member as soon as it's printed. Amendments to an Amendment shall be in the order only with the unanimous consent of the Members present and, if considered, shall be numbered sequentially and treated as subsidiary Amendments otherwise subject to this rule.' So, I would submit to you, Sir, that there has to be unanimous consent."

- Speaker Yourell: "Yes. The Gentleman has moved to suspend that rule and that's the question before the Chair, and that is what we're voting on now."
- Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, how can you suspen... how can you suspend the rule?"
- Speaker Yourell: "Well, every rule 'is suspendible if you get You know what it takes in this House to do enough votes. anything, a requisite number of votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 82 voting *aye*, 4 voting 'no'. Leave has been granted to suspend the rule to amend Amendment #7 on its face. The Gentleman moves now to adopt Amendment #7 to House Bill 252 as amended. A11 those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote *no*. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? On this question there are ... On this question, there are 101 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', the Gentleman's Motion carries... The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Yourell: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Reading page 22, next Bill, House Bill 726. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 726, a Bill for an Act concerning

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

employee inventious. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Effingham, Representative
Brummer."

Brunner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 726 is know as the Employee Patent Act to preserve employees rights with regard to inventions. Bill is modeled after a similar legislation, I think, the State of Oregon. It is specifically...addresses itself to a relatively narrow issue and that is with regard to the policy of very few companies that require as a condition of employment that all patents developed by employees belong to the employer. This Bill provides that a certain very limited number of patents shall not be the property of the employer, and those are specifically with regard to patents that were developed by the employee, on his own time, without any resources of the employer and do not relate at all to the business of the employer. This Bill passed out of here last year, but did not clear the Senate Rules. It. passed by a major...major majority. I do not think it controversial and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Being no discussion is...the question is, 'Shall this Fill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', no voting...none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Reading, there appears House Bill 731. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 731, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Jaffe."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 731 amends the Election Code to provide that where the state canvas conducted on a gubernatorial race reveals difference of less than one half of one percent between the vote totals of the candidates receiving the highest and the second highest totals, the State Board of Elections shall order a recount at state expense and declarations of won shall be based upon the canvas of the recounted votes. As you know, in the last gubernatorial election, we had a very close vote. There were only 5,074 votes that actually divided the candidates and as a result of that, there had to be a court case, and, of course, it went to the Supreme Court and eventually, it was thrown out. But, the Court was very concerned about the expense involved state-wide recount and I think most people were. are dealing with a situation that may or may not ever again, but what we are basically saying is this, happen that where you have a gubernatorial election where there is less than half of one percent separating the candidates, the State Board of Elections shall on their own volition order a recount at state expense. That would eliminate the expense of the candidates and would eliminate them out and raising funds and having to have all sorts of lawyers' fees which they would not have to have under this particular Bill. I would tell you that most states in the Union have a provision like this. I think it's a logical It may never happen again, but I think in case it does happen again, we should have this particular safequard. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lee,
Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to discuss House Eill 731 and the necessity

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

for having this in place. All the issues were outlined by Representative Jaffe, I happen to feel that the potential does not exist to have the type of fiscal impact that we are looking at, and I believe that we have been well served over the past in the history of the State of Illinois and would not suggest approval of this Bill. I would suggestfully represent that we have a *no* vote on this Bill."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, Representative Jaffe, would you yield for a question?"

Jaffe: "Sure, uh-huh."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman indicates he'd yield."

Cullerton: "The Illinois Constitution requires Illinois Courts to decide the contest for the executive branch offices. Does this Bill have any constitutional problems in your opinion as the result of..."

Jaffe: "I don't think so because I don't think that...I don't
think that this would be a constitutional problem at all."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Representative Jaffe, could you possibly tell me

how nuch..."

Topinka: "Thank you. How much this would cost state-wide?"

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

Jaffe: "Well, there is a fiscal note here. As you know, we are talking about something that will...may never happen again. You know, we are not fighting the *82 election over again. What we are trying to say is in the event this happens again, the candidates should be protected, and that they could be Republican as well as Democrat, but at the present time, it would be \$407,000."

Topinka: "State-wide that would be \$407,000?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Jaffe: "Yes, uh-huh, that's what the Fiscal Note says, filed by the State Board of Elections, because I think the cost that you are thinking about involves all sorts of attorney's fee which would then make it prohibitive for a candidate to do so because they would have to go cut and then spend a million dollars in attorney's fees. If the State Board of Election did it on its own volition, it would be \$400,000, and that's what they say."

Topinka: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston." Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The real question is what would it cost to not have a recount where you have an extremely close qubernatorial The cost in that case may very well be that election. someone who was not elected to the highest office in this state would be serving in that office, nonetheless. That is an exorbitant cost. When there is a very close election to require the candidate to come up with all sorts of extra money to...to have court challenges, to hire attorneys, to go through the process and the expense and the cost of the canvassing, itself, in a recount is just unnecessary. That shouldn't be a burden that goes on the candidate. It is not the candidate alone who is seeking the high office, it's everyone who voted for that candidate who has a right to have the person who is lawfully elected to the highest office in Illinois to be sitting in that office. think this is an extremely reasonable Bill, one that is needed if we ever do have a very, very close election in the future. As you know, there can be very reasonable errors that are made in the election process, and most of the complaints that the various Boards of Election Commissioners receive, turn out to be an error, something that was fraudulent, but an error that was

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

through some mistake, and just a few mistakes compounded by the vast population of the State of Illinois can overturn a very close election. So, when it's...when the result is very close, to have a recount paid for by the state is reasonable and it's the way the law ought to be. And I'm going to vote 'aye' and I hope the rest of you will also."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'd yield."

Birkinbine: "On such a recount procedure, the candidates involved are allowed to have observers there overseeing the procedure, are they not?"

Jaffe: "Absolutely...absolutely."

Birkinbine: "I thought so. I was just...thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."

Tate: "Yeah, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Tate: "Yes, Representative Jaffe, could you go over one time and repeat who would qualify for a recount now under the specific circumstance you have outlined."

Jaffe: "It says that where you have a gubernatorial race and there is a difference of less than .5 percent, one half of one percent between the total...the vote totals of the candidates receiving the highest and second highest totals."

Tate: "And our analysis and maybe our analysis isn"t correct, you say the fiscal impact would only be \$600,000, is that correct?"

Jaffe: "The fiscal impact that was filed by the State Board of Elections said \$407,000."

Tate: "400...In our analysis, it has the Stevenson - Thompson

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

discovery recount was, if they would have gone the full recount, would have been estimated up to \$2,000,000."

- Jaffe: "Well, as I explained beforehand, that would be because of attorney's fees. What you're...what you have to do at the present time is you are forcing someone to go out and hire attorneys and then go out and fight this recount. So it's going to cost millions of dollars the way we have it at the present time. If we do it under this Bill, the way we have it, it's done automatically and it would cost \$407,000."
- Tate: "Where did you get this Bill, or where did the idea come from? Is this modeled after other state..."
- Jaffe: "There are many other states that have it and there is no reason that Illinois should not have it."
- Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I commend, I quess, Tate: Representative Jaffe, for his efforts here. our own analysis would say this would have an adverse fiscal impact on it. \$600,000 is \$600,000 and maybe up to \$2,000,000 and Representative Jaffe is not signed on with the income tax yet, but maybe he listened to the Speaker now which is presently supporting The issue here though is one that every time we have a disgruntled candidate that gets beat and wants to have the state finance his recount, I'm not sure that is what out legislation, what our taxpayers send us down here to do that, and, therefore, I think a good vote on this issue should be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Harris: "Representative Jaffe, this may be... the intent of this

Bill may be admirable. Let me ask you, if it's good for

the Governor, why isn't it good for other Members of the

General Assembly?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Well, I think that it would be good, actually. I don't have any quarrels with that, but I'm taking the first step."

Harris: "So then, if that's the first step, then I assume that later on we would come back and amend the Bill and make it applicable to Members of the General Assembly."

Jaffe: "If that's the will of the Assembly."

Harris: "I see. Thank you..."

Jaffe: "I am a mere tool of the Assembly, Bepresentative Barris."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Proceed, Sir."

Harris: "I believe we have, Ladies and Gentlemen, a procedure in place which makes this Bill unnecessary. I think, indeed, it is just an opening step. It applies only now to the Governor. Before long it may indeed apply to us. I do not believe it is necessary, and I would recommend a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the people on the other side of the aisle think we're refighting the 1982 election. We're not doing that. Basically, what we're saying is let's put a reasonable Bill on the... on the books that says that where you have a small percentage separating the two gubernatorial candidates, let the State Board of Elections step in. Let them do the recount. Let it be at a cheaper expense than what we have at the present time. At the present time, because the candidates have to go out and hire lawyers and hire all sorts of people, the cost would be several million dollars. I would suggest to you that you listen... that you look at the fiscal note. Representative Olson asked for a fiscal note. We filed that fiscal note. The fiscal note came from the State

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Board of Elections. It said if they did it, it would cost 407,000 dollars. Most states have this. I don't think that Illinois should be so regressive as to say that we're not going to conduct good and free elections. And what... when you're saying that we have a good law in place, I think you're completely wrong. We don't have a good law in place, and that's why we had all the chaos in the last gubernatorial election. If you don't want to have chaos — and I say this situation may never occur again — you ought to vote 'aye', because I think it's a good government Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will be voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Yourell 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 741. Bead the Eill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 744, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act. Second Reading of the Bill." Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne." Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason why this hasn't been called is because of the fact that we've been waiting for another Bill to pass out of here, and maybe this wouldn't be necessary; but, because the time is getting so short. It simply just amends the Illinois Natural Area Preservation Act and requires that the rules for the Natural Preservation Commission be promulgated after the... after consultation with the written approval by the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Department of Conservation. Such rules are currently required by... to be made jointly by the Department. Simply was brought to us by JCAR. And I have really no pride in authorship of it, but I think it ought to be passed to satisfy both Departments."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? There being no... The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did the Sponsor... Would the Sponsor yield for a guestion, please?"

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

Hoffman: "Did... Did you imply in your remarks that controversy that has been involved in this has been resolved?"

Van Duyne: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Yourell: "Further discussion? Eeing no further discussion, the Gentleman... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Marzuki: "Representative Van Duyne, in case the other Bill goes through which would transfer this, will this have an affect on that particular transfer?"

Van Duyne: "Really, the man in the Chair up there can tell you better than I because it was in deference to him that I kept the Bill this long on Third Reading. But as I said, this was brought to us by JCAR. Representative Beilly knows all about this, too. And so, I'm just trying... And being Chairman of the Committee, they gave it to me just so that it would be put through that way. As I understand, there's no problem, and Bus can clear it up if there would be any problem. As far as I'm concerned, there's none. In fact, it would be a sort of a repetitious Act."

Speaker Yourell: "The Chair will not comment at the moment. The

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."

