141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 10:00 having arrived, the House will be in Session. Members will be at their chairs. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Wayne Van Geldren, Jr., Pastor of Markette Manor Baptist Church of Downers Grove. Reverend Van Geldren is a guest of Representative Tom McCracken. Will the guests in the gallery please rise for the invocation. Reverend."
- Reverend Van Geldren: "Our heavenly Father, we thank You for another opportunity to ask Your blessing upon an Assembly such as this. We realize that all power comes from Thee. And Lord, we ask that You'll bless now in this Session. We thank You for these that have taken upon them the burden of the legislating of the needs of the people of this great state. I pray that You'll give them great wisdom today, and may You direct and bless in all that's done, and we'll give You the glory, in Jesus name. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Ropp will lead us in the pledge of the flag."
- 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 Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Clerk, take the 118 Members having answered to the quorum, and record. there is a quorum. We'll Stand at ease for a moment Mr. McCracken, would you push Mr. Winchester's speak button? No ... Will you push his 'aye' button now. will and his 'no', and his 'present', and his speak? you. Did you push his speak? Alright, his speak. Alright. His speak button is not operating, so he'll have to get my attention some other way. On page six of the Calendar the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 598, Ms.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1994

Braun-Out of the record. House Bill 1474. Mr. Steczo-Out of the record. House Bill 1563, Mr. McGann. Out of the record. House Bill 1658, Ms. Braun. Out of House Bill 2296. Mr. Hallock. Out of the record. House Bill 2369. Out of the record. House Bill 2381. Mr. Hannig, do you want to go with it that? Hannig. Out of the record. Hr .... On the Order of Concurrence, appears Senate Bill (sic - House Bill) 2395, Mr. Steczo. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House the record. Bill 2509, Mr. Levin. 2509. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2509, a Bill for an Act in relation to senior citizens and certain boards and commissions together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I was asked yesterday to take this Bill out of the record. I understand it's now okay to go with the Bill. would move that the House do concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2509. House Bill 2509 is the Bill we passed overwhelmingly several months ago, sponsored by the Speaker and myself and Representative Mulcahey and others. puts consumer seniors on various executive boards and commissions. Amendment #1 simply adds to the list of bodies covered, the Attorney General's Violent Crimes Advisory Commission. Amendment #1 also dealt with Health Facility Planning Board in terms of reducing the number on that Board. However, Amendment #2 which requested by the Medical Society, removes the Health Pacility Planning Board from the purview of this Bill totally. I would ask for concurrence in these two Senate Amendments. This is the Bill that many of us have received a substantial number of postcards from the senior citizens. It is the number one priority of virtually every

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- citizen group in the is state."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments #4 and 2 to House Bill 2509. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."
- Mays: "Now your Amendment #1 or the Senate Amendment #1 adds the Violent Crimes Advisory Commission to this omnibus Bill."
- Levin: "That is correct."
- Mays: "Are there any senior citizens on this Commission currently?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. The Gentleman from DuPage, the Minority Leader, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would request, if the Gentleman wouldn't mind, could be pull this out of the record. We have been reviewing this, and in the line of questions that Mr. Mays is pursuing, find out that there is a line in here referring to the Pension Laws Commission and a few other Commissions, that our position, of course, is to abolish them. And until we have an opportunity to study, we'd appreciate if the Gentleman could take it out of the record."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Levin, I'm sure, will be glad to accommodate you, Mr. Daniels. On page six of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2313, Ms. Karpiel. Is Ms. Karpiel in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, 2513."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2513, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Oh, out of the record. Alright. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2534. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

2542. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2556. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to proceed? Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2600, Mr. Bullock. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrences on page seven of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2605, Mr. Stuffle. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2706, Mr. Bowman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2706, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Housing Development Act together with Senate
Amendment #1."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 2706 is a mortgage insurance plan which passed the House with a very heavy margin, I think, it was over 100 votes. It got to the Senate, and all the Senate did to it was limit this to a multi-family program so as not to compete with existing private insurers in the market. I find... I have no problem with this Amendment, and so I urge the House to concur in Senate Amendment. #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2706.

And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Piel: "I notice the Senate Amendment changes this from six or more units to... as far as the insurance, mortgage insurance, state mortgage insurance, knocks out five or less units. Could you explain why you're knocking out five or less units as far as the state mortgage insurance, please?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Bowman: "Yes. Thank you. There are private companies such as MGIC who write mortgage insurance in the single family category, and single family sometimes, of course, includes duplexes and quadraplexes where there is occupier. So really what they're doing is limiting the Bi 11 so that don't compete with we existing insurers, and that was never the intention anyway. The gap in the market is really in the multi-family market anyway, and so this limitation doesn't ... this limitation doesn't undermine the purpose of the Bill, and at the same time, it doesn't have the state in competition with private enterprise."

Piel: "If a unit owner... let's say that a unit owner had two buildings next to each other, one with five and one with six units, one that would qualify for the state mortgage insurance and the other one he would have to go about, you know, on his own to get the insurance. Are we talking about the rates being lower with the state insurance?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, I heard everything except the very last sentence. What is.... What was the question again?"

Piel: "With the six unit building, wouldn't the rates be lower for the six unit building dealing with the state insurance?"

Bowman: "Well... It's a little hard to say at this stage of the game what the rates would be, but the point, Representative Piel, is that if one is going to draw a distinction between multi-family and single family, it's not obvious that you would necessarily draw it at the point of defining a single family as being one unit only, because there are owner occupiers of duplexes. triplexes and quadraplexes. However, once you get into the six flats and up, you tend to be dealing with a different market, the people who are investors who are not owner occupiers, and that's really

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

the reason for that particular distinction in drawing the line between five and six. You find that the market is separated at approximately that point between owner occupiers and absentee investors, and that's really the line we're trying to draw, the distinction we're trying to make."

Piel: "So basically, what we're talking about is the bigger communities, let's say you know like maybe Springfield, or Chicago or something like that, where the majority of units are six or more units. It would be helping the investors in that area to where your smaller town, let's say 25,000 where they'd have three or four units, you'll only be hurting them a little bit. Right?"

Bowman: "Well this is primarily a Bill to... Well, I think you'll find that most of the multi-family units are in villages and towns and cities as opposed to, you know, rural areas, surely. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, why don't I go over and have a little discussion with Mr. Piel privately and maybe I can take care of some of these questions. So let me take this out of record."

Piel: "There is no need for that. I have no further questions." Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2706? And on that, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who is now open. wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, record. On this Bill, there are 104 voting 'ave', 4 voting 2 voting \*present\*. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2706, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich in the chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill ... On the Order of Concurrence,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

page seven of your Calendar, appears House Bill 2732. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman. The Gentleman from Cook."

- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my intention to ask that
  we concur in Senate Amendments 1... I mean, sorry, Senate
  Amendments 2 and 4, and that we nonconcur in Senate
  Amendment 5. Senate Amendment 2 and 4 adds in... redoes
  the Bill essentially adding the various civic centers that
  have been added in the House and deals with DuPage
  Metropolitan Authority with respect to their civic center.
  Amendment 5, however, relates to the formula for funding
  and that will certainly have to developed in another time
  and another Bill and another arena. Accordingly, I would
  ask that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 4."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 4 to House Bill 2732. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. Proceed."
- Piel: "Representative Greiman, on Senate Amendment \$2, could you tell me what the approximate fiscal impact would be on that Amendment?"
- Greiman: "There is no additional funds of the state, so it has no fiscal impact. The funds are established by a present funding sources, therefore, which there is already a system of funding, and these groups would share in that funding if they get picked, if they get selected by the moving hand once they will share in it, but it will increase any appropriation. So there is no fiscal impact."
- Piel: "No, I said, what was the potential fiscal impact of this?"
  Greiman: "Zero."
- Piel: "Now, it's a funny thing, because our analysis shows that

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

it contains a potential fiscal impact in the excess of \$83,000,000."

Greiman: "Well you're probably looking... First place, you're looking, I assume at maybe Senate Amendment 5, but..."

Piel: "No, it's on #2. This is on #2."

Greiman: "No. The funds are already made available. It doesn't increase the funding. It doesn't increase the funding."

Piel: "Now what you're saying is that this doesn't have a potential impact of \$83,000,000. There is no potential impact whatsoever."

Greiman: "That's right. This, by itself, has no potential impact."

Piel: "It does increase the cap. Correct?"

Greiman: "Pardon me?"

Piel: "It does increase the cap. Correct? It was in #5."

Greiman: "It does not. It does not increase that, no."

Piel: "That was in #5. Right? We're not referring with #5."

Greiman: "Right, Which I'm moving to nonconcur in."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Natijevich: "Is there any further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments 2 and 4 to House Bill 2732? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. to these Amendments, this is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 79 'ayes'. Representative Hallock \*no\*. Hallock 'no'. 79 'ayes', 27 'nays', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 4 to House Bill 2732. And now Representative Greiman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 2732. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the House does nonconcur to House Bill 27... Senate Amendment 5 to House Bill 2732. House Bill... Be at ease for a moment.

- 141st Legislative Day

  Representative Greiman in the chair."
- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of House Bills Concurrence, House Bill 2787, Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike, 2787. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2787, is an Act to create the State
  Migratory Waterfowl Stamp Fund and to create the State Duck
  Stamp Committee concurring in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2787. The Amendment requires that interest that accrues in the wildlife and Fish Fund, the Salmon Fund, the State Waterfowl Stamp Fund... doesn't go to the General Revenue Fund. I think it's a noncontroversial Amendment. I move to concur."
- Speaker Greiman: "... Madison having moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill 2787. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment... Yes. Ms. Pullen. I'm sorry. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. The Gentleman will yield for a question. Mr. McPike."
- Pullen: "Is the underlying Bill still in this Bill, and if so, would you please explain it?"
- McPike: "Yeah, the underlying Bill that's in here, it was not controversial when it came to the House. It deals with the right of duck hunters to have the Advisory Commission that meets with the Department of Conservation to decide how money from the Duck Stamp Fund will be used. The Department of Conservation is in agreement with the Bill, and I know of no groups that opposed it."

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Pullen: "You said it deals with the right of them to have a Commission. Does it create that Commission?"

McPike: "It's an Advisory Body within the Department."

Pullen: "And it creates that Advisory Body within the Department.

Is that right?"

McPike: "No. That Advisory Body exists today. It clarifies...

It clarifies what role that Advisory Body plays. It gives
all final decisions, it leaves all final decisions to use
this money with the Director of the Department of
Conservation."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2787. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 104 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2787, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, t vo announcements. Two announcements. Representative Slape is the ... this morning at 1:06 a.m. became the father of an 8 pound, 7 ounce girl. And we extend to you our congratulations. And, secondly, in order to allow the appropriation's staff to work on the final appropriations which are now in the House ready passage, the House will stand in recess until the hour The Hour of 1:00 having arrived, the House will now be in Session. Members will be in their seats. And those not having access to the floor should please remove We're on page themselves. We are on... seven of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence, and on that Order,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

appears House Bill 2804, Br. Ronan. Mr. Ronan, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act relating to
the property of state institutions of higher learning

together with Senate Amendment #1."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804. Similar to a Bill I passed out during the early part of the Session. What it deals with is putting the provisions dealing with conflict of interests applicable to the Illinois Development Finance Authority and the Illinois Housing Development Authority in compliance with our state statutes. I move for concur."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Piel: "Couple of questions, Representative Ronan. First of all,
this is similar to which Bill? What Bill that passed out
you said was similar to a Bill that passed out of here
before?"

Ronan: "Representative Piel, I don't even remember the number, but it was... I passed this Bill out dealing with the Illinois Development Finance Authority and their statute of conflict of interests about a month ago. I don't remember what the number was. What happened, the Bill went to the Senate and the Illinois Development Finance Authority forgot to get a Senate Sponsor, so the Bill died on the Senate Calendar."

Piel: "Okay. So we're talk... It was dealing with direct and indirect interest. Is that correct?"

Ronan: "Correct."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Piel: "Could you explain what the Senate Amendment as far as direct and indirect interest? Did it delete it all and became the Bill? So---"

Ronan: "What the Senate Amendment did was the same thing that the Bill I sent out of here a month ago did. Basically what it does is it puts the conflict of interests statute on these two projects somewhere to the conflict of interests statute on all other agencies under the jarisdiction of the Governor. What we've got is that individual who do work with the Illinois Development Finance Authority and Illinois Housing Development Authority are possibly found in conflict of interest when they represent a law firm or a body that is only... that owns less than seven and percent of the stock dealing with the business that is involved. This puts this in conformance with other state agencies."

Piel: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 280424 Bill And on that, 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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting \*aye\*, 2 voting House does concur in Senate voting 'present', and the Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804. and that Bill. received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2805. Mr. Homer. Out of the record. Mr. Homer, are you prepared, Sir, to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2805, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Retailers' Occupation Tax Act together with Senate

Amendments #1 and 2."

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and Mr. I perhaps should briefly explain Amendments. The first Amendment modifies a provision added by Representative Ewing when the Bill was in the House, having to do with a minor's right to sign evaluation agreement for inheritance tax purposes and the right of the parent to execute an agreement or enter into an agreement behalf of the minor child without court approval. second Amendment is the rolling stock Amendment which provides a sales tax exemption for rolling stock. Rolling stock is like a train car or a truck that is purchased the State of Illinois, where that train car or truck is used in interstate travel or where the goods aboard that rolling stock are destined for interstate travel, and it is recommended by the Illinois Taxpayer Federation. I would ask your approval of both Amendments by concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Pulton moves for the... for the concurrence... moves that the House concur in Amendment... Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2905.