Koebler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The problem to which Representative Van Duyne and Representative Reilly are referring has one to do with a problem brought up by JCAR in which there was a conflict of authority over who was making the rules for the Preserves Commission. There is a further problem with the Nature Preserves Commission in the fact that Representative Yourell has legislation that would transfer the Nature Preserves Commission from the Department of Conservation to Energy and Natural Resources. Apparently, Representative Van Duyne and... was waiting for Representative Yourell's Bill to pass before proceeding on this; and, if both Bills should pass, of course, there would be a conflict. would have to then make the judgement as to whether or they wanted to see it remain under the Department of Conservation or be transferred to Energy and Natural Resources. That... So there are actually two conflicts surrounding the Nature Preserves Commission."

Speaker Yourell: "Question is, "Shall this Eill pass?". All those in favor will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 102 voting "aye", 2 voting "no". The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 753. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 753, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Eill 753 will allow people who are 65 a little earlier access to the Homestead Exemption Act. Right now the way the law reads..."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Speaker Yourell: "Excuse me, Sir. Bepresentative Tuerk, your Bill is on a Special Order of Business, and we're going to get into that second Order of Business, I believe, next Tuesday. So, would you please take this Bill out of the record? House Bill 753 is out of the record. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 765. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 765, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the adoption of persons. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, House
 Bill 765 creates the system through a registery and
 intermediaries, with the consent of the adoptive parents
 and of the natural parents, for people to find out their
 birthright. This came about because of so many diseases
 that we have found are genetic, and we don't know who the
 natural parents are. The children don't know who they are,
 and it has made it very difficult to treat those diseases.
 This was the need for this Bill. I would appreciate your
 vote."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Feing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall...'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative..."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady indicates she'll yield."

Ewing: "Thank you. I have talked with some people who are concerned about this legislation. And would you explain a little closer - can everybody have an intermediator appointed if you are adopted, or do you have to have...

What are the consents required?"

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Oblinger."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Oblinger: "This is copied after a number of states. The intermediary is a person who becomes the agent of the registery of the Department of Fublic Health. They are sworn to confidentiality. They would do the search in the records for the person."

Ewing: "If a mother gave up a child for adoption and never wanted that fact known, would the intermediator still be able to qo in?"

Oblinger: "Mother gave up the child for adoption."

Ewing: "Say there is no permission to have someone ... "

Oblinger: "Oh. There has to be permission from both the adoptive parents and the natural parents, before this can be done, unless one of the parents is deceased."

Ewing: "Well, Representative, I think that's the real fact here that I'm told and some people are saying that is not the case. If permission is required... is not required, that would make this Bill much more palatable."

Oblinger: "Have you read the part where a parent has to have the written consent on file at the registery before that can be investigated? So if the parents do not want it and they have nonconsent form, it's not going to be used."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady indicates she'll yield."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Oblinger, why is it then that the Child Care Association feels that this has some problems of confidentiality?"

Oblinger: "Representative, what they brought before the Committee that I understood was the way the disclosure of the siblings was to be done. On the Amendment yesterday, I took that part out. This was one of the parts that they

49th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1983
- seemed to object to very strenuously, and I did take that part out yesterday."
- Satterthwaite: "I believe, however, that they are still concerned about confidentiality when you have an intermediary involved. Would you explain further on page six where it indicates that a person, age 18 or older, may obtain disclosure of the identities? Then what is the process by which the child, himself, can initiate that identification?"
- Oblinger: "There has been a consent to the disclosure given by
 the natural parent. That has to be done, and that consent
 has to be in the registery or obtained by the court. If a
 person..."
- Satterthwaite: "When does the intermediary come into play then?

 If there has been consent given, at what point does the intermediary come in?"
- Oblinger: "I understand from the consultant here, if there is nothing in the registery, no consent, no nonconsent, no anything, then the intermediary comes into play."
- Satterthwaite: "So the natural parent would have to take a positive action of denying access in order to keep an intermediary from coming into... into play."
- Oblinger: "That's true; but, if the intermediary is involved, the intermediary does not disclose what he or she has learned except to the court. It is not then given to people that the intermediary has been working on."
- Satterthwaite: "What would the situation be now? If an agency had information about some health problem of a child, why do you need another intermediary? That's what I'm not clear about."
- Speaker Yourell: "Yes."
- Oblinger: "In that case, the court would immediately allow this, because that's with cause. But there are a number of other

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

reasons that people want to do this, and they would then have to show cause such as that. If this is worrying Mrs.... Representative Satterthwaite, I will take it out of the record at this time and talk to her about it."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Eill is out of the record. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 769. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 769, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would request leave to move this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of adopting an Amendment."

Speaker Yourell: "Does the Lady have leave to move the Bill back to Second for purpose of an Amendment? Leave is granted."

Zwick: "Okay. I would move for adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Yourell: "Just a moment, please. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Zwick."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Zwick on Amendment #2."

Zwick: "Thank you. Amendment #2 addresses a slight controversy that arose, something that I did not intention the Bill to do, in that it affected more roads than I wanted it to affect in the original Bill. So this Amendment addresses that. Limits it to only city... only village roads and eliminates the municipal roads."

Speaker Yourell: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Now, Representative Zwick, what's your...?"

Zwick: "May I now have leave to move the Bill back to Third Reading?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Lady asks leave to move the Bill back to Third Beading and hear it at this time."

Zwick: "And move 'do pass'. Okay."

Speaker Yourell: "Move 'do pass'. Now you do that."

Thank you very much. whatever. House Bill 769 addresses, basically, a local problem that arose district concerning the cost that our village board has to pay for in order to, on occasion, lower a speed limit some of the residential streets in the neighborhoods. And under present law, they must undergo extensive engineering studies in order to lower the speed limit on simply a residential street in a neighborhood where children perhaps are playing or is within close proximity to a school. what this Bill says is that with the recommendation of the chief executive officer of the village, which would mayor of the village president, the village either the board could simply adopt a resolution lowering the speed limit by. for example, five miles an hour without undergoing these costly studies. And as I said, it would address only these very local roads, not the township or the state highways. And I would appreciate your support."

Yourell: "Is there discussion? There being no Speaker discussion, the guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. A11 those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote Voting is open. To explain his vote, Representative Parger."

Barger: "Yes, this is the sort of thing of which speed traps are made. You get a local community... I have been a mayor, and I know the problems involved with this sort of thing. You get a law like this passed, and some community will decide that they are going to change their speed limits drastically, below what is standard. The rules of the road are printed with instructions to everyone in the state so

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

that will know what speed limits to expect. You can turn off a main road and have a sign lowering the speed limit in back of you, and you'll never know that you're exceeding the speed limit until you're given a ticket. This is a bad law, and it should be heaten."

Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Zwick to explain her vote."

Zwick: "Thank you. May I explain my vote please? This is the.. May I just say that this is the argument that was raised against the Bill, and that is why I adopted the Amendment. discussed this with the groups that objected to the Bill because of the possibility of a local village setting up The streets that run through a town are speed traps. township roads. That is why we eliminated the township roads and the state highways. It simply now addresses those very local streets within the village in residential areas where it is very costly to hire engineers and count cars. And in fact, on occasion, when they have submitted these studies to try and lower a speed limit in their own happened village, what has is the Department αf Transportation has actually raised the speed limit on them rather than lowered it where they have children playing and kids riding on bikes, walking to school, and there is simply no reason to not allow a village to lower a speed limit on its streets in a very, very local neighborhood." Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

Johnson: "I know we're at the end of the week here, but I think... I think everybody ought to look at see what this Bill really does. Number one, it's simply an attempt - and it got out of the Committee 14 to nothing - to... to eliminate some of the cost and time of local government in conducting traffic studies and so forth that aren't

Johnson, to explain his vote."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

necessary. Secondly, with the Amendments that were adopted, I think they've addressed themselves to all the concerns of all the potential opponents to this Bill. It's a reasonable Bill. It certainly doesn't create any kind of a potential for misuse; and, as late in the week as it is, this is a Bill that a good deal of study has gone into. It had relatively little, if any, controversy in Committee, and I would certainly urge everybody to vote for Representative Zwick's Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Bepresentative Leverenz to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, I am going to
go from a 'no' vote to a 'yes' vote, because Amendment #2,
if you look at it specifically, you will find that the Bill
will probably only affect side streets in the town. The
municipality must have total jurisdiction. If it's a state
road through a town, a county road through a town, the
municipality would not have jurisdiction on that road. It,
therefore, eliminates, I feel, the possibility of the speed
trap. And I'm voting green."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Effingham, Representative

Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, in brief explanation of my 'yes' vote, I think
this is an opportunity to save local governments cost that
there's really no reason that they incurr. I guess I'm
referring specifically to the very small towns and villages
that exist in a very rural district such as I represent.
They really cannot afford the type of studies that are
required here. As was correctly pointed out, Amendment 2,
removes any potential mischief with regard to this, except
the back streets or side streets. And with regard to
those, I would suggest the people who would be traveling
those would be the residents of that village or that town,
itself, and they are not going to allow this to be used as

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

some guise to create unnecessary speed traps. I would urge an 'aye' vote to save local governments the cost of this unnecessary study."

- Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 64 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Ord... 802 out of the record. Appearing on the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 811. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 811, a Bill for an Act relating to restrictions on solar energy use. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Lady from DuPage, Representative Nelson."

- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. One year ago today this House passed this particular Bill by a vote of 151 to 7. It is a Bill that was developed by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to encourage the use of solar energy. And what it does, as amended, is make a covenant that is added to a deed or contract for sale which restricts solar energy use void only that portion of the contract which speaks to the restriction on solar energy use. Furthermore, it prohibits registration of a title in the Torrence Title System of land registration in Cook County, if it restricts the use of solar energy. I'll be pleased to answer any questions that you have about the Bill, but I know of no opposition to it."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? There being no discussion, the guestion is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 96 voting "aye", 7 voting "no", and this

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 817. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 817, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that would require local court systems to report dispositions of supervision for serious traffic offenses of drunk driving, wreckless driving, drag racing, suspended and revoked licenses to the Secretary of State. They now have to report them in DUI cases. This Bill passed out of Judicary 10 to nothing. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I'd like to question the Sponsor."

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Giorgi: "Why is this... Why do you feel this Bill is needed,

Bepresentative Bawkinson?"

Hawkinson: "The reason this Bill is needed is because you often find in the prosecution of serious traffic offenses that an offender will get supervision in one county and then will be prosecuted for a similar offense in another county, and that prosecutor will have no way of knowing that the person has been previously placed on supervision for a serious traffic offense."

Giorgi: "And further then, if he's under supervision, in say,
Winnebago and Boone, and he serves his supervision
properly, why should it be necessary to notify the
Secretary of State that this occurred? If you put a guy on
probation, when he's done with his probation or comes out

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

of jail, you're done with him. You want this record to follow him for the next 20 years so an insurance company can gouge the hell out of him. Is that the intent?"

Hawkinson: "No. This information would not be releasable to insurance companies. It would be releasable as the DUI matters are releasable only in the prosecution of criminal cases. The reason we want them to follow it is, if they have supervision in Winnebago County or Boone County and they come down to Knox County and get another drunk driving offense, our court should have that information in front of them and not give them supervision an additional time. This does not, however, prohibit the court from granting additional supervision."