On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Piel: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Piel: "Our analysis shows that this is deleting a language that
we added in House Amendment #1. First question, could you
explain to us what they deleted in House Amendment #1?"

Homer: "Is Representative Ewing on the floor?"

Piel: "...I can't hear you."

Homer: "Alright. Representative Piel, this actually...

Bepresentative Ewing had a Bill... had the Amendment to the

House Bill when it was in the House. The Senate Amendment

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

#1 merely provides modifications of that original Amendment, and very sincerely if Representative Ewing was here, I would yield to him to give you further explanation. I did speak with him and now that he's entered the chamber, perhaps he would bail me out here. I did speak with him, and he indicated his concurrence with the revisions that were made. But Representative Ewing, I would yield to you, Sir, to explain to Representative Piel what changes the Senate made in 2805, Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ewing to respond to Mr. Piel."

Ewing: "The Amendment that was put on in the Senate is similar to another Amendment. It's identical to an Amendment approved by this House. All we did in the Senate Amendment was change the wording to something that we thought was more satisfactory than when it went out of the House."

Piel: "Okay. Could you explain either one of you, I'm not sure which one wants to handle it, the... where it has references in dealing with parents and the interest as far as the child and possible parents or quardian?"

Ewing: "Representative, this Amendment is intended to show Internal Revenue Service that Illinois law, for purposes of special use valuation for small business and farms, allows a parent to sign the election and the agreement which part of the estate tax process electing to take the special used valuation. allows a parent to sign for a minor child in instances where the parent's and the child's interest are not adverse to each other. This is something that is approved by the Illinois Bar Association. It's approved by a number of people in Illinois who have dealt with this type of taxation in this election, and it merely shows that parent has a right to sign for the minor child without the the necessity of going through a full guardianship procedure. "

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

"Thank you very much. No further questions, Mr. Speaker." Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2805?\* And on that, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? ar. Clerk. take record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2805, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2827. Mr. Levin, are you prepared for that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2927, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code, the Criminal Code, the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act and the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act together with Senate Amendments \$1, 2 and 3."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mr. House. I move that we do concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2827. This is the parental snatching Bill that flew out of this House as it did out of the Senate. Amendment #1 simply removes a reference to the Department of Children and Family Services being required under the scheme of this legislation to notify out of state parents where there is a filing to change an out of state They did not want to be, the agency, carrying out that responsibility. So Amendment #1 removes the reference to them. Amendment #2 makes a series αf technical changes tightening up on the language in the Bill. It makes no substantive changes. It defines several terms, including the words detain, lawful custodian and

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

cleans up some technical problems that were discovered in the Bill. Amendment #3 adds to this Bill the text of House Bill 3199 that was Sponsored by, in the House, by Representative Kirkland and which did not get out of the Senate Rules. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for... that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2827. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Levin, let me direct your attention to Senate Amendment #1 offered by Senator Lemke and Geo-Karis.

Could you describe once again what that Amendment does for the...? It was... Apparently, it was requested on behalf of the Department of Children and Family Services."

Levin: "That's correct. The Bill provides that when there is a filing to modify an out of state judgment for custody, that the court would be required to go to the registry of out of state judgments to see if, you know, any out of state parents have indicated that their children have been absconded. And if the court, in fact, finds that there is a parent, an out of state parent who is interested in the case, the Bill provides, as we sent it over, that the court is to advise the Department of Children and Family Services to attempt to contact that out of state parent. DCFS did not want to be involved in that process."

Cullerton: "But the way you wrote the Bill, you had them involved in the process. Bight?"

Levin: "That's correct. And so ... "

Cullerton: "Why you caving in to the Department of Children and Family Services?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Levin: "Well... in discussions with them, we felt that they were correct that this was not appropriately their role, and that..."

Cullerton: "Why not?"

Levin: "Pardon me?"

Cullerton: "Why not?"

Levin: "That their role is to... You know, their role is, I think, is to take care of children. This a... basically an administerial act, and one that could be performed by the clerk of the court as opposed to by the state agency with the respect to a child that they don't have any custody on.

Now we continue to provide other roles for DCFS in this Bill, at least one other role."

Cullerton: "Alright. Let me direct your attention on Amendment,

Senate Amendment #3. An did you indicate that this was a

subject matter of a Bill, a House Bill was it?"

Levin: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Who sponsored the House Bill?"

Levin: "Representative Kirkland."

Cullerton: "Representative Kirkland. And then, the Bill was killed in the Senate Rules Committee."

Levin: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And what was... Do you have any idea what the vote was on the Bill in the House? Unanimous? 87 votes something like that? Okay. And what does that do, Representative Levin?"

Levin: "Okay. This Amendment was requested by I believe it was the presiding judges of the divorce division in Cook County. The... Let me... Can I yield to Representative Kirkland who is more familiar with this than I am?"

Cullerton: "Sure, it'd be nice to here from him."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Who was it requested by? It was an idea that came out

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

of my law office and simply to clarify the no fault provision... the no fault provision to..."

Levin: "I have a letter from Judge \*Jazak\*.."

Kirkland: "I know you do. Great."

Cullerton: "And he concurs with your law office apparently."

Kirkland: "It's simply to clarify that the separation provisions for six months and two years would include the time that parties are separated prior to the date the law goes into effect on July 1."

Cullerton: "Okay. Alright. Thank you. I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox,
Mr. Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative, in Senate Amendment #2, our analysis talks about the clarification of an affirmative defense to include possession of a child under order of visitation. If there is any order of visitation is it affirmative defense to the charge despite the fact that the visitation may be for a weekend and the child may have then been taken out of state or not returned?"

Levin: "If an affirmative defense of visita... If there is an order of visitation, if it goes... If you recall, the underline Bill provides that if the child is held more than 72 hours beyond the visitation, then, you know, that is a problem."

Hawkinson: "What does this Amendment do as to the affirmative defense?"

Levin: "I don't see our staff person right now. Let me take it out of the record and find the staff person."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Levin, do you want this out of the record or do you want to wait a second while your staff person confers with you?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Levin: "Let's take it out of the record for a moment until I can find the staff person."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, then this will... 2827 will be out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2853, Mr. Olson. 2853. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2853, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2853, which is the Bill that Representative Yourell and I were originally Cosponsors on. I move to leave Sponsor since Representative Yourell has Assembly. Basically, the original provision of the Bill provided means ο£ establishing nomination requirements in those areas of the state and municipalities where we couldn't use the statewide election to support a sufficient number of votes. That is the original part of the Rill-Senate Amendment #1 provides that a duly registered committeeman may register anybody in the county which they live as well as the challenge voters. is not applicable to Cook County or the places with of election commissioners. We also changed the name technically from a committeeman to a committee person. Amendment #2 added a definition of the word 'list' to the Election Code that defines the list as registered voter list include computer tapes or disks or ma v electronic data processing information which contains this information. Also, clarified the election authority may charge a fee to reimburse the actual cost of duplicating lists for anyone who selects them, and also, we make some grammatical and clarifying change in provisions ballot applications. I would move to concur in Senate

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2853."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2853. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Olson, the last time we heard you numble something through, and we were talking about selling a hole in the ground for a dollar. That was last night."

Olson: "I don't recall that."

Cullerton: "I once again become suspicious, not because of the merits of the Amendments, but rather the tone, a voice which you're using. Now I did have a question about Senate #2. As I understand it right now, the county clerks are required to prepare certain information and after each primary ... and give that to the county chairman. And as I understand current law, they can charge to be reimbursed for the actual cost of preparing this data. And as I understand the Amendment, this limits the amount that be charged to the ... to simply the cost of duplicating the data so that the counties in effect can charge less money and therefore, may have to spend more money in time and in work without being reimbursed. Is that what the Amendment does?"

Olson: "Originally, Representative McGann's Bill, 3134, provided specific dollars relative to duplication of lists. Stanley Kusper, a name that may be known to you, the County Clerk of Cook County, actually felt that would not be satisfactory. He had prepared to have a program, whereby the actual cost of reimbursement necessary to prepare the polling list would be made available, and that is what Senate Amendment #2 addresses."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Cullerton: "Well, Representative McGann's Bill was broader because that dealt with other... all political action committees obtaining information as I recall. I think so."
- Olson: "I don't..."
- Cullerton: "But the... The question I have is why are we limiting it in the first place? What is the need for this Amendment? I know it's not your Amendment, but you're trying to concur."
- Olson: "No. The alleged need for the Amendment is to do away from this specific, this specific amount that was included in the Bill which was hung up in the Senate, 3134, a Bill that was agreed to by both the Democratic and Republican side here when Representative McGann's Bill passed out. They preferred to have this language, and I think that came from the County Clerk of Cook County."
- Cullerton: "Well I really think that you're confusing two issues from what I've been told from my staff. This Amendment has nothing to do with 3134. It's a different issue altogether, and I'm willing to be convinced of its need, but I just don't understand it. Why don't you candidly tell me if you really had your druthers, wouldn't you like to not have this Amendment on the Bill?"
- Olson: "I have no quarrel with the Amendment because it's an agreed Amendment between Republican and Democratic staffs in the House as to concurrence. You might speak to the Chairman of the Elections Committee, Representative Nash."
- Cullerton: "If I can have just one second, Mr. Speaker. Maybe someone else would like to ask a question."
- Speaker Greiman: "No one else is seeking recognition, but we'll certainly wait for a while, Mr. Cullerton. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Wolf: "Representative Olson, since Amendment #2 restricts the amount that the county clerks can charge as has been indicated by Representative Cullerton, does this, in fact, makes this Bill subject to the State Mandates Act?"

Olson: "I don't believe it makes it subject to the State Mandates
Act, Sam."

Wolf: "What position do or does the County Clerks' Association have on this particular Amendment, or do you know?"

Olson: "The county clerks of whom I have a good relationship with have had no objection to this Amendment. I think they might have been supportive of the one that originally came over in 3134."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the only reason why I raised the question is it appears that a county which is now being reimbursed for the cost of actually putting together some data, not just the duplication cost, but the cost in hours, is now being reimbursed. The counties are being presumably by political parties, and reimbursed practice apparently will be limited now only to the cost of There are some implication that the the duplications. counties then may lose some money, and I don't know much it's going to be. I don't know if it's enough to even have the State Mandates Act apply, but I just thought I'd mentioned it, and that's the reason why I raised the question."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Are there any other questions? I would speak to the Bill if there are no other questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. And this would be to close, Mr. Olson."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Cullerton and Wolf raised a good question. We hope we satisfactorily answered it. There is no skulduggery on the parts and staffs on either sides of the aisle relative to this issue. We might have had a better vehicle if the original Bill that got to the Senate was adopted, but I have had close contact with the County Clerks' Association. We've had no concerns expressed by them relative to this issue, and I would move to concur in Senates Amendments 1 and 2. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2853? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final passage... final action. all voted who wish? Have all voted who McAuliffe 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Bill, there are... On this question, there are 113 voting 'ave', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2853, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional is hereby declared passed. Mr. Matijevich, on a Majority, matter of personal privilege."

- Hatijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege, and it really is a privilege. Forty-seven years ago, yesterday, Coach Joe Lucco, who's right up there at the podium, and his wife were married, and I offer my congratulations to Coach Lucco. We all congratulate him. Very good, Joe. You were wondering what you were doing up there, I know."
- Joe Lucco: "I've seen a lot of deals on this floor, but the one you and Greiman just pulled on me tops them all. Thank you very, very much. Marina, I know, would appreciate it."
- Speaker Greiman: "We'll now return to a couple of Bills that we

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

passed over. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2740. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2740, a Bill for an Act to amend the County Home Act together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2740. This Bill needs some work, and that's the only way you get it done."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2740. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments \$1, 2 and 3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments \$1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2740. On the Order of Concurrence, on page six of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1474. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1474, a Bill for an Act to amend the

  Illinois Income Tax Act together with Senate Amendment \$1."

  Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to 1474. Originally, this Bill dealt with the issue of unitary taxation. The Senate amended it deleted everything after the enacting clause and established a new and expanded enterprise zone property tax abatement policy. The tax abatement policy is something that we're in of. We agree with the concept of the Amendment. they amended the wrong Section of the Revenue Act. would like to take this Bill back to Conference Committee in order to put it in the right Section and not deal with

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- the enterprise zone area at all. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I renew my Motion to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1474. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1474.

  On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2827. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2827, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code, the Criminal Code, the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act and Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act together with Senate Amendments \$1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I think I've been able to clear up the question Representative Hawkinson has in his point. If there are no more questions, I would renew my Motion to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2727 (sic House Bill 2827). And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor has indeed cleared up my question. However, I believe we have the wrong number on the board."
- Speaker Greiman: "2827. 2827. Okay. Purther discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2827?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'... by voting 'aye',

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Yes, Mr. Brummer. Mr. Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Well, not to explain my vote. Are we voting to concur?

It says nonconcurrence on the board."

Speaker Greiman: "We're voting to concur. To concur."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting "aye", 3 voting "no", none voting "present", and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2827, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2856, Mr. Winchester. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2856, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Downstate Public Transportation Act together with Senate

Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2856. The Amendment in the Senate was requested by the State Treasurer, and it just provides that the Treasurer shall discontinue the monthly transfers into the Downstate Public Transportation Fund after the amount transferred is equal to or in excess of the annual appropriation from that Fund for that year. It's a noncontroversial Amendment, and I would ask for a favorable roll call vote on concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Hardin moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2856. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

141st Legislative Day June 27, 1384

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Winchester, this Bill deals with the Downstate Public Transportation Fund?"

Winchester: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And it transfers money from the General Revenue Fund... or it says that money that's transferred from the General Revenue Fund would stop once the fund has reached the size of this particular year's appropriation. Is that accurate?"

Winchester: "That's it. Yes."

Cullerton: "Alright. What would the fiscal impact of this be?

In other words... Maybe, I don't... Maybe, I just need you to explain..."

Winchester: "It says here ... "

Cullerton: "Maybe, you just explain what happens with the General Revenue Fund and the Downstate Public Transportation."

Winchester: "Okay. Let me read this little paragraph, here,
Bepresentative. The amount projected be transferred to the
Downstate Public Transportation Fund during Fiscal Year '85
is about \$19,000,000. The appropriation request for
assistance to the participants during the fiscal year is
slightly more than 10.6 million. Therefore, nearly 8.5
million is expected to be transferred but not needed, but
also not available for expenditures elsewhere. This gives
the Treasurer's Office the authorization not to transfer it
if it's more than what should be in that particular fund."

Cullerton: "Does it have the effect of giving the Downstate

Public Transportation Fund more money?"

Winchester: "No, it certainly does not. The Downstate

Transportation Fund is allotted a certain amount. Under

present conditions, more money can be put into that fund

than what they're really allocated by law to spend. This

gives the Treasurer's Office the legal right to take that

141st Legislative Day

Bill."

June 27, 1984

money back out."

Cullerton: "Fine. I just thought, perhaps, we might have another opportunity to help out the downstaters in a special way." Winchester: "Downstate Legislators don't. We play by the book. We don't... We just don't do anything other than by the book."

Cullerton: "Right. Okay. Thank you very much, Representative." Speaker Greiman: "Further ... There will be no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2856? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to ... Alexander 'aye'. On this question, there Ms. Alexander. are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2856, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2857. Mr. Clerk, read the

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2857, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Originally, House Bill 2857 returned the jurisdiction for special elections at town meetings, to the township clerk rather than the county clerk. That Bill passed this House a 107.... 105 to nothing. In the Senate, an Amendment was put on that would require publishing of notices in local newspapers. This was put on at the request of the Press Association, and I would ask that we would concur in the Senate Amendment."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2857.

On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Well, I wouldn't want to yield either if I had to carry this Amendment that... put on by Representative...

Senator Grotberg. Senator Grotberg is going to go to Congress I understand."

McMaster: "Hopefully, I think the people of his district would be well served if he did, John."

Cullerton: "If he defeats the Democratic candidate."

McMaster: "Is there one?"

Cullerton: "Yes, there is. Current law requires a publication of a budget in a newspaper in circulation in a municipality.

This Amendment would require publication in a newspaper published in a municipality or if none in the county. Now what is this Amendment really doing?"

McMaster: "Well, I think last year we passed legislation that would allow notices of such as this to be published in supplement. And this is required to be published in a newspaper that is published within the local area of the county."

- Cullerton: "This Amendment will undoubtedly take some business away from some newspaper and give it to another."
- McMaster: "I think the newspapers that would take it away from would be... Well, I don't know quite how to explain it.

  I would say the suburban newspapers, John."
- Cullerton: "We're taking some business away from one newspaper and we're giving it to another. I just want to know who we're doing it to, and who we're doing it for."

McMaster: "I can't give you names, facts and figures on that,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

John."

Cullerton: "Maybe we can do it in the Conference Committee."

"Well, I don't think this is worthy of a Conference McMaster: Committee to tell you the truth, John."

"Maybe it's worthy of being receded from."

McMaster: "I question that too. This is... The Press Association seems to attach a great deal more importance to it than I do. "

Cullerton: "The Press Association is in favor of this Amendment."

McMaster: "Yes. Did you want to do battle with them. John?"

Cullerton: "I already have on the issue of trying to take away their jury duty exemptions. Could you just explain it more time? It's going to take away some business from some newspaper. Why are we doing it?"

McMaster: "At the request of the Press Association ... "

Cullerton: "What is ... What is ... "

McMaster: "... We are saying that a law which passed last year permitting these notices to be published in the supplements of newspapers would now require publishing of these notices in local newspaper, which can be interpreted to mean a newspaper printed within the county. For instance, in our downstate counties, John, we don't have a newspaper in every city. published So we go to consider a local newspaper, one that is published within the county. understand it? We're downstaters, John - we're not the big city people."

Cullerton: "Right. Okay. Well, thank you for answering questions. I'm not really sure why we're doing it still, but it just looks suspicious to me."

McMaster: "It's a good idea. Well, John."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

"Indicates he'll yield for a question." Speaker Greiman:

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, does this have anything to do with assessment notices? It says, legal notices. What kind of legal notices?"

McMaster: "Well, let's see if I can find all the legal notices that it lists."

Hastert: "I can't hear you, Sir. Tom, I can't hear you."

McMaster: "Yes, I understand. I'm trying to find a list of these notices."

Hastert: "I'll wait."

McMaster: "I guess I don't really have it. Wait a minute, it might be in the gray book. Alright. Are you ready?"

Hastert: "Ready."

McMaster: "Amends the Illinois Municipal Budget Law, the Notices Act, the Custodians of Money Law, the Truth in Taxation Act, the School Code, the Township Law of 1874 and the Township Waterworks and Sewage Systems Acts. Reverses the provision of Public Act 83 - 721 relating to publication of notice and newspaper supplements. Does this answer your question?"

Hastert: "I think so, what I'm concerned about in legal notices.

Last year, we passed a great deal of legislation out of here that did give some notice provision, but also give mail legal notices on changing of assessments on that type of... those types of issues. I think what this, and correct me if I'm wrong, Representative, but I think what this does is just say that instead of supplements to newspapers, they have to print them in the proper papers themselves. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "That's my understanding of it."

Hastert: "So it doesn't reduce at all the obligation of a township or a county or a school district or a taxing body or the assessors themselves, such as Board of Review or the supervisor assessors, to publish legal notices. Is that...

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

That is not your intent, is that correct?"

McMaster: "That certainly is not my intent to do away with any information that should be made available to the public by means of newspaper notices."

Hastert: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Nr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Brummer: "I'm looking at the language, specifically, in the Amendment regarding the change in provisions concerning publication, and it appears that in almost every instance, if not every instance, you delete the requirement that that be published in the... that be printed in the English language. Does this mean that it may be printed in Swedish or German or Spanish and does not need to be printed in the English language?"

McMaster: "I question that, Rich. I don't know where you're seeing that language, but..."

Brummer: "Well, do you have the Amendment in front of you?"

McMaster: "No, I do not."

Brummer: "Well, if you get the Amendment so that we can address this issue, specifically, on page three at the top on line four, the existing law says that it'll be printed in the English language. That language is all stricken. Then if you look on page four on line 16 and 17, the current law says it'll be printed in the English language, and that language is stricken. That English language is stricken in there. This Bill is printed in English by the way."

McMaster: "I'm getting the Amendment."

Brummer: "And I... There are several places in going through this... The next place is on page seven. On line 27, the current law says that it shall be published in a newspaper printed in the English language, and the language, the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

words printed in the English language is stricken on line 27 on page seven. Yes, I'm wondering why you're eliminating the requirement that this be printed in the English language."

- McMaster: "I just now found the Amendment, Rich, and I am with you. I don't really understand why they're striking the English language. I see no reason to publish it in Swedish although I am half Swedish, Rich."
- Brummer: "Well, I don't... It seems to me that if we're going to specify a printing and publication provision that is reasonable in the State of Illinois, to require that it be printed in English, and I guess it concerns me somewhat if we're going to still have the publication requirement, but remove the requirement that it be printed in English. There is at least an implication that somehow we can print it in any language I suppose. Not many people in my district would understand a legal publication printed in Russian, and if it has any significance, I would suggest that the publication..."
- McMaster: "I didn't know you had a Russian language newspaper down there, Rich."
- Brummer: "Well, I'm not sure if we do, but if we do have some newspaper printed in a different language, most of the constituents in my district, and I suggest many districts, would not understand it. We do have, of course, some requirements, some statutory requirements in some areas that certain notices be printed in two languages, one in English and one in Spanish, but this does not even say that it shall be printed in two language is English and Spanish, but it simply eliminates the requirement that it be printed in English and I'm wondering why."
- McMaster: "Rich, would you please look on page four of the Amendment, beginning on line 19."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

McMaster: "Let me finish."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I'm sorry. Proceed, Sir."

McMaster: "Have you read that, Rich?"

Brummer: "Yes. That's the only place in the entire Bill that it refers to the English language. There were about four other places that I pointed out for other publication type things that it eliminates the requirement that it be in the English language."

McMaster: "Well, I would imagine that this is cleaning up the statutes a little bit, rather than scattering it all over.

If you'll put it in one place, I'm sure it affects the whole Act."

Brummer: "Well, in fact, the language striking it on page four amends Chapter 85. The notice that you referred to is in Chapter 102, which is a different notice requirement, that particular notice requirement leaves in the English language. The other requirements, for example. the requirement on page five of the Bill amends the Revenue Code, Chapter 120, there it eliminates the English language requirement. The only place that leaves it in Chapter 102. It eliminates in Chapter 85. It eliminates it in Chapter 120, and my only question, maybe that's a good idea, but I wonder why. In fact, it eliminates it in Chapter 139 that it be printed in English language on page seven. I simply want to know why we're eliminating the English language requirement."

McMaster: "Well, I certainly can't answer that question, Rich."

Brummer: "What was the answer?"

McMaster: "I couldn't answer you."

Brummer: "Well, why don't we..."

McMaster: "Do you want to take it out of the record, Rich, or do you want to nonconcur or what do you want to do?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Brummer: "Well, let's take it out of the record right now until

we clarify that at least. Maybe there is a valid reason

for eliminating the English language requirement, but I...

And if there is, maybe we ought concur. Why don't we take

it out of the record at the moment."

McMaster: "Let's take it out of the record for a while."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. 2857 will be out of the record. On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 5871 (sic -2871). Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2871, amends the Code of Civil

Procedures together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. The original Bill, 2871, provides... forcible entering detainer statute: provides that written notice required as a precondition of any possession not be invalidated by the payment of past rent due unless all of the rent demanded is collected within the notice period. However, the landlord may agree in writing to continue to lease upon partial payment and the notice must give the tenant this information. There Amendment in the House on that that clarified a between interest rates on judgment, two statutes, one said 9% and one said eight, and this clarifies that 9% correct amount. An Amendment added in the Senate has to do premises liability and eliminates the existing common law distinctions between the duty of care owned by an owner or occupier of property to invitees and licensees. Nov under common law entrances upon property are divided into classes, trespassers. licensees and invitees. Trespassers would not be affected by this Bill, the duty of care owed to them, nor the duty of care owed to people coming on property for recreational use which is covered

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

under another statute. However, this would change... in effect, the duty owed to a licensee to make it similar to change the duty owed to an invitee which is reasonable care under the circumstances. This Bill has passed out of the House in years passed, and this year as an Amendment. Last year it passed out a 109 to nothing. This year as an Amendment in the Senate. It passed 56... 56 to nothing. It's also a recommendation. The Illinois Supreme Court has recommended that the Legislature look at this issue."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane moves that the Hause concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2871. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2871? those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Voting is now open. This is final action. Representative Currie, the other way. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Nr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye'. voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2871, and this Bill. received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears Senate Bill 28... appears House Bill 2876. Nr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2876, amends an Act relating to levying or imposing taxes together with Senate Amendment #1."

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

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

Bill #1 to House Bill 2876 is improperly drafted, and I

move to nonconcur so that we can correct that, please."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2876.

There being no discussion, the question is, \*Shall the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2876? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2876. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2887. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2887, amends an Act to revise the law in relationship to recorders together with Senate Amendment #2."

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

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

I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill
2887. Senate Amendment #2 puts a cap on the fee to be
charged until January 1, 1990."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, House do concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2887. There being no discussion, the question is, Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2887? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Voting is now open. This is final action. vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting present. House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 (sic -Senate Amendment #2) to House Bill 2887. and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2896. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2896, amends the Illinois Insurance Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

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

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2896 originally reauthorized credit

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

provide group life insurance to its members and unions to clarified some provisions regarding unemployed workers exercising conversion options. Over in the Senate, Senate Amendment #1 was placed on a Bill which did three things. First, required reporting by companies that exhibit rapid growth patterns in their accident and health writings they relate to their surplus account so that the Department could assist them in preventing insolvencies. Secondly, it clarified some language to conform to a 1980 model law by including a couple of items that were inadvertently left out last year when the Bill went through. And third, it eliminated the requirement that uninsured motorist property damage coverage much be included in all new motor vehicle policies which do not include collision insurance, and it substitutes a requirement that it be made available. are basically some clearance items in the Insurance Code. I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake moves the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2896. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I'm only concerned to ask some questions regarding provision #3 if Senate Amendment #1 having to do with uninsured motorist damage coverage. Can you go over each one of those points in a little more detail so that I understand them? I'm not sure I understand what that... what that subprovision did."

Churchill: "In provision #3?"

Johnson: "Yes."

Churchill: "Apparently, from what I understand, originally, the
Assembly passed a Bill which was House Bill 1707, which
mandated uninsured motorist property damage coverage on all
automobile liability policies. There was a lawsuit that

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

was filed in Cook County by three insureds, an automobile insurance company and an insurance brokerage firm, pointed out several defects in the law. A Circuit Court Judge. Richard Currie, has entered an injunction in that case staying the implementation of House Bill 1707 until the Legislature can act to clarify and correct these problems. This Amendment, apparently, is meant to correct those problems so that the stay may be lifted. It provides for an optional choice rather than a mandated coverage. Ιt increases the limitations from \$5,000 to \$10,000 for the limitation, and it's meant to be a cheap way of covering uninsured motorist costs."