Giorgi: "Where, Mr. Hawkinson, does it show that this will not be released by the Secretary of State in his six terminals that release two million copies a year to anybody that wants to buy them?"

Hawkinson: "That's already present law."

Giorgi: "How's that again?"

Hawkinson: "That's present law in regard to the DUI reporting, and this amends present law."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Bowman: "Our analysis, which was done on April 1st, indicates the Secretary of State did not at that time take a position on the legislation. Has the Secretary now taken a position?" Speaker Yourell: "Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "It's not registered on the Bill; but, in conversations with the Secretary of State's people, I believe they're supportive of it. In further explanation, if you look at the Bill, you'll find on page four, in the present law it requires that this information not be

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

released to any outside source and shall be used only to assist in assessing driver performance and for the purpose of informing the courts that such driver has been previously referred to such program."

Bowman: "Well, thank you for the information, but that was not directed at my question but, I believe, somebody else's question. The... According to the analysis, it also indicates that state's attorneys and the Attorney General will be authorized to enforce the forwarding of conviction reports to the Secretary of State. Have they taken a position on this legislation?"

Hawkinson: "Would you repeat your question, please?"

Bowman: "Has the Attorney General and/or the Association of State's Attorneys taken a position on this legislation, since they are involved in enforcing it?"

Hawkinson: "No. The Attorney General is no longer involved in enforcing. We had an agreed Amendment with Bepresentative Cullerton that removed the Attorney General. State's attorneys have been supportive of this concept and are, I believe, supportive of this Bill. I believe the Bar Association also registered in Committee; although, I'd ask Representative Cullerton to check that."

Bowman: "Okay. You seem a little vague as to exactly who's supporting this."

Hawkinson: "No one's opposing it, Representative."

Bowman: "Thank you. Representative Hawkinson, we have... a lot of the legislation just sort of sneaks through, because nobody opposes it. And that's why I was just checking on to see if there was any act of support for it."

Hawkinson: "I believe you were on that Committee. Weren't you,
Representative?"

Bowman: "No, Sir. I am not on the Committee. Well, okay. Since you took the Attorney General out of it, who then will be

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

responsible for forwarding... or enforcing the... making sure these records are forwarded to the Secretary of State?"

Hawkinson: "The state's attorneys will be responsible for enforcing it, if the information is not indeed forwarded."

Bowman: "What role does the clerk of the court, or the judge or the probation officer play in this?"

Hawkinson: "The clerk of the court forwards the information."

Bowman: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I just... thought you got through saying that the state's attorney did."

Hawkinson: "No, the state's attorneys enforce it if the clerk does not forward it."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Bownan: "I see. Okay."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. Secretary of State has introduced his own legislation in the Senate on a limited part of this and, so far as I know, has taken no position, but certainly it's consistent with the thinking expressed in the legislation he has had introduced. What we're talking about here is very Somebody may be put on supervision, and I think we all think that's fine the first time. Maybe even the second But somebody, under the current law in a big county, like Cook, where they might get tried before a half dozen might get different Judges, supervision half dozen different times; or, they might get caught in one county one time, another county in the next and a third the third Eventually, somebody who repeatedly - and these are not minor offenses - it's not like parking tickets or something. These are very major driving offenses. Eventually, at some point, certainly we would lose our We would say, you know, 'You could have one patience.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

mistake. Maybe we'll give you a chance. You can have two. But three, four, five times, eventually we've got to draw the line somewhere. All in the world this does is make the information available ultimately to the person, the Judge, who would be making the... the final determination as to whether you're entitled to supervision the next time, as to whether you've had that privilege before and whether you abused it. The Bill is, I think, an obviously good Bill and should be passed. The Gentleman has a good idea, and we should all vote 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. don't know why we need it. Supervision is really a not guilty. And basically, what you're saying is that when someone is not guilty, that ought to be reported to the Secretary of State, and I don't think that that's right. At the present time, everything is reported to Secretary of State anyway. If you get a ticket, that's reported to the Secretary of State. If you're found guilty, that's reported to the Secretary of State. I don't really know why we need this Bill at all. I think it's just unnecessary that we have this Bill to begin with. nonetheless, you're in a situation of where you're saying, even though the court has found somebody innocent and put them on supervision, which is not a guilty plea, 'Well, we're going to consider that a guilty, and you're going to have to report that to the Secretary of State anyway. And I don't know what the Secretary of State's going to do with this information. What is he going to do with it? I have no idea what he's going to do with it, and some of the stuff is confidential. Some of it is not. I think it's a badly drawn Bill. I don't think it attacks the problem and certainly takes an individual who's

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

found innocent and declares them guilty by wirtue of this particular law, and I don't think that that's fair."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the remarks of the previous... immediately previous speaker, this legislation would require the reporting of a court supervision case in which there actually has been no supervision. And the current law says that when information is forwarded to the Secretary of State, the information shall be used only to assist in assessing driver performance. Nowhere does it say in this legislation that I can see that in the event supervision is successfully completed, that the Secretary of State will make an affirmative statement that the to be expunded with regard driver's record is ta performance related to the matter of supervision. That is the theory, Representative Jaffe has said, as ٥f supervision; that if you successfully complete supervision, everything is as if you were never arrested in the first If this Bill becomes law, supervision will be the place. same as it was before. Everything will be the same as was, as if you were never arrested, except with the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will still have records in his file indicating that there had supervision. That is not the intent of supervision in this That is not consistent with current law. not intent... current... consistent with the intent of this legislation... of the legislation that we have had in the past, nor the policy state-wide in the State of Illinois with regard to supervision. If someone completes supervision, they should be allowed to qo on as though nothing had ever happened. The record had been expunged. As some of you well know, where supervision is completed,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

at least in some counties and I presume state-wide, you can file a petition to have your record expunged, and that expunge will go all the way through all the records. But I don't see anything here that will require the Secretary of State to affirmatively expunge his records. If that is to be done, then perhaps this legislation might be proper; but, in it present form, it's a bad Eill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The previous question has been moved. Representative Hawkinson to close."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would only correct some of the impressions given that supervision is basically a guilty. That is simply not true. In order to get supervision you either have to plead guilty or be found quilty before you can be placed on supervision. The expungement of the record is not changed. The record will still be expunged. All forwarding to the Secretary of State will be subject to the confidentiality provisions of the Act as it exists, but it will enable law enforcement to know that this person has received it before. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Yeah, I rise in favor of this Bill. I think it's important that when a Judge sentences somebody who was previously on supervision, that he know that."

Speaker Yourell: "Yourell 'no"."

Levin: "And I think this mechanism would provide it. The information that goes to the Secretary of State is then

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

conveyed back to the courts the next time the person is be sentenced, and so the individual would be known by the Judge that there was a previous supervision either in that county or in some other county. When we initially passed the breathalizer reforms, the intention was to cover this then. It was a loophole at that point, and I think we're just cleaning up a loophole. This has been covered by the media fairly extensively, and I urge some more 'aye' votes."

Speaker Yourell: "To explain his vote, Representative Hallock." Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think the Members of the House should be aware as to how exactly court supervision works. Anytime there's a negotiation court supervision has agreed to, first of all, the defendant has to go before the Judge and actually plead Then after the court supervision time has lapsed, it goes into the record as not quilty finding, but he first has to plead guilty in this case. This Bill doesn't limit supervision. It, in fact, just requires that we report supervision. If you really want to get tough and crack down and make sure bad drivers, drunk drivers, wreckless drivers, drag racers are not on the highway, you have to vote for this Bill. Please vote "yes"."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Homer to explain his vote."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I also rise to support this Bill and would urge your favorable consideration. The court supervision concept came into law in 1977, and the reason for that concept was that prior to that time law enforcement people and prosecutors found themselves in a difficult situation when a true hardship situation arose where a person had a third moving violation, for example, and depended on that license for a living. At that time... Up until that time, often the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

ticket was amended to a monmoving violation. speeding case became a noisy muffler, and that was an absurd consequence. So, what the Legislature did was... was sensible. It adopted a court supervision policy that would allow a person to avoid the... the effect of conviction and still plead quilty. However, this can also be abused. It is often abused: because, if offender an comes into a county with one of these very serious offenses and says, 'No, I've never been arrested before', the prosecutor checks with the Secretary of State; and, if that person has received court supervision for wreckless driving 101 different times in 101 different counties, that record from the Secretary of State would corroborate that person's story that he had never been convicted of any such offense before even though he's been convicted over a hundred times. That's how extreme such a situation can be. would urge your favorable consideration of this vote, and I think it's imperative that we have that."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Olson to explain his vote."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a former Circuit Clerk who had close observation of the abuse of the use of court supervision in many counties and on behalf of the Circuit Clerks." Association, I know they would applaud the Sponsor and would seek your affirmative vote to accomplish what we need to do with regard to poor drivers."

Speaker Yourell: "To explain her vote, Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have been a Circuit

Court Supervisor for some 30 odd years, and I've had

experience with court supervision and expungements of

records. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a guestion. If I am

convicted of the charge, given court supervision..."

Speaker Yourell: "We're beyond that point, Representative."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Alexander: "Oh, thank you very kindly. I'm going to ask the General Assembly to vote 'no' on this, because it will work a hardship on those persons who cannot afford to, at the end of the supervision, the finding of not guilty, sometimes to pay that 17.50 to have these records expunged. And many of them do not know of that procedure in the court system."

Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, &r. Clerk. On this question, there are 56 'ayes', 38 'nos'. The Gentleman... The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson, is recognized. Leave for Postponed Consideration?"

Hawkinson: "Could I poll the abentees, please?"

Speaker Yourell: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Bullock. Christensen.

Cullerton. Domico. Ralph Dunn. Laurino."

Speaker Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Dunn. Votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll..."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Barnes. How is the Lady recorded? Representative Barnes."

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting *no*."

Speaker Yourell: "Record her as 'aye". Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Foll of the Absentees.

Mautino. McPike. Nash. O'Connell."

Speaker Yourell: "Excuse me. Bepresentative Mautino 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "O'Connell. Panayotovich. Shaw. Stuffle. Vitek, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Yourell: "What's the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk? On this question, there are 59 'ayes'... For what reason do you rise, Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record Representative Leverenz 'aye'. Mr.

Clerk, what is the Roll Call? Representative Flinn."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, change me from "no" to 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record Representative Flinn as "aye", from 'no'
to 'aye'. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record Representative Stuffle as *aye*.

Bepresentative Richmond. Record..."