Johnson: "Okay. Just for a clarification in legislative intent.

Then this would only be as to uninsured motorist property
damage coverage as opposed to your standard U coverage for
bodily injury and so forth. Is that right?"

Churchill: "As far as I understand, that's true property damage."

Johnson: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Representative Churchill, that, on the concurrence, that's what the uninsured property damage coverage that we mistakenly passed last Session that mandated that people carry uninsured motorist property damage coverage?"

Churchill: "That is correct. It would take it from a mandate to an optional coverage."

Terzich: "And I understand at the present time there is an injunction on in doing that benefit until we pass some type of legislation that will simply make it optional."

Churchill: "That is true by Circuit Court Judge Richard Currie in Cook County."

Terzich: "Well, it was a ridiculous Bill that the Legislature passed last year that made it mandatory insurance, and

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

certainly, we need to get this problem resolved. This provision, by making it optional and it must be offered, is probably better than nothing, but certainly is a step in the right direction. I would move that we support this and concur with the Senate Amendments.

- Speaker Greiman: "Purther discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau,
  Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, stand in support of the Motion to concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 2896. As the two previous speakers mentioned, this is a corrective measure where companies will make available that coverage. It is needed and necessary to comply with the court order, and I stand in support of the concurrence."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2896?\* All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting "aye", none voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2896, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby We will go back and pick up a couple of declared passed. Bills that we passed over earlier. On the Order of Concurrence, on page six of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2542. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2542, amends the Illinois Municipal Code together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

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

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The original Bill, House Bill 2542, passed this House by a 104 to 0 vote. It has to do with the prohibition of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

disconnection of territory in the municipality if that municipality has not levied the property taxes for at least three of the last five years. It also restores language inadvertently omitted in Public Act 83-656. Amendment 1 is... is part of a Bill that... Bill 2396 that passed this House a 112 to 0, it has to do with adding the word 'creek' regarding the annexation ο£ property by a municipality which is 60 acres or less. Amendment 2, which was House Bill 2924, which passed this by a vote of 36 to 17 has to do with the appointment of police and fire commissioners in municipalities that are greater than 130,000 and less than 2,000,000. Also has to pertain to municipalities that may disconnect a ... or discontinue a tuberculosis program without referendum. provides Also that a mayor, alderman, city clerk, city treasurer or member of a board of trustees may hold another office under city government or civil service if such person is granted a leave of absence. It also exempts collective bargaining agreements from the requirement that an appropriation be made as a condition press precedent to the making of a contract. Amendment 3, Senate Amendment 3, amends the Housing Authorities Act, provides municipality within a county of 3,000,000 or more population basically, Cook County, may prevent a housing authority of a county of 3,000,000 or more or another municipality within such county from exercising its power for the purpose of financing planning undertaking constructing or operating one or more rental housing projects located within the effective municipality if such project is in excess of 1% of the total rental housing of a municipality. Mr. Speaker, concurrence to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved that the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Cullerton. Let's please give the Gentleman your attention."
- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to concur. You may recall that this particular Bill, although it did pass the House, we had some questions about it. After it got over to the Senate, they were able discover just how bad the proposal really is. It deals with a very, very special legislation, an attempt at special legislation to thwart the plans of a owner of some property to develop that property. It allows for... the Bill does is to add a new criteria that must be imposed before a person can disconnect from a village. And the new criteria must be that the village must have levied a property tax in it at least three the last five years. Now in the particular village that he's concern with. Long Grove, they don't have a property tax. So this absurd criteria is being added for only one purpose, and that to thwart the efforts of someone who has complied with the They're trying to run down here to Springfield change the law to... to change the situation. It's a very bad concept. It's ... It's ... I say it's special legislation now, but it's very possible that could affect numerous other situations throughout this state because might be other people trying to disconnect who have met the criteria, and the same situation could apply that is no sales... property tax levied within the last there three years. So I don't object to the Senate Amendments. object to the House Bill. I think that the vote on

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

this Motion should be a 'no' vote, and we should put this into a Conference Committee."

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

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the On House Bill 2542, when it went over to the Senate Sponsor, along with the House Sponsor, were gracious enough to let me add Amendment #2 which is a Bill that a lot of us were interested in and passed out of this House a couple of weeks ago. However, at this point, there is problem with the ... with the Bill, as Representative Cullerton explained, but I would hope that we would vote either 'no' or 'present'. In fact, I intend to vote 'present' on this particular Bill so that we could go to a Conference Committee and try and work out our differences with the Sponsors. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would hope that we would vote 'present' and not concur in this particular item."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Mays: "In Amendment #2, Representative, you touched on the collective bargaining Section. How and exactly does this change the existing law?"

Peterson: "Currently, Representative, it is my understanding that
the money has to be appropriated before the entrance into
the collective bargaining agreement, but, as you know,
school districts enter collective bargaining agreements,
and there's no provision that they have to have had this
money budgeted in advance. So, it really is not
changing... making any dramatic change in the collective
bargaining provision."

Mays: "Are you saying that currently, if they don't have the

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- money budgeted for entering into collective bargaining, they can't do it, and we're trying to allow them to do it with this Bill then?"
- Peterson: "From my analysis, it says that the collective bargaining agreement would... it would exempt the collective bargaining agreement from the requirement that an appropriation be made as a condition precedent to making of a contract. So, I assume that is the current law."
- Mays: "So then, without an appropriation from the city council or the school board, they can go ahead and enter into a contract?"
- Peterson: "Well, the school board can do that at this time. This is regarding municipalities, I understand."
- Mays: "You had mentioned the schools. I didn't."
- Peterson: "No. I'm saying that this is currently the law for school districts, and this would bring the municipalities into the same area."
- Mays: "Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Lake, to close."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, regarding special legislation, it seems that the other day we had a Bill here regarding Continental Bank which is certainly special legislation. This particular Bill deals with a municipality in my particular Legislative District. I think it's a good Bill. It passed out of this House 104 to nothing, and I would hope that the House would ... would agree with my Motion to move for concurrence to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is now open. This will be final action. Have all

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman...
  Yes, Mr. Peterson, to explain your vote."
- Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, if it's appropriate at this time, I'd like to move for nonconcurrence to Amendments 1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, let me finish this, and we'll give you a chance."

Peterson: "Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 34 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 32 voting 'present', and the House does not concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Peterson."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time, I would move for nonconcurrence to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2542. We will pick up another Bill that we had passed over before. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2513. 2513.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2513 amends the Revenue Act, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Karpiel."
- Karpiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate
  Amendment #1 and 3, and I move to nonconcur with Senate
  Amendment #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage moves that the House do

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2513.

  And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. A question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. She'll yield."
- O'Connell: "It is not a question in opposition to your Amendment.

  But wasn't this Amendment placed on another Bill during the

  course of this Session, and what was the fate of that

  Bill?"
- Karpiel: "Amendment #2, the one we're nonconcurring in? Which Amendment are you referring to?"
- O'Connell: "Amendment #1."
- Karpiel: "Oh, Amendment #1?"
- O'Connell: "Which I believe is on for concurrence, isn't it?"
- Karpiel: "Yes, I'm concurring with Amendment #1, but I am not aware if that was placed on another Bill. I don't recall such and neither does our staff."
- O'Connell: "I thought it was Representative McCracken's Bill. And the question I have is, in that particular Amendment was 500,000, and this is seeking where there is a change in assessed valuation of 100,000."
- Karpiel: "It looks like Representative McCracken is on the phone.

  Oh. Representative Churchill says that it was his, and it was for 50,000."
- O'Connell: "Well, I'll confer with Representative Churchill.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. Mr. O'Connell, are you through? Have you finished, Sir? Alright. Mr. Brummer. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."
- Brummer: "Yes, since this is going to Conference Committee anyway, I suppose, or is there any indication that the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Senate will recede on Amendment #2?"

Karpiel: "I believe they will."

Brummer: "It is your understanding that they will recede on Amendment #2?"

Karpiel: "Yes."

Brummer: "So then, if we concur in Amendment #1 and 3, this will be final passage with regard to this House."

Karpiel: "Yes."

Brummer: "Okay. Could I ask you then several questions with regard to Amendment #1?"

Karpiel: "Yes."

Brummer: "I opposed that when Representative Churchill had that
Bill here. I think a number of business groups opposed
that once they were alerted to it, once it got over to the
Senate, and I think that's the reason that Bill was not
called in the Senate. And, in fact, I do not think it came
out of Rules Committee, if I recall the history of that
Bill correctly. With regard to Senate Amendment \$1, number
one, it requires that notice go to all the units of
government when there is a petition for a reduction in the
assessment level of 100,000 dollars or more?"

Karpiel: "Yes. That appeared on the last tax bill. Yes."

Brummer: "Okay. If a particular business feels that it overassessed. in... I think, different counties use different assessment complaint procedures. how is t he business going to know if they are... if they feel at the time they're filing the complaint - frequently they have not had an appraisal yet at that point - if they feel they are assessed by an amount in excess of 100,000 dollars?"

Karpiel: "Representative, this is not my Amendment, and Representative Churchill has said that he would answer your questions or Representative McCracken. I don't..."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Representative McCracken, are you seeking

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

recognition? Alright."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is similar but not identical to an Amendment I tacked onto. I believe it was House Bill 329. House Bill 329 was called, never cleared the Senate so that that Amendment is no longer actively working its way through the Body. is different in the respect that it has a threshold of 100,000 dollars as opposed to 500,000 dollars, which was the original Amendment. I support it. It's limited to cases outside of Cook County by virtue of its applying only to the Property Tax Appeal Board and changes current law in this respect. Under current law, a district is not within the meaning of the school recomputation statute where there is not a final court order so that where the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a judgement, the school district been a party to that decision and, thus, has been held not to come within the scope of the recomputation formula."

Brunmer: "Mr. Speaker?"

McCracken: "All this does is..."

Brummer: "I think you're addressing the... a different Amendment.

I was asking questions about Amendment #1 which appears to
have nothing to do with that issue."

McCracken: "Representative O'Connell told me this was Amendment

Brummer: "Amendment #1 deals with the type of notice that is required when there is a reduction sought in the assessed valuation of 100,000 dollars or more. It has nothing to do with recalculation of the school aid formula that I can ascertain."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Brummer, Mr. Churchill seems to be prepared to respond to that. Mr. Churchill."

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

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

the House. Apparently, Senate Amendment #1 is a portion of the House Bill 2512, which I had passed out of the House here and which died in the Senate Committee. There were portions of House Bill 2512 which numerous interests found objectionable; and, for that reason. died. There was one provision which almost everybody agreed was not as bad which apparently Senator Barkhausen decided he would add to this as Senate Amendment #1 and that was the notice provision. Originally, the notice provision was objected to by the State Chamber of Commerce, because it provided that a party may become an intervening party once notice was provided. It's my reading of at least the analysis on this that that is not the case anymore, and this is strictly a notice provision to taxing bodies with no intervening powers. If there questions, Representative Brunner, I'd try and help you out on it."

Brummer: "Okay. I think the language that is used now, number one, the notice needs to given by the Board of Review rather than the taxpayer. I think that is definitely an improvement. My question, I guess, is, for the purpose of legislative intent with regard to this. Should the Board of Review fail to give that notice and then subsequently lower an assessment, is that notice jurisdictional in as much as those taxing bodies themselves are not parties to the assessment process?"

Churchill: "Originally, in House Bill 2512, it was jurisdictional. It is my understanding that this is not jurisdictional."

Brummer: "Okay. So, it would not be jurisdictional with regard to the decision of the Board of Review then?"

Churchill: "It is my understanding that is the case."

Brummer: "Okay. Thank you. With that understanding, I'm not

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

sure that this is a real good Amendment. but it certainly... it is... it is in much better shape than it So that everyone understands, before. anytime a business would come in seeking a reduction in assessed valuation of 100,000 dollars or more, the Board of be required to give a notice to all of the various taxing bodies affected by that. What that means is, the purpose of that, I think, is to make it more difficult for businesses to get reduction in assessments by bringing political pressure to bear on the Board of Review by notifying the community college district, the school district, the fire protection district, the park district, the library district, all the various districts. Representative Churchill previously indicated on his last tax bill there were 16 districts that would have affected by this. All those districts are going to come in and bring some pressure on the Board of Review so that the business will not get the reduction in the assessed valuation that it feels that it is entitled to. I quess I question the constitutionality of that. creating arbitrary distinction of 100,000 dollars or more. I question whether it is wise public policy; but. in event, since it is not jurisdictional as indicated by the... the House... by Representative Churchill here debate, it is not as onerous as it was, but I still question and think it is probably poor public policy. given the fact that the last time Representative Churchill had a much more onerous Bill here - it passed - I suspect we're going to concur in this Amendment."