Richmond: "'Aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "... Representative Bichmond as "aye". Are there any changes or additions? What's the Boll Call, Mr. Clerk? On this question, there are 63 "ayes", 34 "nos", 9 "present". On this question, there are 33 (sic - 63) voting "yes", 34 voting "no". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... what is... 63. What did I say? Oh, I'm sorry. 63 voting "aye", 34 voting "no". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 821. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 821, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections
of an Act to create sanitary districts and remove
obstructions from the Des Flaines and Illinois Rivers.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yos, Mr. Speaker, what the Bill does is it increases from 5,000 to 10,000 the maximum amount of contract or purchase order which does not require advertizing in the public bidding. Also increases the minimum value of contracts for which a bond is required from 5,000 to 10,000. The last adjustment for this was in 1977, and this also brings it in compliance with the City of Chicago, which their limit is 10,000 dollars. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

will be voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Voting is open.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Mr. Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned... I really don't understand the 'no' votes on the Bill. It simply changes the amount for the Metropolitan Sanitary District. You know, the cost of inflation has gone up. This is nothing I think we just passed a Bill that says that more. without a bid on House Bill 1803 was up to 40,000 dollars. This is no more than what the City of Chicago currently has, and it just amounts to 10,000 dollars. The provision has not been adjusted. We've had inflation for the years, and the last time it was adjusted was in 1977. It went from 2,500 to 5,000 dollars. And this is simply to realistic and adjust it to the current cost inflation, and it's not a substantial adjustment. I think it's a minor one, and it just simply does it in the same compliance as the entire City of Chicago. So, I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 41 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority...

Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I'd like a Roll of the absentees."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Clerk. That'll give you 52."

Terzich: "Well, I'd like to at least get it on Postponed
Consideration."

Speaker Yourell: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Bullock. Christensen.

Hicks. Hoffman. Leverenz. Mautino. Nash. O'Connell.

Shaw. Vitek. Winchester. No further."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, record me a 'nc' vote on that, would you please?"

Speaker Yourell: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's not recorded as voting."

Speaker Yourell: "Record him as 'no'. Bepresentative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record him as voting 'aye'. Representative
Levin."

Levin: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Yourell: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Levin: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record the Gentleman as "aye". Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, may I be changed to vote 'aye', please?"

Speaker Yourell: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Lady is recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Yourell: "Record the Lady as 'aye'. Representative
Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. The Gentleman was kind enough to help me out
the other day when I needed a Bill to be put on Postponed
Consideration. So, I'd like to have my vote changed from
'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Yourell: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Yourell: "Change him to *aye". Any other changes?

Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "How am I recorded?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

DeJaegher: "Change that to 'aye', please."

Speaker Yourell: "Change him to "aye". Further changes? What's the record... What's the...Representative ... How is the Gentleman recorded, Representative Erunsvold?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'present'."

Brunsvold: "Becord me as 'aye'."

- Speaker Yourell: "Record the Gentleman as "aye". Bepresentative Harris "aye". Bepresentative Warpiel "aye". What's the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 49 voting "aye", 57 voting "no", 2 voting "present". The Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration. Leave for Postponed Consideration. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 825. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 825, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to grade A milk and grade A milk products and repeal certain Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 First of all, I'd like to give a few definitions as to what

 we're talking about here. A lot of people thought that
 this Bill would be utterly impossible to handle, and I hope
 that it isn't. We're talking about increasing the minimum
 solids, not fat and milk."
- Speaker Yourell: "For what reason does the Gentleman, Mr. Vinson, rise?"
- Speaker Yourell: "Please give your attention to the Gentleman.

 For what reason does Bepresentative Ballock rise?"
- Hallock: "I think this noise is utterly ridiculous. We ought to

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

stop it."

Speaker Yourell: "That's the order we want to restore. Proceed,

Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just explain what solids and not fat includes. In milk, there are components including butterfat, water, and proteins and minerals lactose or sugars. Currently, under our current law, we deal with butterfat contents and solids, not fats. result of many peoples concerns about increased fat in milk, the processors have produced milk that. bν definition, contains less than 2% butterfat and less than 0.25 of butterfat. So, we have skim and low-fat milk. attempt here is to increase the minimum standards, not fat, which includes protein and minerals by some 21%. The intent here is to increase the nutritional value in the low-fat milks having no change whatsoever in homogenized which you get across the store now, with a result that we will begin to be able to deal with a very serious problem that we have in this country; that being we're paying some two billion dollars in federal taxes for storage of surplus commodities. Those surplus commodities are dried milk, cheese, butter and condensed milk. Many of the processors who are opposed to this Fill, as well as one of the largest farm organizations in the State of Illinois. in fact, are not really attempting to deal with particular problem. This Bill, in some small wager, will begin to deal with that. There is a slight cost increase in only, in only now, 2% milk. The dairy cow herself now produces milk at the equivalent value of 8.8% solids, fat. In the proposal, the homogenized milk, there would be no change. So those processors and people who will say it will be an added cost - that is untrue. For those who it would be an added cost in 2%, it would be less than

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

currently 1.75% increase. And in skim milk. it would be less than a full point, actually three-quarters of a point. This is a very good Bill. It's an attempt to resolve a problem that is facing this country. It is a nutritional problem that I think we can deal with very effectively. Some of the opposition say that we should not pass Bill, because it would raise the cost of milk. And we ought to be more competitive with other liquids. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've checked with the local Kroger grocery store, and let me relate to you the prices that we're talking about. The only thing that was less than milk was spring water for 99 cents a gallon. Homogenized milk is \$1.99. The two areas that we're talking about increasing the solids, not fat, is 20 cents less than homogenized milk at a \$1.79. Wine was \$4.29, and that wasn't a very good grade either. Orange Juice was a dollar more and all of the colas exceeded a dollar gallon. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker. this is a piece of legislation that every dairy farmer in the State of Illinois supports. It is a Bill that every person who is in the area of low income that cannot afford to spend very much money will get substantial increased nutritional value. It's a Bill that begins to deal with a very serious problem that we have in terms of sizable surplus costing taxpayers in excess of two billion dollars a year just for storage. I'm asking for your favorable support so that together, legislatively, we can deal with this problem. The other final point from those people who are opposing this is that it would place other states around us at a competitive advantage, and that is just Those states around us would also have to meet our so. standards. The State of Illinois, to the best of knowledge, we are an importing state of milk. The State of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Wisconsin and their Legislature just this Session have similar kinds of legislation to do this. I have attempted to deal with the opposition by stating that the effective date of this Bill would not go into effect until January 1 of 1985, giving sufficient time for bordering states and/or federalization to come... federal legislation to come into compliance. Let me close by saying the State of California has this Bill already into effect for some ten years. Though there has been decrease in per capita consumption, the significant reduction in the State of California per capita is far less than the national average. I welcome your favorable support and would be most happy to answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

McPike: "The purpose of this Bill is to increase the fat content of skim milk?"

Ropp: "Negative. Solids, not fats, which is protein and minerals and..."

McPike: "I'm sorry. Okay then, the solid content of skim milk?"
Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

McPike: "Is this a federal standard that... that decides what the solid content is in skim milk, or is it a state standard?"

Ropp: "We have within our state law milk for homogenized...
standards for homogenized milk only. The state now
complies with other federal legislation that deals with
skim milk and 2%."

McPike: "Would this make the. the skim milk in Illinois have a higher solid content than could be sold in Indiana, or Iowa, or Missouri or Wisconsin?"

Ropp: "At the current time if this Eill passes, it would be, and that's why..."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

McPike: "How much..."

Ropp: "... I have the effective date a year and a half away so other states would comply or come in..."

McPike: "How much extra would this cost per gallon?"

Ropp: "Homogenized milk, there would be no increase in cost."

McPike: "I know that. It doesn't affect that. How much would it cost on skin milk?"

Ropp: "All the way from as little two cents up to what some have said, ten cents. The national average of consumption of milk, including cream, is only 25 gallon."

McPike: "Twenty-five gallons per person."

Ropp: "Per person."

McPike: "Per year?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

McPike: "Thank you. Could I address the Fill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Yourell: "Froceed, Sir."

McPike: "Our staff says that it will cost somewhere between cents and twenty cents, and the Sponsor said somewhere between two cents and ten cents. And the amount consumed person is about 25 gallons a year. So, it would cost then somewhere between two dollars and five dollars person. Eleven million people in the state, it's going to cost consumers in this state then somewhere between 20 and 40 million dollars to pass this Bill. I have risen earlier this year to speak against welfare programs for farmers. It seems that there's a misconception that most welfare recipients live in the urban areas in the poor sections of the city, and they are the ones that are receiving all the welfare subsidies, but not when you really look at what is happening in this country. And here is another clear example. We start with a set aside program for acreage so that 20% of the acreage by farmers are not planted, and they get direct subsidies for that. Then we have a PIK

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

program where they can set aside 30% of the farm and not pay... and receive money for that. Then we have a nontill program where they receive money for that, and then we have a conservation program where they receive money for that. Then we pay subsidies to those that grow tobacco, peanuts, and corn and sugar, and now we have another subsidy for the milk producers. I * m - - -We have another subsidy now for the farmers that produce milk. I don't think it's ever going to end. Here is an example of the Sponsor of the Bill is trying to save the Federal Government, nationally, two million dollars in storage in order to save two million dollars... two costs: and. billion dollars in storage costs - not per year - on an annual average the Sponsor is trying to save the Federal Government storage costs. And in so doing, he is adding to the people that live in this state an added burden of probably 25 million dollars a year to buy milk. it's unreasonable for the Gentleman to continue to come before the General Assembly with all these welfare I think that we reach a point where we can no longer afford to pay for the welfare programs for Gentleman's constituents. There is no end to the amount of cost that he will put before us, and there is no end to the amount of money that will be required to pay for all of his welfare programs. I think it becomes a little embarrassing for the Gentleman to come before us and maintain that the free enterprize system... that the farmers that support free enterprise system cannot exist under the free enterprise system but must be continually subsidized with welfare payments. I don't think that we can afford this. I don't think that we can afford to put our state at a competitive disadvantage to the surrounding states, and I think it's unreasonable to ask this General Assembly to,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

again, put 25 or 40 million dollar burden on the backs of those people in Illinois that would prefer to drink milk simply because he is trying to give these welfare payments to the farmers in his district and in other districts in I really don't think that the farmers believe the state. in these welfare programs. I think that they would rather see the free enterprise system work and I think if we would allow it to work instead of continually adding subsidies and welfare to them, that we would end up with a much better system than what the Gentleman is trying to provide for us. So that I would ask you to vote against the 25 million dollar tax increase to the people VOUL district."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

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

Nelson: "Representative Bopp, I do understand what you're trying to do here, add not butterfat, but protein and minerals.

But, how is that done? The milk is processed at a dairy, and then are you going to have to add back in this powdered milk that's been in storage for nobody knows exactly how long?"

Ropp: "What they would be adding back could be powdered milk that they themselves may be storing or processing or condensed milk which has been... the water has been removed and the fat may have been removed. Currently, there are machinery that are in place now that can pretty well do this as they just run milk right through it, but it is a fortification. We are currently fortifying milk right now with vitamin A an D in many cases. So, it's not a major problem in any way."

Nelson: "There's not cost to the dairy involved are you saying?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Ropp: "Well, yes there's some monetary cost, as we've talked about it. All the way from two cents to ten, depending on what you want to listen to. Some people have said that it would be an added increase in the cost of the product. That's not necessarily true, because they're already buying milk. So, they already have it purchased. The added cost might be in the processing of the milk, taking out the water, condensing it or/and taking out the butterfat or as the dried powder would be fortified or replaced into the skim milk or the 2%."

Nelson: "Well, our family drinks a lot of milk, and our analysis indicates that the consumer would pay anywhere between five and twenty cents more a gallon. What I'd like to ask you is, did Wisconsin pass the Bill that was introduced in their legislature?"

Ropp: "It is in their Legislature just as ours is in our Legislature. The State of California has had this Bill for some ten years already."

Nelson: "Well, I think my concern is over the addition of what seems to me to be a perfectly sanitary and healthful product, and I'm an advocate of drinking skim milk and 2%.

And I guess I do not guite see the necessity for the additives."

Ropp: "Well, let me say just in answer that guestion, one of the dairies who wrote every person in this Legislature opposing this piece of legislation... Just for the record, if you happen to have milk from Dean's Dairy, which is a very excellent dairy, their standards that they themselves are imposing on themselves are almost identical what I am proposing. And so to them, there really should be no increase in cost, though they're saying there will be a cost. I have substantial figures to back that up. One of the problems is that we have too many other dairies that

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

feel that skim milk ought to be a real profit maker and that they should not fortify it, or add, or maintain or leave in the solids, not fat, that should milk possess; and, as a result, that... those are the dairies, in my judgment, that are opposing this, because they're going to have to come up to those standards. And I wouldn't be surprised that the dairy that wrote is somewhat concerned that well, by these increased standards, the palatability and the flavor of the milk will be significantly increased. And really your children and your family will enjoy skim milk a lot better if this passes."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Pangle."

Pangle: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Sponsor indicates that he..."

Pangle: "What is the Farm Bureau's position on this Bill?"

Ropp: "Farm Bureau's position on this Bill is one that represents an affiliate of their organization, the Frairie Farms Creamery. If you check with farmers who are dairy producers who are members of Farm Eureau, they support this legislation."

Pangle: "But has the Farm Bureau come out against or for this Bill?"

Ropp: "They have a letter on your desk that says they do not support it, because it will cause problems with interstate shipment. I can assure you this causes no problems with interstate shipment whatsoever."

Pangle: "But they are saying they do not support this Bill. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "I'm saying they don't understand the Bill."

Pangle: "What about the retail merchants of the State of Illinois?"

Ropp: "The retail merchants are also opposed to it, because there

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

are a few processors who are apparently retail merchants. If you're a single full retail merchant yourself; that is, not in the processing business, if you're a grocery store that does not have, as your sole operation, a processing plant, you should have no effect on this Bill. But there are a few people who are processors, as well as having retail stores, and they are opposed to it. One of whom I'm sure is Dean's. They are meeting the standards within a very minimal amount in one of the three categories that I'm proposing to increase. So their opposition should not be there."

- Pangle: "The biggest milk producer in the State of Illinois is Prairie Farm. Is that correct?"
- Ropp: "Prairie Farms doesn't produce any milk. Dairy farmers
 produce milk."
- Pangle: "Just to finalize. Since there will be an increase, evidentally, this will increase the cost of milk in all the school systems throughout the state. Would that be correct, downstate, Cook County and so forth?"
- Ropp: "The figures that I have seen is under this proposed legislation you will get a 21% increase in nutritional value, at best, maybe ten percent increase in cost."
- Pangle: "But there will be an increase to education as far as milk and so forth. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would just like to add, if you love your children, vote *no*."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative John
- Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, it's getting close to milking time. So, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman has moved the previous guestion. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bopp, to close."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am aware that most school districts are not allowed to get too much skim milk. of all of it is whole milk, and so there'd be no increased And if you really love your children, you'll support this Bill, because it does provide increased nutritional If you have care and loving compassion for who are on low incomes, who really can't afford a lot of money to buy food, a few pennies for this will give them added nutritional value that they, heretofore, could not receive. Let me say that this is a piece of legislation that does not have an effective date as of today. It is a year and a half away, knowing that there are people who that Illinois would be at a competitive disadvantage, and I've taken that into consideration. I urge your favorable vote so that we can provide better nutrition for the State of Illinois so that Illinois can be a leader midwest in caring for their children, both yours and mine."

Speaker Yourell: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would Tate: like to commend the Sponsor's efforts for trying to insure higher milk solid standards; however, the issue should probably be a federal issue. And unfortunately, legislation was recently defeated in the Biawaka Amendment that was proposed in Congress this year. What these standards would do, they would, among other things. prescribe the minimum nonfat solids be required for each product. It would also raise the cost of whole milk by four cents per gallon, low-fat milk by thirteen cents per gallon and nonfat milk by six cents per gallon.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

you're concerned with the poor people in this state, the people that need good nutrition, that have to go and buy milk, a good vote would be a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Yourell: "Representative Mulcahey to explain his vote.

 Representative Oblinger to explain her vote."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, has really been - and I hate to use the word that's you're all using - but ludicrous. I haven't heard one of you say how many gallons of Coca Cola your kids drink, and it's been going up because the cost of making cans, the cost of But you assume that that's alright; but, when it's labor. for a good product, you don't. The one that asked about Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau has an Executive Committee that makes these decisions. The local Farm Bureau's have no input into it, and the various groups that make up the Farm Bureau do not. Here the dairy farmers are for it, but the Farm Bureau has ignored this, and I think you ought to take this into consideration and, also, all that Coke your kids drink."
- Speaker Yourell: "Representative Panayotovich to explain his vote."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have not seen a great flux of consumers asking for this Bill to be passed, and I do agree with the Sponsor that you probably would be increasing the taste. You would be increasing the butterfat and the nutrients, but I think that I think one of the main things we have to watch out for is we're going to also be increasing the price very much. And with that, I vote 'no'."
- Speaker Yourell: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 45 voting *aye*, 56 voting *no*. The Gentleman from Macon... or McLean, Mr. Ropp."

49th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1983
- Ropp: "How many more do I need for a Fostponed Consideration?

 Two? Three?"
- Speaker Yourell: "Representative Capparelli. How is the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Capparelli is not recorded as
 voting."
- Speaker Yourell: "Vote him 'aye'. Bepresentative Leverenz. How is the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."
- Speaker Yourell: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative Stezco. How is the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting "present"."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, vote me 'aye', please."
- Speaker Yourell: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative Hicks. How is the Gentleman record... No. Okay. What's the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk? On this question, there are 48 'aye', 55 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill is on Postponed Consideration. Appearing on the Order of Third Cal... Third Reading is House Bill 839. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 839, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to authorize county boards and various probation departments to develop programs for public service employment. Third Reading of the Eill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends an Act authorizing public service employment program for probationers. What it does, it provides immunity for the state and all units of local government, not just the county, plus their employees for the tortious conduct of criminal offenders put on public service work; that is, picking up trash, maintaining public

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

facilities as a condition of probation or supervision. Presently, such immunity is available only to the county and its officials and employees. I think this is a good Bill. What it does, it increases the people to participate in it so that they don't have to worry about the immunity, and I don't know of anybody opposing it. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Hensel, I'm looking at page one..."

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

Johnson: "... lines 25 through 31, which it indicates, 'neither the state and so forth nor any official... or any official acting the course of his official duties shall be liable for any tortious acts of any person placed on probation or supervision. Is this only for acts of the individual defendant in connection with that supervision, for example, public service acts, you know, cleaning the streets and that kind of thing, or is it for any tortion? In other words, what if a person was place on probation and committed a tort unrelated to that? What kind of liability are we trying to limit the state to? I'm not against the Bill. I just want to understand, as a matter of statement of public policy, what we're concerned about."

Hensel: "I believe, under the Amendment #2, it says tortious acts of any person placed on a public service project, and I think that should clear it up, shouldnot it?"

Johnson: "That's fine. That's fine."

Hensel: "Thank you."

Johnson: "Yeah."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "I realize the intent of the Eill. I, myself, in my

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

township have a Workfair program, and I think that this is what you're trying to enact, usage such as this. But what's this going to do to the Workmen's Compensation Act?

I'm having trouble within my township regarding the Workmen's Compensation Act because of the prevailing rate that we pay and what the organization pays that you've placed that person under. What's this going to do to the Workmen's Compensation Act? This is my concern."

Hensel: "It should have no affect on it, because they are not an employee of that township or unit of local government.

They are put there by the courts to work off a minor offense, and so they are not employees of that unit. So, it shouldn't affect it."

DeJaegher: "Did the amount of work that they work, etcetera then, would not... would not be held against their fine, if that was the case. If that person was confined to a jail for a specific reason and he was fined "X" amount of dollars, that would not work against that fine. Is that what you're telling me then?"

Hensel: "Well, you were asking about unemployment."

DeJaegher: "I know, but I mean... It's more or less... It's the same circumstances that prevail I think. If you would work that person, given that person would be fined for 'X' amount of dollars, he would be confined to a jail for 'X' amount of dollars. If he went out and worked for that, would that work against that fine, and would that be considered compensation in this Act?"

Hensel: "No, it wouldn't."

DeJaegher: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, is this your first Bill?"

Hensel: "Yes, it is."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Hallock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. A11 those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote *nay*. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 96 voting 'aye', 9 no. and the Bill. having received the voting Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, for a Motion."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we would suspend House Bule 32(c) until May 31st. 32(c) requires that when Senate Bills are printed that they contain the name of the House Sponsor on the printed Bill. Because not all Senate Bills have been picked up by House Sponsors, we would have to delay in having these Bills printed. Bather than have that delay, we are asking to suspend this rule so that the Bills can be printed and ready so that we can have them posted in Committee. So, I would move for the suspension of House Rule 32(c) till May 31st."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Cullerton, is that Motion is writing?"

Cullerton: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Yourell: "Yes. On that Motion, the Chair recognizes,
Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. How did we get to this Order of Business, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman was recognized for the purpose of a Motion."

Vinson: "But how did we get to the Order of Motions? I say, how did we get..."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman was recognized for the purpose of a Motion, and I believe that we had informed the Minority Leader and others there that this was going to take place.

And there apparently was an agreement. Now, if there wasn't, I'm..."

Vinson: "No, Sir. There is not agreement on that, and I would ask the Gentleman to take it out of the record at this time."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "No, I knew that there was not going to be an agreement on the Motion, but I do want to have the Motion heard. And I think it's clear that the Speaker has the authority to go to the Order of Motions, and this is clearly a new subject matter that the Speaker had decided to call a Motion. And that is why it's certainly in order to hear the Motion, and I understand that the Gentleman is not in favor of the Motion but will be happy to debate it."

Speaker Yourell: "Well, Mr. Cullerton, in order to clarify the situation, what the Chair will do now will go to the Order of Motions and under the subject matter of suspensions of the Rule 32(c). How's that? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Don't you think that's a rather blatant abuse of that rule?"

Speaker Yourell: "Pardon me? No."