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

Pierce: "I was off the floor, Representative Churchill. Was

Senate Amendment #2 concurred in?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pierce, this is a Motion to concur with

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Senate Amendments 1 and 3."
- Pierce: "Not 2, I hope."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady has suggested that she is going to move to nonconcur."
- Pierce: "Oh, fine. I was out of the room, because that's a terrible Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know I've already spoken,
  but it was more or less to clarify an intent or a question
  of intent..."
- Speaker Greiman: "That's why I called on you, Mr. Churchill. Go ahead."
- Churchill: "Thank you. I would like to speak to Senate Amendment

  #1 in regards to the policy, because I do differ with
  Representative Brummer on that point. I was before this
  Body on House Bill 2512 and explained the problems that we
  had been having in my area about large businesses such as
  the Mariott Great America, which is now \*Bally\*s\* Six Flags
  Great America..."
- Unknown: "God bless Mayor Washington."
- Churchill: "... going into the process without notifying any of the taxing districts as to what they were attempting to do in terms of change of assessment. I think that the notice provision is a good provision. It provides to those bodies who will be affected by a tax change an opportunity to examine the request, an opportunity to come forward and..."
- Unknown: "God bless Mayor Daley."
- Churchill: "... at least apply some political pressure if that's the case. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Lady from DuPage, Ms. Karpiel, to close."
- Karpiel: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do want to thank

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Representative Churchill for belping out on this Amendment which was part of his Bill originally in the House. And I would, since everything has been clarified, I would just urge an 'aye' vote on concurrence for Senate Amendment 1 and 3 on House Bill 2513."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2513? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3... Alright. Mr. Mulcahey 'aye'. Panayotovich 'aye'. Mr. Laurino 'aye'. So that on this question there are now 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 2513. The Lady from DuPage, on a Motion."

Karpiel: "I now move, Mr. Speaker, to nonconcur with Amendment #... Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 2513."

Speaker Greiman: "They Lady from DuPage moves that the House do nonconcur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2513. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2513. On page seven of the Calendar, picking up Bills over which we have passed previously, appears House Bill 2714. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2714, an Act concerning the National Dr.

Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday, together with Senate

Amendment #1."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

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

- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2714, as it went to the Senate, dealt the subject of Dr. Martin Luther King. birthday. The legislation attempted to codify into law legislation that would conform the state holiday to the national holiday here in Illinois. The Amendment in the Senate, Senate Amendment #1, was somewhat technical in nature offered by the Illinois Association of School Boards and supported by the Teachers' Association. The Bill with this Amendment would, in effect, become effective January of 1986, which is consistent with the federal legislation. I know of no opposition, and I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2714."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2714. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a question. I'm not looking at the Senate Amendment itself. I'm looking at an analysis, and the analysis tells me that the Senate Amendment provided for an effective date of January 1st, 1984. Can you... Would you elaborate on that?"
- Bullock: "Well, the analysis... the staffers on both sides looked at this, and it is in error, and they're going to... and they're going to ask that the... As I was about to explain, the staff did bring to my attention that inconsistency. Prior to this Senate Amendment, there was no effective date. And the Amendment would, in fact, make it effective in '84. In fact, the holiday, however, would be effective consistent with the national legislation which is '86."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Vinson: "Well, I've got, I guess, Representative, two or three questions. Number one, how can you make a Bill effective on a date prior to when the Legislature even acted on the Bill?"

Bullock: "Well, what we're saying, Representative Vinson, is that the Bill itself becomes law on that date; but, of course, the birthdate, the next birthdate would be effective for celebration or at least for this state recognizing it on the 86th birthday, 1986 birthday."

Vinson: "Let me ask one more question. Maybe that will get to whether I really care about whether we get involved in this issue. Am I right in thinking that holidays that are approved by the Legislature have an impact on school reimbursement?"

Bullock: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Representative."

Vinson: "Am I... Am I correct in believing that holidays that are officially approved by the Legislature have an impact on school reimbursement?"

Bullock: "Well, of course."

Vinson: "Okav. Now, I thought ... I thought that was right. Ιf we, aside from the somewhat dubious proposal of passing a Bill in June of 1984 that is going to be effective January of 1984, and we're not talking about retroactive We're talking about the Bill itself being effective, which is, I think, a dubious proposition. Ιt seems to me that what this might do would actually increase school reimbursement for this year. Now, is that the case?"

Bullock: "Of course not, Representative."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly,
to the Bill. I think everybody really ought to take a
pretty close look at this one. Now, I'm not going to
recommend that you vote for or against the Gentleman's

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Motion, because I would be interested to see what the would make of this dilemma of in June the Legislature passing a Bill and, in July or August, the Governor signing a Bill and the effective date of the Bill being the preceding January. That would be an interesting proposition for the courts to deal with. I don't think we can do that. It might be useful for us to establish that we actually can do that, because it would be a quantum leap forward in legislative power, I suspect. But I do think you all ought to look at it very carefully."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, further discussion? The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Sponsor yield?"

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

Hastert: "Representative Bullock, I seriously have a question here I guess following along with what Representative Vinson was talking about. Would the state incur - otherwise, if we made last. the third Monday of January an official holiday. Now we have to give employees off and things like this. Would we incur a past debt if we..."

Bullock: "Representative Hastert..."

Hastert: "Let me ask... finished quest... If we set this holiday for last ... last year or last January and it becomes a national or a state holiday, we did not give people off, would we be liable to pay them?"

Bullock: "Well, in answer to your first question, yes, the state's... as a matter of fact, all states, now that it is federally mandated, would be required to give those educational employees that day off, yes. The answer to your second question, if individuals prior to '86 request that day, we would provide that day also. It may not be the same day, and that's why this legislation is necessary to bring about the conformity. And the reason we delayed

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

the actual effective date of this to '86; a) it tracks the federal legislation and; b) some of the school districts came to us and said they had already printed calendars and things of that sort and that this would, in fact, be an imposition to them, both in terms of some administrative costs and actual inconvenience. And so we agreed to track the federal holiday. But employees, whether this Bill were passed or not effective January '86, would be allowed that a day off under the federal legislation."

Hastert: "Okay. I understand that thinking but this would be effective date of '84, all I'm asking for that that doesn't, when we go back, it doesn't retroactively cause the state to pick up an economic burden. We don't have to go backwards and pay all state employees and all ... and the school districts to pay all school districts for an official holiday that we put in place that's already passed. That's my... only my concern."

Bullock: "In answer, N-O, no."

Hastert: "Thank you. Could you... Why wouldn't we have to do that if we made that an official holiday?"

Bullock: "Well, if you wanted to do that, but that's not what this legislation does."

Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to readdress this Bill, because I've just been handed a copy of the actual Amendment, and I can clarify some problems."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Vinson, that's contrary to our rules.

If the House will give you leave or if... Surely there's someone over there that could speak. Alright. Does... Mr. Vinson would like to have leave to address the House again on this issue, contrary to the rules. Does the Gentleman have leave? Mr. Vinson, they're kind to you. Proceed."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Vinson: "The Membership of this House has always been kind and generous, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate it in this case. I said, and I think I mentioned that I was reading the analysis, I suggested that there was a January 1st, 1984 effective date in this Bill in the Senate Amendment, and I said that from the analysis. And that is what the analysis And I do hope the staff member who wrote the says. analysis is listening at this time, because the analysis is wrong. In the actual Amendment, if you read the Amendment, does do what Representative Bullock said. effective date of January 1st, 1986. And I want to apologize to him and to the Membership for misleading them, and I just want that clarified so nobody's confused voting on the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Vinson. Alright. Do
we need further discussion on this? Mr. Friedrich.
Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

everything else."

Friedrich: "What would be the disadvantage, Representative Bullock, for having the effective date January 1st, 1985 so that it would pick up next year but not obligate us to pay for schools, people, everything else for this year? I don't quite understand... I don't think this adds anything to the respect to Dr. Martin Luther King. I'm not objecting to that at all, but I think you're playing games

Bullock: "Well, I don't think that's a question. I think it's a statement, and I certainly think the substance of the Bill speaks for itself, Representative."

with a bunch of pay and days off and school days and

Priedrich: "Well, I've been told our analysis is wrong. I'm sorry."

- 141st Legislative Day June 27, 1984
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Bullock, to close."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2714, as amended by the Senate, would codify and conform with national law the observance of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. birthday. This Bill, in effect, becomes effective in 1986. I would respectfully urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate
  Amendment #1 to House Bill 2714?' All those in favor
  signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting
  is now open. This is final action. The Gentleman from
  DuPage to explain his vote, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There obviously is no need for me to explain my vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Yes, Mr. Brummer votes 'aye'. Mr. Brummer, you're voting 'aye'. Okay. On this question there are 104 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2714. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Again going back on some of the Bills over which we passed, it ... appears House Bill 2509."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2509, an Act in relationship to senior citizens and certain boards and commissions, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the third time, and hopefully we'll get all the way through it this time on this Bill. Just to refresh people's memory, this is the Bill that adds senior citizens

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

to various executive boards and commissions. Amendment #1 added the Violent Crimes Advisory Commission to the Bill. This is a new Commission that advises Attorney General that it is not a legislative Commission. and there was a question as to what the composition of that Commission is currently, which I believe was... when this Bill was up before. And the answer is that since it was just created with the Violent Crimes Act, which took effect just a couple months ago, it has not yet been formally constituted, but it is the view of the General that there should be a right for seniors to be on this Commission. And, of course, the Attorney General not always be the current Attorney General, and so the effect would be to bind future Attorney Generals as well. Amendment #2 removes the Health Facilities Planning Board from the purview of this Bill, and that was requested by the Medical Society."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2509.

And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Nr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of İ had asked the Sponsor, when this Bill previously came up, if it was indeed... if there were any senior citizens currently on the Gang Crime... Violent Crimes Advisory Commission, and he rightfully stated in his opening remarks this time that that Commission was not... it was just formed and there are no members currently appointed to it. The whole fact of the matter is that this Bill and with Amendment #1 the ... there is no limitation on who the appointee should be in any of these commissions OF councils or advisory whatsoever, currently. Indeed, the record of the Thompson

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

administration and those others that are involved in appointing members to this ... these commissions and the advisory councils has been most laudable over the Every one of the commissions that have been formed and have had the members appointed to them have had least one senior citizen on them. every one of them mentioned in the Bill. Now, with regards to this particular concurrence Motion, this is final action. bak if you want to go along with the ... the flow, if to do whatever you can to send out whatever nice letters you're going to to all those people that sent you those cards to lead them to believe that this is going to have any type of meaningful impact on the council's decisions effecting them, I think you're ... you know, go right ahead, think you're dead wrong. And I think misleading the public on that particular concern. With Amendment #2, I can't understand why if it's a good idea to have all of these other boards and indeed add the Violent Crimes Advisory Committee or whatever it is under the purview of this Bill, I can't understand why you would take the Health Pacilities Planning Act out of the purview: because, if there's any issue that affects senior citizens pensions, which we've done a job to in this other than Assembly yesterday, it would be health care costs. would move that we nonconcur on this Bill. And if the concurrence Motion is what's before us right now, 1 would definitely suggest that a 'no' vote would be most appropriate."

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

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Who will make the appointments? So I know who to go talk to."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Levin: "Okay. In each case, it is an appointment that is made by the Governor."

Leverenz: "The Governor?"

Levin: "Yes."

Leverenz: "We pause while he checks with his staff."

Levin: "The Violent Crimes would be the Attorney General, but in all of the other cases, it's the Governor that makes the appointments."

Leverenz: "How many total appointments are we talking about? How many by the Attorney General? How many by the Governor?

We'll pause while he checks with stafff."

Levin: "There are 27 boards. I think 26 of them are the Governor, and one is the Attorney General."

Leverenz: "How many? I'm sorry."

Levin: "There are a total of 27 boards affected. Twenty-six are by the Governor. One is by the Attorney General."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Purther discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I stand in support of this concurrence Motion. I\*ll tell you I've heard from a number of people on the floor here, 'Well already senior citizens who are members of the boards'. And that's true, but you lost one word when You this Bill and that is consumer members. Every board or commission that I sit on or know anything about, yes, we have senior citizens on them. And who are they? They represent agencies. They represent senior citizen groups. They are not the people who are receiving the services. who are we to sit there and say, 'This is what you need, when we've never had to experience? I want some consumers on there who can say, 'Yes, this is working', or, 'No. it is not working. And that's the kind of people

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

we're now going to appoint, and I think this is a good Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bopp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Might I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "It's my understanding that the Sponsor of this Bill, which is, in part, the Speaker of the House, has gone on record in opposing commissions somewhat in total, and I guess I'm wanting to know why we're attempting to pursue this particular Bill that deals with commissions when this chamber has already gone on record opposing the advancement of the commission process."

Levin: "These are executive appointments that are made."

Ropp: "Well, how can the Governor appoint anything if there's no commissions? What's he going to appoint them to?"

Levin: "Okay. If a, you know, if... The answer is... Yeah.

Okay. If they are abolished, then there will be no appointments made to them."

Ropp: "Well don't you think they're going to become abolished.

This House has pretty well spoken. The Speaker of the House has pretty well spoken. The Minority Leader has pretty well spoken. And this House has pretty well spoken."

Levin: "If they are, then, you know, obviously these... there are a total of three here that are affected. If they are abolished, then obviously the Governor or whoever it is would not be making any appointments. The alternative would be for the Governor... the Governor would be able to strike references to those commissions from this Bill using his amendatory veto power. We certainly don't know at this point what's going to happen."

Ropp: "Okay. In spite of the fact that this chamber has already

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

spoken in opposition to the commission process and most of these already have senior citizens on it, and I think a lot of people are attempting to get senior citizens pretty excited on this issue - if, in fact, you've got senior citizens that want to be on any of these commissions, I strongly recommend that they contact each one of you within your own district, and you, through your efforts and contact with the proper officials within the state, can make those appointments reasonably successful. And I don't think this Bill is necessarily needed as a result."

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

Cullerton: "Representative Levin, I have a request from the Minority Leader Daniels and Speaker Madigan to have this Bill taken out of the record for a fourth time is it or a third time? Third time? Want to do that?"

Speaker Greiman: "Good. You're getting it down almost perfect.

Keep it up. 2509, out of the record. Alright. We're continuing... Going back picking up some Bills over which we passed previously. On the Order of Concurrence appears

House Bill 2556. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2556 amends the Juvenile Court Act, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4."