Vinson: "Don't you think that's a rather blatant abuse of that provision?"

Speaker Yourell: "Would you like to speak on the Motion, Sir?"

Vinson: "Yes, I'd like to speak on the Mction."

Speaker Yourell: "Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again we face the situation where the majority in... who adopted their own set of rules, are unwilling to abide by their own set of rules. There's no reason we can't let Members

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

decide whether they want to pick up those Bills before they're printed. That's a perfectly appropriate thing. We may even get to a situation where we're printing Bills in the House that haven't even been passed by the Senate with... rules like these. I think that we ought to oppose this. I think we ought to do things in an orderly fashion, and I think the public and the Members have the right to have the rules abided by. There's simply no need to hurry things through like this. As you know, Mr. Speaker, every time you folks get in a big hurry, you get in trouble. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has moved to suspend the... Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "If I could just close, the previous speaker has raised some issues. First of all, he talks about Majority Party adopting rules. That's an interesting comparison to last Session when we didn't adopt rules, permanent rules, at all. I would point out that this Resolution has the support of Assistant Clerk, Tony Leone. would indicate that the Bills will still be read a first The Calendar will still indicate who the House Sponsor is, and that, also an interesting comparison to last year, I've been told that this rule in the past, under the last Session, was always violated. So, I'm simply trying to do it the right way by violating... by asking to... suspend the rule rather than violate it, as was the practice in the last Session, and I would just point out that the reason for doing this is so that we can have more time to hear what the Bills are in Committee. So I would ask for the adoption of my Motion to suspend this rule."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Greiman, do you wish to be heard on the Motion?"

Greiman: "Well, I just want to say I support that Motion. The

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

opposition to the...the Gentleman opposing this Motion has raised triviality to an art form. I believe that, and of all the trivial things to do battle over, this is it. I think we should all think about what the great Speaker Reed, who was the Speaker of the Bouse in Washington in the Congress, he said, 'After an election, one Party governs, and one Party watches.' And, Sam, that's it."

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Majority (Minority) Party, through Sam Vinson, very often likes to say that they are on the side of the public. I would think the sooner that we get a printed Bill, a Senate Bill, printed and available to the public, the better you are informing the public. For a Bill to sit over there for three or four days before a House Sponsor identifies himself as a Sponsor of that Senate Bill, to wait for that to be printed, is absurd really, and that's probably why it's been violated, even by your Party, when you had the Majority. So I think that all of us, no matter which Party we belong to, ought to do it correctly and Otherwise, the public is not being suspend that rule. served. In fact, I would plead with Vinson to remove objections, because you know you're wrong. I'm sure you do."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 32(c). All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 71 'ayes', 26 voting 'no', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. On the Order of Third Reading, there appears House Bill 840. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 840, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Steczo: "Thank you, Bill 840, when it was originally introduced, was one that provided that in various counties throughout the State of Illinois a sheriff would be appointed the Director of Emergency Services, unless the county board appointed someone else. However, due to a very vocal opposition from various emergency service and disaster directors, the Bill was amended and changed quite dramatically. And now, as amended, simply states that in cases where a sheriff currently is, the emergency service coordinator in a county and there are two within the State of Illinois - that that sheriff may be compensated some small...with some small stipend already provided for in this statute for providing those services. I believe that that has taken away probably most of the opposition from the Bill. I would answer any questions, and if not, would ask the House to approve House Bill 840."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 101 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Calendar on the Order of Third Beading is House Bill 844. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Bepresentative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 844 addresses the issue of the nonreferendum transportation tax rate for unit districts. you know, dual districts have substantially a greater amount of taxing authority combined than do unit districts. And this Bill originally provided an increase from 18...from 12¢ to 18¢. This particular...then I amended it to provide that we would arrive at that 18% over a three year period of time, providing for a 2¢ increase each the...for each of the three years to bring it up to 18¢. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, as those of you know who were here last year, we passed legislation out here which covered twice this amount. All those does is provide that in unit districts, the taxpayer exposure will be the same as the taxpayer exposure in dual...in dual districts. And I would encourage your support of this legislation."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Piel: "Sorry about that. I just happen to be reading the analysis, Gene, and I happen to see on here this Bill will allow nonreferendum property tax increases up to .06. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "This will allow for...in any community that has a unit district, whose tax rate is equal to or lower than the amount included to increase that tax rate, the school board increase that tax rate by 2% each of the next two years. If you live in an area which has dual districts, such as yours, it would have absolutely no effect. In fact, Representative Steczo and Nelson have distributed

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

information to you on what the current rates are for dual districts and unit districts and their suggestions, which are in House Bill 1186. I think you will...it points out that in many of these areas, there are very few districts affected."

Piel: "Thank you."

- Speaker Yourell: "There being on further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Yourell 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Bepresentative Hoffman to explain his vote."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think I have that much breath left in me, and I accept the will of the Majority."
- Speaker Yourell: "On this question, there are 27 voting 'yes', 71 voting 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost.

 Appearing on the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 845. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 845, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "If you liked that last Bill, you re going to love this one, because this increases the transportation tax rate from 37 1/2¢ to...I m sorry, the building and maintanence fund tax rate from 37 1/2¢ to 46 1/2¢ over a period of three years. So whereas the last Fill was 2¢ a year, this is 3¢ a year."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yourell aye. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman.

Hoffman: "What can I say?"

Speaker Yourell: "On this question, there are 27...28 voting "aye", 73 voting "no". This Bill, having failed to received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. On the subject of Motions...on the Order of Motions, subject matter - reconsideration - House Bill 2033. The Chair recognizes Representative Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, that's 2023."

Speaker Yourell: "2023."

Curran: "I move to reconsider the Amendment #3 to House
Bill...first of all, I guess I need permission to bring it
back to Second Reading."

Speaker Yourell: "No, first you have to reconsider the vote by which that Amendment lost."

Curran: "No, the Amendment won."

Speaker Yourell: "Oh, well won them. Do you..."

Curran: "I think first we go back to Second Reading."

Speaker Yourell: "Does the Gentleman have leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading? Leave being granted, the Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which that Amendment won...Amendment #3 passed. Proceed."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3, which I would like to replace with Amendment #4, in deference to Representative Johnson's wishes, had some wording in it which would have basically negated the purpose of the Bill. So I just ask to withdraw...reconsider Amendment #3 and then pass Amendment #4. The Amendments all by voice wote sc far."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman moves to reconsider Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4. Mr. Clerk,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Amendment #4."

Curran: "We want to withdraw #3 and add #4."

Speaker Yourell: "We did that."

Curran: "Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment \$4, Curran, amends House Bill 2023 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Yourell: "Mr. Curran, you withdraw #3?"

Curran: "Yes, we withdraw #3."

Speaker Yourell: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Mr. Curran on Amendment #4."

Curran: "Now wish to offer Amendment #4 which just corrects some...some language problems in Amendment #3 in deference to Representative Johnson's wishes."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? All those in favor of
Amendment #4 will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.
Amendment #4 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Yourell: "Third Reading. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 848. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 848, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nonprofit Health Care Service Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a uniform, sensible recommendation of the Illinois Insurance Law Study Commission and the Illinois Department of Insurance, which calls for the termination of the privileged legal status of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan and then conversion to a mutual legal reserve accident and health insurance company. As far as I know, this has no opposition. We have a fiscal note on this from the Fiscal Commission, and it shows that this will have no impact on state revenue. But in the future, it could even create a

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

little bit of extra revenue for the state. So it's a pull money Bill. I'd appreciate your vote."

- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Being no discussion, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Beading is House Bill 849. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 849, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill would provide for school boards to provide that a mailing list of minutes and items of interest to people who wish to subscribe for a fee. So anybody who wants to know what's going on in the school board can do so, but there would be no expense to the school board, because they can charge a fee for the subscription. I urge a favorable vote."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there any discussion? Eeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill rass?'. All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', no...none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 854. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading is 856. Read the...out of the record. On the

- 49th Legislative Day May 20, 1983
 Order of Third Reading is House Bill 863. Read the Bill,
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 863, a Bill for an Act in relationship to fingerprinting of minors for identification purposes.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave, please, to return this Bill to Second Reading, in order that we may table one of the two Amendments which have both been adopted, and which it turns out, are repetitious."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady ask leave to return this Bill to
 Second Reading for the purpose of tabling an Amendment.

 Does she have leave? Leave is granted. The Bill's on
 Second Reading. Proceed. Mr. Clerk."
- Cowlishaw: "Yes, Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, I move that Amendment #1 be tabled. Amendment #2 accomplishes the same thing as

 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Yourell: "Is there objection to table Amendment #1?

 Amendment #1 is tabled. Amendment #2. Okay, that's it? 2
 is on."
- Cowlishaw: "2...Yes, 2 has already been adopted, Sir."
- Speaker Yourell: "Ckay, Amendment #1 is tabled. Amendment #2 is adopted. The Bill is on Third Reading."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker."

Mr. Clerk."

- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady asks leave to hear the Bill immediately on consideration of Third Reading. Does she have leave? Leave granted. Proceed."
- Cowlishaw: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I think I explained when we were considering Amendment #2 yesterday, this Bill is commonly known as, the fingerprinting the children Bill. It is a response to the alarmingly great increase in the numbers of

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

missing children in this nation and in Illinois as well. We have already had many efforts along the line of providing fingerprints of youngsters by park districts, schools and municipal police departments throughout Illinois. including the Chicago Police Department. However, that opportunity for parents or quardians would like to take advantage of it has not been uniform throughout the state, which is, therefore, the reason for this piece of legislation. As amended, this Eill provides very simply that municipal police departments and sheriffs' departments shall make available to parents or who request it, the service of providing fingerprints of minor children. The parent or guardian is to keep that one and only set of fingerprints. The cost for this program, in accordance with the fiscal note which has been filed, do not accrue to the State of Illinois, which is exempt from the State Mandates Act. But since the Bill provides that police department or sheriff's department may charge for this service, it appears that...that the average cost for that to the parent or taxpayer might be around a dollar and fifty cents. This Bill is endorsed by the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, the Chicago Folice Department, the Illinois Parent and Teacher Association. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I just want to...did you say this is voluntary? I'm sorry."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman...the Lady indicates she'll yield."
- Cullerton: "Yes, did you say this is not mandatory? I just
 wanted to know what you did with your Amendments with
 respect to...the way I read the Eill, it says, 'The

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

corporate authorities of each municipalities, which has established a police department, shall require such police department to comply with the requirements of this Section. Now, is that still the way it reads?"

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Sir, that is correct. The police departments shall provide the service. The parent or quardian, however, doesn't have to take advantage of that.

Parent...only those parents or guardians who chose to have this done for their children would have that provided."

Cullerton: "Alright, thank you."

Cowlishaw: "You're welcome."

Speaker Yourell: "Mr. Freston."

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

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

Preston: "Representative, is there anything in the law that now prohibits police departments or sheriff departments from voluntarily doing this now?"

Cowlishaw: "Oh no, Sir. That, in fact as I mentioned, that has already been done voluntarily, I believe, by the...for example, I believe the Chicago Park District has undertaken such a proposal."

Preston: "So what's the need of a Bill that requires them to do
what they are already doing now throughout the state if
it's asked for?"

Cowlishaw: "In my opening remarks, Sir, I mentioned that because of the fact that this has been a somewhat spotty kind of thing throughout Illinois - it has been done in some areas but not in others - the reason for the legislation is to make this opportunity available to parents, regardless of where they live in Illinois."

Preston: "Are there then police departments or sheriffs*

departments that you know of that have refused to

fingerprint the child for a parent who brought that child

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

in? Has it ever been refused as far as you know ever?"

Cowlishaw: "I'm sorry. I cannot answer that guestion, because I do not know the answer. I do know, however, there are various sheriffs' departments and other units that have...of government that have provided this service.

There are others who simply have not chosen to do so. That may not mean they are unwilling."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Slape...Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Lady yield to a question?"

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

Slape: "Does this Bill address, in any manner, who gets custody of the fingerprints and how many copies of the fingerprints

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Sir. As I mentioned before, this Eill provides very specifically that one set of fingerprints will be taken. That set is to be retained by the parent or quardian."

Slape: "Alright, thank you."

are made?"

Cowlishaw: "You're welcome."

Speaker Yourell: "Bepresentative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield please?"

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

Hannig: "In most of the counties that I represent, the sheriffs are already doing something along this line. How would this Bill change that practice, for example?"

Cowlishaw: "I certainly hope it will not change the practice in any county where there is a sheriff's department or in any municipality where a police department is already doing this. It will only mean that, in fact, it is done throughout the state with some uniformity."

Hannig: "This would encourage the fingerprinting? Is that the idea of the Eill?"

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Cowlishaw: "Representative, I am hoping that because it is something that is a state-wide kind of thing, that, in fact, more parents would become aware of the fact that when a minor is missing, the problem of identifying that child is a tremendous difficulty for law enforcement officials. Young children have no dental records and, you know, many other...there are many other difficulties involved in the identification of minor children. All this does is try to provide a tool for that purpose."

Hannig: "I think you stated that it would not cost the state any dollars. Is that correct?"

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Hannig: "Because the local people who have the fingerprinting done would pay for it?"

Cowlishaw: "The local law enforcement officials are, according to
the provisions of the Amendment, entitled to charge the
parent or guardian, if they chose to do so - they don't
have to charge, but if they want to, they may charge just
to cover the cost."

Hannig: "But would not necessarily cost the counties any money either. Is that correct?"

Cowlishaw: "No, they may charge to cover their costs."

Hannig: "Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye' and 5 voting 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 864. Bead the Eill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 864, a Bill for an Act in relation to public utility taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Out of the record? Out? Appearing on the Order of Third Reading is Bouse Bill 872. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 872, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain organizations which discriminate. Third Reading of the Fill."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 872 creates an Act to prohibit the conducting of state business at and the payment of certain funds to private clubs and other organizations which discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion or indeed any other protected class covered by the Illinois Rights Act. In order to lay out for you the need for this legislation, let me just read a very short letter that appears in the current issue of the Doners Forum, which is a newspaper for the philanthropic community printed in Chicago. It says, 'The scene is of the dignified and handsome Mid-Day Club high in the First National Bank Building. A group of foundation trustees and staff members has just entered, invited for lunch by a respected But as the men and women not-for-profit organization. proceed to the nearest coat room, a moment of high drama attendant rushes out. Heavens, such a stir. Numbled apologies. Finally a clear direction. your coats at the end of the hall. Folitely, please hang quickly, the women go and open the door at the end of the hall. Behold, the broom closet. Now, we have a number of private clubs, particularly in the Chicago area, and I presume elsewhere in the state, that discriminate. The State of Illinois pays at least \$7,000 a year on behalf of various officials and agencies to dine and cavort at these

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

private clubs. These include the Attic Club, the Chicago Club, the Mid-Day Club, the Bacquet Club, the Union League Club, some of which prohibit women, and a number of them are quite coy in response to questions about their racial When a staff member called and asked them if they prohibited blacks, they said, 'Well, the person you have to talk to about our minority policy is not in right now. Well, it seems to me that if they have a clear-cut policy, they ought to be willing to say so over the telephone. In any event, it seems to me that we should not be using public funds in this way, and this particular piece of legislation would prohibit that. It would also prohibit the expenditure of ... or the subsidies so that sometimes private organizations ray on behalf of their employees for membership fees to such clubs if those firms are covered by the State Purchasing Act. I ask favorable consideration from the House for this legislation."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'd yield."

Ewing: "What is the main objective of your Eill then?"

Bowman: "The main objective of my Bill is to make sure that the state does not support directly or indirectly clubs which discriminate. I'm not trying to outlaw such organizations. If people want to join private discriminatory clubs, that's their business. But if so, they should do so with their money, and the state should not encourage or use its money directly or indirectly to support such activities."

Ewing: "Now, this is in dealing with the facilities when they discriminate with the facilities between male and female."

Bowman: "Well, Representative, the way the Fill is written - and Amendment #2 is the Bill - it defines discriminatory club

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

with reference to the protected classes covered by the Buman Rights Act."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I certainly agree with this legislation, and I am going to ask the Sponsor to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment, because this is a club right here. We're one of the most exclusive clubs in the world, and the most exclusive in Illinois, and yet we discriminate in our facilities. You ask the Ladies if they have equal facilities in this House. I ask you to take that back for an Amendment. Let us make equal facilities in this House are entitled to as many stalls as the men."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel."
Karpiel: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

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

Karpiel: "Representative Bowman, are these clubs the ones in question that a former candidate for the Governor of Illinois had to eat in, because he couldn't find any good restaurants in the City of Chicago?"

Bowman: "Representative Karpiel, all discriminatory clubs are covered by this proposed legislation, regardless of who may have formerly or is currently a member."

Karpiel: "Well then, Representative, if the outcome of the gubernatorial race had been different, would the Governor have had to...in getting state salary, would have had to not be able to eat at these clubs?"

Bowman: "The prohibition would not be on whether someone were to visit one of the clubs, but only whether state...the Comptroller would authorize warrants and to...in payment to those clubs. However, by the way, in response to the previous question, the General Assembly is included."

Speaker Yourell: "Have you concluded? Representative Brummer."

49th Legislative Day May 20, 1983

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Brummer: "There was an Amendment adopted, I recall, that originally the Bill provided that anyone who provided any state goods could...who purchased...who sold any goods to the state could not pay dues on behalf of any members that belong to clubs that discriminate. There was an Amendment adopted to address that issue at least partially. What was that Amendment?"

- Bowman: "The Amendment simply says now that if the firm which does business with the state is covered by the Purchasing Act and, for example, that would require a minimum of \$5,000 worth of business with the state, then they would be covered. But the small business person or indeed does business as covered by the Small Business Purchasing Act, which is a separate Act altogether, would not be covered."
- Brummer: "Okay, you referred previously to some clubs that discriminate in Chicago. I want to make clear here at least what I think are some additional discriminatory clubs. Rotary Club, for example, I think restricts membership to men. I think that's correct, I think, to the best of my knowledge. Would this be applicable with regard to Rotary Clubs then?"
- Bowman: "Representative, it would be applicable only to the extent that the fees were paid on behalf, or by the employer, or by the state or that...to the extent that..."
- Brummer: "The Rotary would be a discriminatory club within the definition of this."
- Bowman: "Well, I'll take your word for it. I mean, I'm...You are probably more familiar with it than I am."
- Brummer: "At least in Effingham, I think, the Elks' Club is...the membership is restricted to men, so that would be a discriminatory club."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Bowman: "Well yes, if that's the case."

Brummer: "And the Knights of Columbus, which, I think, is restricted both on the basis of religion and sex, would be a discriminatory club that exists, at least in Effingham and many other places."

Bowman: "Well the question, Representative Brummer, is how much a business either they do with the state or whether...I mean, I have no objection, for example, to someone joining the Rotary Club or the Elks' Club or so forth. But if they are doing so, they ought to do so with their own money if they are doing business with the state. That's all."

Brummer: "Okay, then what this would really...what this would mean, that if, for example, there was a business in Effingham with a road contractor, the majority of his business was with the State of Illinois, this Bill would prohibit that company from paying out of company treasury the dues of the...of a member of that business being a member of the Rotary Club, or Elks' Club, or K of C Club, or Knights of Columbus or Kiwanis."

Bowman: "That's exactly right."

Brummer: "Okay."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Piel: "For the purposes of clarification, Representative Bowman,
I notice it says, "conducting state business". That
concerns me a little bit. Let say that we've got two
state officeholders. Let's say that the Governor and the
Comptroller are out to lunch at a club. The state's not
picking up the cost of it, but they are talking about,
let's say, the budget, the income tax situation. They are
technically conducting state business by their
conversation. That would...I'd like your explanation on

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

that please."

Bowman: "Okay, Representative, I think you're looking at the Bill in its original form. As amended by Amendment #2, I don't believe the phrase 'state business' appears anywhere. There is a reference to meetings which are covered by the Open Meetings Act not being held at such facilities with specific exemptions for communities where maybe a public hearing is held at a church or something of that nature, fraternal association, the Elks' Club, for example."

Piel: "No, according to our analysis, as far as the Committee

Amendment #1, it also...it also forbids conducting state
business at a discriminatory club."

Bowman: "Representative..."

Piel: "What I am trying to do is get the gist of what conducting state business is according to your intent of the Bill."

Bowman: "Representative, look at the right Amendment. The Amendment #2 is the correct Amendment, not in Amendment #1. Amendment #...I direct your attention to Amendment #2 Section 3. It simply says 'no meeting', and meeting is defined as one covered by the Open Meetings Act, 'may be held at any private club that...or any discriminatory club; however, a meeting may be held at any private club that is a fraternal or religious organization...'. I think you're looking at the wrong Amendment."

Piel: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "The Gentleman yield for a question please?"

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mautino: "Mr. Bowman, would you please tell me if females are members of the Sangamo Club here in Springfield?"

Bowman: "At one time, they were not. I believe they are at the present time. I see some female members here nodding

49th Legislative Day

May 20. 1983

assent. They are members."

Mautino: "And they accept all races, I'm assuming."

Bowman: "I trust that is the case. I see some other members of various races nodding their heads in approval."

Mautino: "Otherwise, it would have been a very interesting situation, wouldn't it?"

Bowman: "Indeed it would have been, Representative Mautino. I'm glad that the Sangamo Club is a very progressive, farsighted, socially responsible club."

Speaker Yourell: "Bepresentative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would call the House's attention to page two of Amendment #3, which is the Bill, Section 4. And I would specifically ask Representative Cullerton to join with me in asking the Gentleman to take the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. What the Section says is, 'No official or employee may obligate the state to any discriminatory club.', and I believe we need the word 'knowingly' inserted in this Section."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."