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of This Bill, House Bill 2556, amends the Juvenile the House. Court Act. It's a product of a couple ο£ years of negotiations between the Illinois State Bar Association. Justice Committee and the State's Attorney's Juvenile Office of Cook County and other interested people who worked on these changes to the Juvenile Court Act. The Bill basically did Number one, two major things. it standardized the use of station adjustments and non-judicial adjustment plans so that there will

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1994

predictability with regard to informal station adjustment, which right now are done throughout the state on an ad And the second part of the Bill clearly defined speedy trial rights in juvenile proceedings. Senate amended the speedy trial Section with the Senate Amendment #4. And what the Senate Amendment #4 did was separate the issue of speedy trials into two categories: one, the nondelinquency type cases where they say that the speedy trial provisions shall be 120 days, and a judicatory hearing shall be held with 120 days; but, if it fails to specify and that if the 120 days is violated, the dismissal of the petition shall be without prejudice. We also would indicate, for the purposes of legislative intent, that the 120 day period runs from the date of a demand for Now the second category would be delinquency cases. And in delinquency cases, we say that there also is a 120 day written demand, and, also, for the purposes of legislative intent, we will say that the violation - strike that - that if the 120 day period goes without the individual, the juvenile, being brought to trial, that the dismissal will with prejudice, and the ... we would have then a speedy trial provision very similar to the criminal court. are two other Amendments of substance: one is Senate Amendment #2 which was a subject matter of Representative LeFlore's House Bill 2877 which passed the House 110 to 1. And that Bill, for some reason or another, was... out of the Senate Rules Committee, and they used this Bill as a vehicle. That Bill amended the Juvenile Court Act to require compliance reports to be submitted regularly to the court bу the truant officer or other school officials whenever a dispositional order has been entered requiring a minor to attend school. No report need be made until the juvenile has missed more than 10 out of 40

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

consecutive school days. There was an Amendment, Senate Amendment #3, which was put on the request of the at Department of Children and Family Services which also amended the Juvenile Court Act to provide that a detention or a shelter care hearing... and a detention or shelter hearing, the court must find that reasonable efforts have been made to eliminate the necessity of removal of nondelinquent minors from their homes, and it grants a trial court authority to order a minor to participate in correction community programs, including unified delinquency intervention services administered by DCFS. That's designed to give the Judge another option with regard to juvenile court matters. I think that I say Amendments have been worked out with the cooperation of the State's Attorney's Office i n Caak with the Illinois State Bar Association. I think very significant and important change in the Juvenile Court Act. It addresses the critical manner of the standardization of the practice whereby minors are dealt with through station adjustments and non-judicial I think it will benefit both adjustment plans. juvenile probation officers and the minors, because it does allow some predictability to what is now simply a discretionary practice. And the speedy trial provisions, as I have described, are very important. would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1,2, 3 and to House Bill 2556. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3 and 4 to House Bill 2556. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he would."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Jaffe: "Yeah. Let me ask you this. This doesn't include any of those truancy provisions that were on the Ropp Bill that... does it?"

Cullerton: "No, the... the Senate Amendment #2 deals with truancy. It was the subject matter of Representative LePlore's Bill, House Bill 2877, and it was not what Representative Ropp's Bills which were more controversial..."

Jaffe: "Well, that doesn't make tru... It doesn't take truants back into the court system, does it? Or..."

Cullerton: "No, it..."

Jaffe: "It doesn't make them subject to..."

Cullerton: "It simply deals with juvenile truants who are already
in the court system that are under court order to do
something. It provides for more regular reporting to the
court."

Jaffe: "But it doesn't provide..."

Cullerton: "For new additional proceedings... It's not designed to increase the number of juveniles or truants to come under the court jurisdiction. It doesn't change that law whatsoever. It just says that it deals with the issue of dispositional orders that are already made by a Judge to a truant, and it just increases the... with regularity the reporting system to the court as to what is going on with regard to the order."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox,
Mr. Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Is it working? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, our analysis of Senate Amendment #4

seems to indicate that there is a distinction drawn between

speedy trial provisions for juveniles held in custody and

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

those held not in custody. I believe you described the distinction between delinquency cases and nondelinquency cases. Is there any... Do the speedy trial provisions apply only to those held in some kind of custody, or does it apply to all delinquency cases?"

Cullerton: "No, the speedy trial provisions apply to all types of cases, quote, 'delinquency and nondelinquency'. The distinction is that the dismissal orders. the dismissal orders with regard to nondelinquency cases, that the dismissal is without prejudice: whereas, in the delinquency cases, the dismissal is with prejudice."

Hawkinson: "I understand that distinction. But, within the framework of the delinquency cases, does it apply to delinquency cases where the minor is not in custody where a demand has been made?"

Cullerton: "The... the distinction is not between those who happen to be in custody and those who do not."

Hawkinson: "Alright."

Cullerton: "It's simply..."

Hawkinson: "So... So, it does apply to those who are not in custody where a demand has been made."

Cullerton: "Yes, that's correct."

Hawkinson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill... to the Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Hawkinson: "I would rise in opposition to this Motion. There are many fine parts to this legislation. There has been work on it, but there is absolutely no need and no reason to introduce the concepts of the speedy trial provisions into juvenile cases, particularly where the juveniles are not in custody. The whole concept of our juvenile law is to provide a more informal disposition for juveniles - not to punish so directly as to rehabilitate. That's why we have.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

more options. Where a juvenile is not in custody, there is simply no reason to provide this kind of a loophole where a case can be dismissed with prejudice, where there may be other aims of the system and desirability in prolonging the case beyond 120 days for one reason or another. Where a juvenile is in custody, there are already sufficient safeguards written into the law. There is a 10 day requirement and a 30 day requirement. There is simply no reason to put this added burden on the prosecution, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Bowman: "Question of the Sponsor. Representative Cullerton, has the Commission on Children..."

Cullerton: "I'm sorry."

Bowman: "Has the Commission on Children taken a position on any of these points contained in Amendments 1 through 4?"

Cullerton: "I... I don't recall whether the Commission OB Children was involved in the negotiations with this Bill. This Bill was another numbered Bill which we put in last year, which we held up so that the various groups could negotiate, and then it turned out that we needed to introduce a new Bill as a vehicle. I don't recall whether the Commission on Children was involved. I do know the Juvenile Justice Section of the Illinois State Bar Association was the one that was primarily involved with the status. Knowing what's in the Bill, I would think that the Commission on Children would be in favor. It's designed to provide more safeguards iuveniles"

Bowman: "Are there any other organizations that you know of who are either for or against the Bill that you could enlighten..."

Cullerton: "Well, the Cook County State's Attorney's Office

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

initially had a problem with the Bill, because there is a backlog of these cases. And the speedy trial provisions would have... proved to be a problem. So, we amended the Bill twice to go from 60 days, then 90 days, then finally ended up with 120 days. And we have checked... checked it out with them, and they are in approval now of the... of the Bill."

Bowman: "Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Ropp: "Representative Cullerton, in your explanation of some of these Senate Amendments, has this in any way improved the speediness in which truants may be encouraged to get back into the educational school system? I guess what I'm saying, what does the reporting to the court have to do with encouraging a student who does not want to go to school to return to school?"

Cullerton: "This Bill ... this Amendment deals with the chronically or habitually truants as defined in the School Code. Those people, as you know, are people who juveniles who have missed more than 10 out of 40 consecutive school days. Okay? And it says that reports submitted regularly to the court by a truant officer or other school officials whenever a dispositional order has been entered requiring a minor to attend school or to participate in a program of training. So. if the student who is an habitual truant has been before a court and that court has ordered them either to go to school or participate in a program, training program, that there shall be a report made to the Judge, a status report, on a regular basis telling the Judge whether the truant is doing what he was ordered to do. This was Representative

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

LeFlore's Bill. He pointed out, as I recall, there was some problems with these orders being entered and then the Judge not hearing as to what was happening. So we are trying to get the truant officers to be reporting back to the courts so the court can take an appropriate action."

Ropp: "Okay. Then the ... "

Cullerton: "So, to answer your question, I really think, yes,
that it would encourage those habitual truants who have
been ordered to do something, that it will encourage them
to do it, because now we'll have... a Judge will be
informed that they are not complying with the order."

Ropp: "Yeah, but does the... does the Judge then have some authority or leverage to encourage him to get back to school, or does he just read the status report and that's all that happens?"

Cullerton: "Well, this... this Bill does not change the law with regard to the court's powers to enforce its orders. I assume that the same provision... I know that the same provisions that now are in the law still apply."

Ropp: "Which really don't do anything."

Cullerton: "Well then, why don't you put a Bill in?"

Ropp: "I have, but I can't get it through your Committee. Are
you going to support it the next time?"

Cullerton: "The more I learn about this, the more your subject...

your issue sounds interesting, and I think we should study
it in the Interim Study Committee."

Ropp: "Well, no, we'll bring a new Bill next year, and maybe you'll help me Cosponsor it where we can really deal with the educational problem where truants really are one of our big concerns. And I welcome your support at that time.

Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berrios. Mr. Berrios, is... Mr. Countryman."

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Countryman: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Countryman: "Representative Cullerton, I'm still confused over this speedy trial rule. Is it my understanding that it applies only when they're in custody?"

Cullerton: "No. It..."

Countryman: "Alright. So it applies to any case then, is that right?"

Cullerton: "Right. The speedy trial provision applies in both delinquency cases and nondelinquency cases."

Countryman: "Alright. Making a distinction between a case of a minor in need of supervision and a delinquency case, if, in fact, the delinquency case isn't taken to hearing within the 120 days, it's dismissed with prejudice. Is that right?"

Cullerton: "In delinquency cases, right."

Countryman: "Whether in custody or not."

Cullerton: "Right."

Countryman: "But if it's a minor in need of supervision, and it's dismissed, it's dismissed without prejudice."

Cullerton: "That's been changed to be called a minor in need of authoritative intervention. And that would be a nondelinquency case. And that would be without prejudice.

The case would be dismissed without prejudice."

Countryman: "I... I don't understand the rationale for that distinction. Do you know of any?"

Cullerton: "Well... Well, the delinquency cases are... are cases that are analogist to criminal offenses; and, in those cases, a minor could be incarcerated. And, philosophically, even though Representative Hawkinson's point was that philosophically the Juvenile Court Act is... is treating people different than the Criminal Court Act, as a practical matter we have seen that... in our... the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1994

sophistication of juvenile offenders is such that it really is analogist to the Criminal Code with regard to these more serious criminal offenses. And in that respect, think... I think that there is should be a speedy trial provision, and that's what we're saying. 120 days, as you know, is the same as the criminal court. So that with prejudice is for the delinquency cases - without prejudice is for those... everything else where there's so many different possibilities that we felt it wouldn't be an import... it wouldn't be a good idea to make it without... with prejudice. So, we made it without prejudice."

Countryman: "Well, I come out of a different background than my colleague, Mr. Hawkinson. I used to be the public defender in DeKalb County. So, I had these cases years ago. And it seems to me you might be discouraging the prosecutor from bringing a delinquency petition and using one of the other methods; because, if he didn't get his case to trial in the 120 days, then he might be using one of the other methods, because prejudice doesn't attach. And that might not be good public policy. But I wonder if you wholeheartedly believe in this Amendment."

Cullerton: "You know, I should also point out that in the Bill there is a provision for the prosecutor to petition for a 30 day extension. So, now we're talking about 150 days, which is - I don't know how many months - five months, six months. I don't think that there's a problem in any other county, except for the possible exception of Cook, with regard to bringing these cases within that period of time. And we've sat down and worked it out with the Cook County State's Attorney, and they feel they can... they can comply with this law."

Countryman: "Have you talked to any of the downstate state's attorneys?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Cullerton: "Homer and Hawkinson and those quys? I try not to if can avoid it. I haven't spoken with Mr. 'Dozier'. I can tell you this: that the Illinois State Bar Association Juvenile Justice Committee, which representation of prosecutors, statewide - this is their Bill, and they're very much in favor of it. It's number one... It's one of the top agendas of the Illinois State Bar Association."
- Countryman: "And that's true of the Amendment that was placed on in the Senate?"
- Cullerton: "It was put on in the Senate by Senator Bloom. He's the Sponsor of the Amendment. And the Illinois State Bar Association is... You don't have to be, you know, in favor of it. I'm just trying to explain who's behind this."

Countryman: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison moves the previous question be put. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Cullerton, to close."
- Cullerton: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Motion to concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4."
- "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Speaker Greiman: in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2556. On that, all those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Homer, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2556. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- hereby declared passed. We will return now to House Bill 2857. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2857, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."
- McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2857."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox moves that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2557 (sic 2857). There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor signify by... Yes, I'm sorry. Mr. McMaster is your light not working?
- McMaster: "It was, yes. That's 2857, not 2557."
- Speaker Greiman: "2857. That's the Bill that's on the board.

  2857. Alright. So, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2857? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2857. On the Order of Concurrences, on page seven, appears House Bill 2926. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2926, a Bill for an Act to amend the Secretary of State Merit Employment Code, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  House Bill 2926 was introduced at the request of the
  Secretary of State and the Merit Commission that increases
  the compensation for the Chairman of the Merit Commission
  from 7500 dollars to 10,000, a modest increase, and the
  members of the Merit Commission, of which there are only
  two, from 5000 to 7500 dollars per year. The effect of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Senate Amend... That's the underlying Bill. The effect Senate Amendment #1 that Representative DiPrima is very interested in - Larry, this is your Bill - provides that an individual living in a veterans' home of a hospital obtain a free Illinois veterans' identification card from the Secretary of State. It is thought that if all veterans which are now currently living in the veterans\* home, they pay three dollars a piece for the card. The Secretary of State wants to furnish that for nothing for a net cost of 900 dollars. The effect of Senate Amendment #2 eliminates the requirement that the Secretary of State's Personnel Director must have practical experience in the area of personnel administration and must not official of a political party. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and House Bill 2926."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 and House Bill 2926. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I support your Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2926? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2926. And this having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page eight of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2950. Nr. Clerk. read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act in relation to employees and their personnel records with Senate Amendment

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brunmer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2950. House Bill 2950 provides an exemption from the... the Employees' Review of Personnel Records Act. Δς it was introduced in the House originally, it provided exemption with regard to those employers who employ 00 more employees. It was amended in the... in the House Committee to provide five or more full or 20 employees. Ιt was amended further down in the Senate to provide that it be... that those employers to which this would applicable would be employers with five or more employees. regardless of whether they are full or part time, excluding members of the employer's immediate family. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association. It was introduced at the request of the National Federation of Independent Businesses. It is supported by the State Chamber of Commerce on behalf of the small businessmen of the State of Illinois, and I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham moves that the
House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2950.

On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from
DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise reluctantly in support of the Gentleman's Motion, reluctantly because his Bill doesn't go far enough. What his Bill ought to be is a simple repealer of the terrible Bill we enacted last year. That's what we really ought to do with it, and this is just to cause medic effort to slightly improve it. Doesn't improve it very much, but

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

it is in the right direction. And I hope next year the Gentleman will have the courage to come in here and offer a repealer. But I would urge people to vote 'yes' on the Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2950? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2950. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. On the Order of Concurrence on page seven.. page eight of the Calendar appears House Bill 2952. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2952, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2952 is a Bill that came Elections. It's the exit poll Bill which basically says ... prohibits exit or entrance polling of voters within 100 This puts it in conformity with feet of a polling place. the prohibition on people who are electioneering politicking for particular candidates. Senate Amendment #1 provides that precinct committeemen shall become deputy registrars upon assuming office, and we're doing that by virtue of putting a deputy registrars oath incorporated in the statement of candidacy. This issue of deputy registrars is covered in a number of other areas such 1301 last year, a number of Bills which we've Senate Bill dealt with this year. Ιt also permits the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

committeemen to challenge anywhere in the county in which they're registered. It's important to keep in mind this it's no applicable in Cook because of the nature of the Boards of Election's commissioners. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2952."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2952. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Oh, Myron, this is the exit polling Bill. We're opposed to this."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Representative. You're opposed to this?"

Cullerton: "I'm just one vote, but I think we're trying to kill this Bill."

Olson: "I'm not at all surprised. I've heard rumors to that effect."

Cullerton: "Why don't you nonconcur, make it easy, save some time?"

Olson: "What do you want to do with it if we send it back?"

Cullerton: "It's a crazy Bill. We don't need it. It's already against the law."

Olson: "What's so crazy... Did you vote for it in May?"

Cullerton: "Nope."

Olson: "Why not? It was an excellent vote. 84 to 19."

Cullerton: "I was one of the 19."

Olson: "Wonderful."

Cullerton: "Why don't you just nonconcur? We'll save some time."

Olson: "A lot... What is your opposition to the Bill?"

Cullerton: "Well, first reason I voted against it is because it's already against the law now. It's just stupid. It's just an effort for somebody to get some publicity, and the publicity is already gone. Tomorrow the newspapers are

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

going to be reporting about the World's Fair, and this is going to be lost in it. So, I think we should just... just forget that we even passed it and go to a Conference Committee and work it out. Maybe we can come out in the fall when you need some more publicity."

Olson: "Have you been in touch with CBS? Have they called you?

They said they were going to be in touch with you."

Cullerton: "That was about seatbelts, I think. The law right now says you cannot engage in any political discussion within any polling place or within a hundred feet of any political... of any polling place. That's the law right now. So, you don't need this Bill."

Olson: "A lot of people feel we do."

Cullerton: "Why? You tell me why we need it?"

Olson: "County clerks feel people are being unduly harassed entering or exiting..."

Cullerton: "Where... Where are they being harassed?"

Olson: "About all downstate counties. It's a very..."

Cullerton: "But they're not being harassed within a hundred feet of the polling place."

Olson: "Oh, sure, because the ... "

Cullerton: "Well then, that's against the law right now."

Olson: "It isn't against the law. We should pass this Bill and let there be a constitutional test. May I count on your support, Representative Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "No. The... I encourage... I encourage everyone to vote against this Motion, go to a Conference Committee and maybe we can draft a Bill that actually does something."

Olson: "What would you suggest in Conference Committee? I'm
always a little nervous about sending election Bills to
Conference Committees. We already have one going to
Conference..."

Cullerton: "I have no intention of using this as a vehicle. I'd

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

just like to kill the Bill."

Olson: "That is your privilege, Sir. And I appreciate your..."

Speaker Greiman: "A man couldn't be more honest. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, on the Bill. When I was early in my voting days before I was an elected official, somebody polled me when I came out respecting a couple of issues we had voted on, and it really didn't bother me. So, I think it's okay. So, I'm going to vote against the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Effingham,
Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Olson: "Yes. Yes, Sir."

Brummer: "We've had a discussion regarding negative polling is the underlying Bill. which, of course, And if we concur, of course, that's final passage, and it goes to the I think we ought to look at the Governor's Office. Amendment on which there is concurrence. It seems to me there's things in there that...that I would agree with some things I disagree with. Number one, making precinct committeemen deputy registrars so that they could people anyplace in the county and not be limited to their own precinct. I agree with that. I notice on page five though when we expanded the places where people could register to vote, previously we had designated principals of high schools and now that language is stricken on page five. Why are we eliminating the ability to have principals of high schools or their designee appointed as deputy registrars so they can register the 18 year old students?"

Olson: "That concern has been covered in House Bill 2853 which we concurred on a couple of hours ago which takes out the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

specificity of the time they may register and basically permits them to register at any time."

Brummer: "Yes, but that Bill has not yet been signed into law; and, if the Governor for some reason vetoes that, and I don't think we can avoid the necessity of a Governor's signature until it becomes law, if he for some reason does not sign that and this Bill passes, we would no longer be able to have principals as deputy registrars. Is that correct?"

Olson: "Well, Representative Brummer, under Senate Bill 1301,
which was the President of the Senate's Bill and the
Speaker of the House Bill last year, we now have in place
in the State of Illinois promulgated rules by the State
Board of Election which will, in essence, make virtually
everybody in the state be a possible registrar. I think we
will have plenty of registrars."

Brummer: "Well, are we indicating any legislative intent here by now striking the current law which says principals can be deputy registrars?"

Olson: "I don't think so."

Brummer: "Well, why are we striking it then? Why are we striking the language that authorizes principals to be deputy registrars?"

Olson: "It is struck for the reason that it feels that we are covering this in some other areas, and it is unnecessary."

Brummer: "But that has not yet been signed into law."

Olson: "I anticipate it will be. I am not a seer, but I think it will comfortably be there, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Olson: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Van Duyne: "We have an unusual case, Representative, in our county. Sometimes our county clerk - well, to use a phrase - drags her feet a little bit. So that.. that prompts my question. Is there any penalty in here for county clerks who do not provide supplies for these deputy registrars?"

Olson: "Supplies?"

Van Duyne: "Well, we can't register them on a postcard. We can't repre... We can't register then on a styrofoam plate. can't register them on a napkin or whatever. So. it's necessary for us to have a regular form that is supplied by the county clerk on which to register any prospective Now, it's been, in our county especially, voterit's probably just a quirk, but all the Democrat deputy registrars are the ones that are always having the trouble getting supplies from the county clerk. Is there any provision in this Bill for castigating the ... or in any way punishing the county clerk like about a thousand dollar a day fine or something like that for not supplying deputy registrars with needed supplies?"

Olson: "Senate Amendment #1 says that by virtue of being a committeeman, you will be a duly authorized deputy registrar and, with that, goes the legislative intent to do whatever is necessary to implement the Bill."

Van Duyne: "You're avoiding my question, Sir."

Olson: "No."

Van Duyne: "I asked you specifically, is there any penalty for a county clerk who does not supply deputy registrars with their needed forms?"

Olson: "We have not specified a penalty."

Van Duyne: "Okay. Thank you. So, see, I can't vote for it either."

Olson: "Whatever."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Breslin in the Chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brookins."

Brookins: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Brookins: "Mr. Olson, did I understand you to say that this will remove the principals to become deputy registrars?"

Olson: "Sorry. I didn't hear you."

Brookins: "Will this prevent principals of high schools to become deputy registrars?"

Olson: "The language here will strike those. Correct. They are going to be covered in another Chapter."

Brookins: "I passed a Bill, 751, last year which was signed into law, and this will repeal that Bill?"

Olson: "I don't believe it will. No. This has reference to new incidents. The permissiveness of citing people at... To register people at the polls is so broad based in some other legislation that we have already in place that is signed. For example, 2853 which just passed out of here. You will... I remember when your Bill came through the Elections Committee, and I was supportive of that. So, I would not be a party to putting you out in left field."

Brookins: "So this is covered in the House Bill ..."

Olson: "2853."

Brookins: "2853."

Olson: "And 1301 is so broad based on registration that virtually any civic group, League of Women Voters, labor organizations will be permitted to register voters."

Brookins: "Thank you."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I don't often rise on this floor, but I think this is a bad Bill this time, and it should be defeated. I know I heard the discussion on this

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Bill on many occasions. This is the kind of Bill that you give a precinct committeeman the opportunity to go around with a registration cards in his pocket, maybe put them into a drawer or someplace and never get to the clerk's office. And it certainly will hurt everyone, hurt most of the people throughout the state. This is one Bill that I do not think should pass. We should all be defeated."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson, to close."

"I • d Olson: iust like to speak to Representative Taylor's comments on that. The Amendment to permit deputy precinct committeemen was offered by registrars to be Representative Larry Hicks on your side of the aisle and was agreed to by here and has passed through on a couple of sides. So that is not a valid concept. We are only speaking of downstate. We're not addressing the issues your fine community, and we have no problem with county clerks with either Elections Committee on both sides of the aisle. Just to close, Madam Speaker, I'll briefly remind everyone that this Bill passed out unencumbered in the House 84 to 19 on May 10th. The Senate has moved it on to 13. Unless we have some extraneous forces at work which we will soon find out I would assume then we'll have a favorable Roll Call vote on 2952."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2952. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 45 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no' and 10 voting 'present', and the Motion to concur fails. Representative Olson. Representative Olson wishes now to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2952. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

no discussion, all those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2952. House Bill 2961, Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2961, a Bill for an Act providing for state collection of certain locally imposed taxes, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961. We sent House Bill 2961 over. It authorizes the state to agree to collect county and municipal taxes similar to taxes imposed by this state. The Department of Revenue wanted Amendment #1 for ease of administration, and it basically says that they don't want to collect taxes where there are specialty taxes levied on such things as sales taxes only for restaurants or special sales taxes for motor fuels. Where the taxes are the same kinds of taxes that the Department of Revenue now collects, they say, 'Fine. We'll collect them, but we don't want to be responsible for collecting specialty taxes.' I'd move for the adoption of... or concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961. And on that question, the
Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Wolf: "Representative Keane, does this now permit the Department of Revenue to collect taxes or sales tax imposed by a home rule unit?"

Keane: "It... Let me hold on for a second. The limitation that they have deals with local sales taxes, and the Amendment

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

forbids the Department from entering into contracts with municipalities or counties unless the local tax is assessed on a basis identical to the state's tax base. So, if there is a specialty tax, let's say that the home rule unit specialty tax above and beyond normal taxes for cigarettes, they don't ... the Department does not have to agree to that, because they don't want to go into the bookkeeping of saying, 'We collect this'. But where the base tax is the same, that's fine. They can agree. It's strictly permissive. The whole Bill is permissive. Ιf the Department of Revenue doesn't like it, they don't have to do it.

Wolf: "I understand that, but if a home rule unit were to pass a sales tax over and above the state sales tax, which is based on all of the same criteria that the state sales tax is, then the Department of Revenue would collect that sales tax."

Keane: "That's correct. That's correct."

Wolf: "With a retention on the same basis as the original sales tax?"

Keane: "I would assume that there would be the same small fee..."

Wolf: "Two percent. Two percent."

Keane: "... a collection fee that the Department would levy."

Wolf: "Thank you very much. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Wolf: "This Bill now looks to be in the same concept of... to a
Bill that I introduced a year ago and which, when it
arrived at the Senate, I think was defeated by something
like 18 to 1 in the Senate Revenue Committee. I'm
certainly glad to see that the Senate has come to its
senses and seen the light. Thank you."

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

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the Sponsor might yield for a question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Vinson: "Representative, in the event that the Department of Revenue and the Governor agreed to collect these compatible taxes in one year and then subsequently there... an administration change, and the new Department of Revenue and the new Governor no longer wanted to collect the taxes, would they be able to do that, to opt out?"

Keane: "Yes. It's my understanding that they can opt out."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Reane, to close."