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

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

Bowman: "Yes."

McGann: "My esteemed Chairman, in your presentation, you made reference to the Union League Club of Chicago."

Bowman: "Yes, I did."

McGann: "Do you feel as though that club is discriminate?"

Bowman: "Well, we called about their membership policies and got a rather vague answer, and I know that in the past that they have...they have been discriminatory. It was a big issue when they admitted 'Hannah Grey' and Jane Byrne to membership as honorary members. I do not believe that

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

they...Jane Byrne or 'Hannah Grey' were ever admitted as full-fledged members of the Union League Club. But to tell the truth, Representative, they were called and were vague with staff as to their membership policies."

McGann: "Well, on that, Representative Bowman. The ... you say the Union League Club was discriminative. It may have been many, many years ago. But I would say in the last, at least, seven to ten years, it has not. It has...it does have a policy of admitting women to the club as to my knowledge. Now in regards to honorary memberships, many clubs extend honorary memberships to certain officials of city and other agencies. And that is probably why the former Mayor Byrne was admitted as an honorary member. But I am sure if she applied as a regular, she would not. But I would like, if it's possible, to correct the record defense, Mr. Speaker, of the Union League Club of Chicago, that presently they are not discriminatory in their practices of admission. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous guestion."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman has moved the previous guestion.

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

The previous question is moved. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want the Membership to understand that this Bill does not prohibit private clubs from discriminating, although frankly, that would not trouble me to see such legislation. But really the intent of this legislation is to make it clear that the state does not, with its own financial resources, directly or indirectly, through people who do a significant amount of business with the state,

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

condone such practices and use such resources to support such practices. Now if people want to join those clubs, they should do so with their own money. If they want to visit such clubs and dine there, they should do so at their own expense. The...the public and the citizens of the State of Illinois should not be expected to support those practices, however, and that is the purpose of this legislation. And I move...now move passage of House Bill 872."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. A11 those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 60 voting voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 42 of the Calendar on the Order of Motions, subject matter - House Bill 1195. The Gentleman moves, pursuant to Rule 35(b), to take from the table and place on the Order of Second Reading First Legislative Day. This requires 71 votes. Mr. Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 74 and 35(b), I have a Motion to take House Bill 1195 from the table, because in this case, I don't believe the Committee system worked. It happens. It happens. These rules were set up, I believe, to correct cases like this one. Listen closely. House Bill 11...House Bill 1195 was put on the Speaker's table after failing to receive enough "yes' votes in two presentations to Committee during the last week we heard House Bills in Committee. On the Tuesday when it was first heard, the Bill needed nine votes from the 17 person Committee. And about 6:30 p.m., it received 8 votes in favor and 1 vote against. On Friday, the last day Bills

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

were heard. Committee Members again were on the run. The Bill was called and lost 8-4, none against and 2 *present*. The Bill addresses a problem existing in my area and in many of yours, which is that podiatrists unable to obtain hospital staff privileges, must transfer their patients 20 or 30 miles to find a hospital that will allow them staff privileges to do surgery. Specifically, not a single hospital in Kane County or in DuPage County up where I live, in Kane County, has a podiatrist on staff, and podiatrists practicing there must transfer their patients to or near Chicago to find a hospital again for surgery. This Bill simply directs that hospitals in Illinois give podiatrists the opportunity to obtain staff privileges subject to rules and regulations drafted locally by each hospital and its medical staff. Now the current situation is an impediment, pardon the pun, to podiatrists who have had eight or nine years of post high school education to obtain their license to practice podiatry. And the creates an unnecessary convenience for situation constituents who go to podiatrists for help, often through referral by a doctor realizing the need for a foot specialists for his patient. In my area and in many of yours, they simply can't have surgery at their local hospital. Again, I would say that the circumstances of the Committee overload in the last week we heard Eills caused the Committee system to not properly process this Bill. would add that because I did not try to circumvent the Committee process by seeking to discharge Committee after only one hearing, as you know, I need 71 rather than 60 votes today. And I request your 'yes' votes to take this Thank you." off the table.

Speaker Yourell: "The Chairman of the Human Services Committee,

Representative White."

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor is correct in that he did get...did receive two full hearings on House Bill 1195. He had witnesses, he had a number of witnesses to come before us. They all had a chance to argue in favor of the Bill. We did have enough Members to vote 'yes' or 'no' on that piece of legislation. Each time he came up one vote short, and I would resist any attempt at this time for this Bill to be taken from the table."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, on the Motion."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am
 a Member of that Committee, and I voted "yes" both times on
 the Bill, but I think that the Representative is incorrect.
 It had a very, very full hearing, and everybody had the
 opportunity to vote on it. And you just can't keep
 bringing Bills back like this."
- Speaker Yourell: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Topinka."
- Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee. As Spokesman for the Health Committee, it did have two full hearings. I concur with Representative White as to how it was conducted. They were busy times, and they were times when Representatives could not be in those hearings, because they had Eills in other Committees. Not only that, I find that the Eill, itself, is faulty. I would resist that it be brought from the table at this time."
- speaker Yourell: "There being no further discussion, the guestion is on the Motion to take from the table. It requires 71 votes. All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 42 'ayes', 47 'nos', and the

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Gentleman's Motion is lost. We have two Orders of Business to take care of, and then we're going to adjourn. We have a Death Resolution for a former Member and at this time, the Chair recognizes Representative Friedrich for an announcement."

Friedrich: "Immediately following adjournment, there will be a Republic Caucus in room 118 for 30 minutes, and if you'll be promptly there, we'll be away promptly. And I think this Death Resolution will be bandled by me, too."

Speaker Yourell: "Yes, Representative Friedrich on a Death Resolution. Oh."

Priedrich: "Former Member."

Speaker Yourell: "Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 252, Dwight Friedrich -Whereas, the hearts of every Member of this House is deeply learn of the recent death of a saddened to distinguished colleague, Edwin R. Eaaq. of Breese. Edwin B. Baaq served with and whereas. Illinois: considerable distinction in the Illinois House ο£ Representatives during the 66th through the 77th General Assemblies; whereas, Edwin R. Haag was born in Carlyle, Illinois on July 5, 1895 to Alex and Philomine Haag; and whereas, Edwin R. Haaq, who was educated in Carlyle schools and at Cornell University, was an elementary and secondary school teacher for nine years; whereas, Edwin R. Haag dutifully served his country as a 2nd lieutenant in United States Army Air Corps during World War I and during World War II was commissioned a Lieutenant in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1943 and rose to the rank of Commander by 1947: whereas, Edwin R. Haaq was a devoted husband, father, grandfather and great grandfather; and whereas, Edwin B. Haag was active in his community as a businessman, a member of the Knights of Columbus, the American Legion, the St.

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

Joseph's Men's Sodality and the St. Dominic's Catholic Church; and whereas, Edwin R. Haag will be long remembered by his former colleagues for his honesty, hard work and dedication to his constituents, family and friends. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we and all the Members of this House join the family, numerous friends and former constituents of Edwin R. Haag in mourning the death of Edwin R. Haag, a wonderful and dedicated human being whose full and meaningful life can inspire us all, and be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to his family."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Friedrich."

Priedrich: "I'm not sure there are any Members of this House that
were here when Ed Haag served here. I was in the Senate at
that time, and he was one of the three Representatives from
my district. He sat on the other side of the aisle, but I
certainly had all the respect in the world for him because
I worked with him on every project that involved our
district. He was a man who certainly reflected credit not
only on his district, but on the State of Illinois, and I
would like to have all Members join as Cosponsors of this
Besolution and move its adoption."

Speaker Yourell: "Leave. Mr. Clerk, do you have the Adjournment Resolution?"

Clerk Leone: "Adjournment Besolution."

Speaker Yourell: "Move the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The Amendment...the Resolution is adopted, and we are adjourned. Yes, just stand by a moment. The Clerk will read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 45, resolved by the Senate

49th Legislative Day

May 20, 1983

of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representative concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, May 20, 1983, they stand adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1983 at 12 o'clock noon."

Speaker Yourell: "All in favor will say "aye", opposed "no". The 'ayes' have it. We stand adjourned until noon on Monday, May 23rd. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Republicans report to room 118 promptly?"

. . 11/21/83 09:05

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

PAGE

1

MAY 20, 1983

	nat 20, 1703		
HB-0252	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
	THIRD READING	PAGE	7
	THIRD READING	PAGE	103
	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
	RECALLED THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	11 20
	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
	THIRD READING	PAGE	28
	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
HB-0690	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	128
	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	129 136
	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	142
	RECALLED	PAGE	142
	THIRD READING	PAGE	143
HB-0787	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
	THIRD READING	PAGE	146
HB-0817		PAGE	147
	THIRD READING	PAGE	157
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	160
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	35 172
	THIRD READING	PAGE	179
	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	179
HB-0845	THIRD READING	PAGE	181
	THIRD READING	PAGE	183
	THIRD READING	PAGE	184
	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
	THIRD READING RECALLED	PAGE PAGE	38 185
	THIRD READING	PAGE	185
	THIRD READING	PAGE	190
	THIRD READING	PAGE	50
HB-0924	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
	RECALLED	PAGE	55
	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	57 58
	THIRD READING	PAGE	59
	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
HB-1085	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
	THIRD READING	PAGE	66
	THIRD READING	PAGE	68
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	69 72
	THIRD READING	PAGE	76
	THIRD READING	PAGE	77
	THIRD READING	PAGE	78
нв -116 5	THIRD READING	PAGE	79
HB-1167		PAGE	87
HB-1170		PAGE	90
HB-1195		PAGE	198
НВ-1196 НВ-1196		PAGE PAGE	91 93
HB- 1201		PAGE	94
	THIRD READING	PAGE	95
	THIRD READING	PAGE	4

11/21/83 09:05

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

PAGE 2

MAY 20, 1983

HB-1213	THIRD READING	PAGE	95
HB- 1225	RECALLED	PAGE	97
HB- 1225	THIRD READING	PAGE	98
HB-1226	THIRD READING	PAGE	99
HB- 1230	THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-1231	THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-1235	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
HB-1245	THIRD READING	PAGE	102
HB-1249	THIRD READING	PAGE	114
HB-1261	THIRD READING	PAGE	119
HB-2023	RECALLED	PAGE	182
SB-0013	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0025	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0047	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0053	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0060	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0101	FIRST READING	PAGE	2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3
SB-0107	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0112	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0133	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0136	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0167	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HR-0252	ADOPTED	PAGE	201
HR-0278	ADOPTED	PAGE	87
HR-0278	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	80
HR-0279	ADOPTED	PAGE	87
HR-0279	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	81
HR-0280	ADOPTED	PAGE	87
HR-0280	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	81
SJR-0045	ADOPTED	PAGE	202

SUBJECT NATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JOE HARBOD	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE YOURELL IN CHAIR	PAGE	30
REPRESENTATIVE GREINAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	55
REPRESENTATIVE YOURELL IN CHAIR	PAGE	100
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	203
=======================================		