Keane: "I think the Bill... or the Amendment and the Bill have been discussed. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2961. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2992. Representative Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2992, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to vending facilities together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992. House Bill 2992 is the Bill that we

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

passed dealing with the blind vendor's program. And as it passed the House, it required the Department to establish objective criteria as far as who gets the various...blind vendor stands and to notify all the participants in program when there is a vacancy at a stand. Senate Amendment #1 Sponsored by Senator Demuzio. requires that all full-time teachers at facilities for the visually or hearing impaired operated by DORS, receive the vacation, holiday, sick leave and personnel (sic-personal) days given to all other state employees under the Personnel Code. There are currently 77 teachers at the Illinois School for the Deaf and 33 at the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired, who do not receive vacations or holiday, despite the fact they re full-time employees. If they were teaching in the public school system - anywhere in state, they would receive these holidays and vacations. Ιf they were any other state employees doing anything else, they would receive this. This Amendment simply puts these individuals on a par with everybody else who teaches and every other state employee."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
  Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992. And on that question, the
  Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."
- Mays: "Bractly, how many holidays are we talking about adding to their current schedule?"
- Levin: "According to the analysis I'm looking at, it says that at the ISD, educators are paid for a 180 school days and that ISVI a 185. In terms of number of days, I'm not... I do not have that specific figure."
- Mays: "My analysis indicates there would be 13 state holidays

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- added to their pay."
- Levin: "Okay. Well that is what state employees, other state employees receive. You know, I don't question that."
- Mays: "How many vacation days are we talking about here?"
- Levin: "Again, I don't have that ... "
- Mays: "My analysis would indicate that there will be almost seventeen and a half vacation days added. How many personal and sick days?"
- Levin: "It is my understanding, Representative, that they only...
  that the rest of this, they already receive. So that, what
  we are talking about is vacations and holidays is what
  they're not getting now, and so that's only effect this
  Amendment would have is on the vacations and the holidays."
- Mays: "The Amendment addresses sick leave as well as personal days doesn't it?"
- Levin: "It does, and they are currently receiving that. So this makes no affect... has no affect on that policy."
- Mays: "What is their current contract period for?"
- Levin: "Pardon... There are two... My understanding is, that in one case, there is one union that represents employees and at the other school, it's a different union. So, I... you know, I don't know what the contract periods are. One is the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the other is the APSCME. They each represent one of these units."
- Mays: "Lady... Is this currently a topic of negotiation between the respective unions and Central Management Services?"
- Levin: "It is my understanding that Central Management Service would like to make it a topic of negotiation."
- Mays: "It is my understanding that this has been a topic in negotiation for the past year with these two unions and Central Management Services, currently. If you were a bargainer with the... on the management side, Representative, would you interpret this as a good faith

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

effort on the part of the unions in circumventing their collective bargaining process and coming directly to the Legislature?

Levin: "I think this is a matter of simple justice. It makes no sense to me, that every other teacher in the State of Illinois gets holidays and vacation days, and every other state employee that's full-time receives holidays and vacations pay. To single out one group, the teachers, handicapped individuals, visually and hearing impaired and say, they shall not receive what everybody else receives. I think it's simple justice that we do this."

"Well, I was... To the Bill, Madam Speaker. I'm glad to Mays: hear the equity argument so eloquently raised by the Sponsor of this concurrence Motion. In fact, he mentioned his presentation, his opening remarks, that the school year for the employees, even though they're considered full-time, is between a hundred...185 days. Your average state employee with standard work week, works a total of days plus, minus those provided by various leave position... provision. What you're doing here is giving them something that no other state employee has for a comparable work week or work year. They're currently being... and under this proposal, we will be adding 13 They are off, might I remind you, holidavs. between and August 1st. So you'll be giving them July 4th. They're also off Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, you name for two additional weeks. So they're getting 13 state holidays under this. They'll be getting 17 days estimated for vacation, even though they re off two months when no other state employee gets that. And they will be three days of sick leave added to the provisions of their current contract when this Bill passes. Currently, get three-fourths of that which represents the amount of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

time that they are working for the State of Illinois in relation to the other employees in the State of Illinois. Above and beyond all of that though, I urge a 'no' vote concurrence Motion because this topic has considered and been discussed in good faith for the last with the Department of Central Management Services topic. this very And what we're doing is setting precedent in this chamber, and we do that all the time. 1 quess people can think nothing of it, but we're setting very dangerous precedent in this chamber for all public employee unions to go right around the collective bargaining process when they don't get it at the table. They come right here. We might as well abolish these unions and just decide it right here, if that's the will of Let him cast a vote 'yes' and if you agree Sponsor. with that, you cast your green vote. I don't think that's appropriate. I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Tuerk: "Well, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman from Adams covered the subject matter quite well. Actually, the basic points here are the inequity of process. plus the fact that they are circumventing the bargaining agreement and the bargaining table legitimate negotiations coming to the Legislature, asking for an inequitable package here, which is far and more generous than what other state employees get. join the Gentleman from Adams in opposing the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in favor of this concurrence, and thank my friend, Mr.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Levin, for concurring...trying to concur in this Amendment. Basically, the issue that we're trying to address is simply one of fairness and one of equity. We have throughout this state, a good number of state institutions where we have people who work year around, and they simply do a good job, and they're simply given benefits which are A 1 1 we're asking for is in these two state institutions in Jacksonville, the School for the Blind and the School for the Deaf, that we give these state employees, who work equally hard and do an equally good job, to also have the same benefits and the same type of agreement with the State of Illinois as we give to other state employees throughout the State of Illinois. The issue is simply fairness equity. I think this is a good proposal, and I think we should vote "ves"."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's interesting that we're discussing equity here because these fine people that work in these schools have been working without a contract for several years, but yet, they dedicate their time at these schools working with these people that have these handicaps - working, I would indicate on holidays and other times when all of the rest of us are not required to work, and all they're asking is to be treated the same - to be treated fairly. So as a consequence, I would rise in support and indicate that the equities are in favor of those people and would ask for a favorable vote."

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

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Hastert: "Representative, I'm just trying to get some points

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

clear. You said that the contract for these people is the employment of for a 185 days. Is that correct?"

Levin: "A 180 days, which is the ... "

Hastert: "A 180 days."

Levin: "Which is the same as the dietary workers, the dorm workers and the administrative personnel."

Hastert: "Well... And so their salary... and they're paid for a 185... 180 days. Correct?"

Levin: "There is currently no contract."

Hastert: "Well, that they do negotiate these contracts. Is that correct? Don't they... They have to be under contract.

Isn't that not correct?"

Levin: "My understanding is they've been at impasse for..."

Hastert: "Would you speak louder, please? I can't hear you."

Levin: "They're not... There has not been a contract, I believe, for the last year. The problem is, there is no contract right now, and I believe there has not been a contract for the last year."

Hastert: "So would this be the practice then, of this Body when there is no contract, that we are the negotiators? Are we trying... Are you trying to negotiate in for the con... in the law... what would be their contract normally?"

Levin: "I... You know, I think here we're talking about basic equity. In this particular situation, I think we have to go a particular situation at a time. The teachers in these two schools, for the visually and hearing impaired, work a 180 days, they're considered full-time, they do not... get the holidays or the vacation. At the same school, working the same length of time, the dietary workers, the dorm workers, the administrative personnels, they do get these holidays. Every other state employees get holidays. Every other teacher in the State of Illinois gets holidays. And I think we ought to look at the particular situation. I

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

think this is one that the equities are well on the side of this particular Amendment.  $^{n}$ 

Hastert: "Well, Representative... To the Bill, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Hastert: "I think you'll find that any other teaching employee in the state is under a contract. Most of them are under a contract for a 185 days. These people are fortunate enough to be under a contract for a 180 days for various sums of money whatever that is negotiated and whatever they decide that that sum of money should be. Any other teacher in the State of Illinois contrary to what the Representative from Chicago says, teaches for a 195 or 180 days, whatever the contract might say. The holidays are inconsequential, I think that's a basic issue that you have to look at here. It's a basic issue that those people are paid 180th of their salary everyday that they work. That's what the school schedule is. That's how any other school schedule in the State of Illinois is, and when we start saying that we're contracting or paying these people for a 180 days and then cutting out and giving them vacation time on top of that - that completely circumvents the whole process, the whole contract...process, the whole negotiation process, the Bills that we passed out of here last year on public And I just think it's a terrible concept, negotiations. and I think it's a terrible precedent. And I don't really understand where the Gentleman from Chicago - what he's trying to do, unless he's just trying to open up a whole can of worms and upset the whole negotiation process that we have in this state. It's absurd. It's absolutely absurd to try to say that you're going to pay people for a 180 days and then, say that on top of that they only work certain days during the week, and then that they have to be

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

paid for days that they're not even there that school isn't taught. I don't see where that Gentleman is coming from. It think this deserves a 'no' vote and would urge everybody in this Body to vote 'no' on this issue."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I think maybe some of the people who have recently spoken should listen very carefully to what I'm going to say. This group at the School for the Deaf and the School for the Visually Impaired has been in this situation for many a year. And I don't know whether I have to say this or not, but I went down there and worked with them on these very problems in the 1960's when I was State President of the IFT and problem is here. They are neither fish nor fowl. They're not educational workers - completely state workers. They're not teachers. They are... have to be certified teachers, but they are hired on a twelve month basis by the state as educational workers. They are not hired as Therefore, if they are educational workers on a teachers. long hiring by the state, they should be given the state holidays, sick days and all of the rest of it that state workers have. They are not hired as teachers. I think we ought to understand this before you get up and speak on it. These people are state workers on a year long contract paid on a twelve month basis and therefore, should be treated as state workers. They certainly are not treated as teachers, and I would secure... help secure your vote on this because maybe we can determine whether they're teachers or state employees by this vote."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to close."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

House. Just in closing, I would concur in what both шу colleaques, Representative Oblinger and Representative Ryder said, this is a unique situation. Every other state employee receives holidays and vacations. Every other school employee in the public school receives this. other employee who works at the school system, at these two facilities, the dietary workers, the dorm workers, the administrative personnel receive it. It's basic that they should receive it as well, and I ask for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. voting 'aye'. 29 voting "no". and 2 \*present\*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992. And this Bill, having received the necessary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 3031, Representative Currie. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3031, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Civil Administrative Code together with Senate Amendments
#1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. T move the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 +0 Bill 3031. House Senate Amendment 1 contains recommendations for the Block Grant Advisory Committee. recommendations include changing the date of our report to the General Assembly so as to meet state agency budgeting timetable. They also prescribe public hearings for the agencies with respect to distribution of Pederal

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Block Grant dollars in the State of Illinois. Senate Amendment 2 is an effort to respond to a Supreme Court declaration that... preference for Illinois laborers on public constructions project was in some respect unconstitutional. The language in Senate Amendment 2, I think, deals adequately with the court's concerns, and I would urge concurrence on both these Amendments in this Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Greiman in the Chair. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3031. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will."

Klemm: "Representative Currie, on Senate Amendment #2 one of the questions or one of the points in our analysis says that it defines in Illinois laborer, and it says that it's a person who resides in Illinois for at least 30 days and intends to become to remain in Illinois resident. Do they have to file an affidavit or something? How do you determine whether they're going to remain or intends to remain?"

Currie: "I think the assumption would be in favor of somebody who, as an employee, would expect to remain in Illinois, and I think the obvious assumption is that anytime somebody has accepted a job, the chances are they intend to continue holding that job and thus, the assumption is that the individual intends to continue residence in the state."

Kleam: "But it's not..."

Currie: "There is no requirement of affidavit."

Klemm: "It's not a requirement of some sort of certification or something like that."

Currie: "Affidavit No."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Klemm: "It's not a matter of just that. If someone has been here

30 days, they apply for the job, we assume they're going to
be here."

Currie: "If someone challenges that Section with respect to an individual, there certainly is no requirement for affidavits or certification or anything even like it."

Klemm: "Could somebody challenge that somebody is... lives in Indiana? their home is there, but they've applied for a job across the state line?"

Currie: "I assume someone could challenge."

Klemm: "What would happen then?"

Currie: "Well if it were, indeed... The language of the Amendment does specify that there are certain situations in which this preference does not apply. If, for example, there are not available laborers that are Illinois residents on any construction project, the manager would have the option of automatically certifying, I think the number is 3, individuals for whatever position..."

Klemm: "Well I'm not worried about that part of it. I wasn't concerned about that part, I'm just talking the certification or something."

Currie: "But I would assume that somebody who didn't... some
Illinois resident who did not get that job would be able to
file suit against the project construction management
people on the grounds that they were violating the law,
what I'm suggesting is that there are exemptions for
certain numbers of employees who do not need the
requirements of this Act."

Klemm: "All right. Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a question."

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

141st Legislative Day June 27, 1984

Vinson: "Representative, would you care to explain..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Representative Greiman in the Chair.

Go ahead."

Vinson: "What I'd say?"

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon me?"

Vinson: "Did I say something?"

Speaker Greiman: "No, I said something. I said Representative Greiman in the Chair."

Vinson: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Greiman: "Now you can say something. Go ahead, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "That's probably right on the record, but we all new it
the minute you got in there. Representative Currie, would
you care to explain to the Assembly what happens when the
Emperor shut off Japan to the world?"

Currie: "It sounds to me, Representative Vinson, like a rhetorical question, and it sounds to me as if you'd love to answer the question yourself."

Vinson: "Would you care to explain to me what happens when the Chinese built the Great Wall of China?"

Currie: "Representative Vinson, we are on House Bill 3031, a concurrence Motion, with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. I don't understand the relationship between your question and the action we are taking this afternoon."

Vinson: "I might explain."

Currie: "Please."

Vinson: "What happened when the Emperor shut off Japan and what happened when the Chinese built the Great Wall of China was that both civilizations stagnated. There was no economic growth. There was no economic vitality. Now we created in this country a very different philosophy, a philosophy of growth, a philosophy of trade - free enterprise. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a pernicious Bill that would destroy

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

our free enterprise economy, have us stick our heads in the sand the way the Chinese and the Japanese did with probably the same results that we see what those are. I would urge a \*no\* vote on this pernicious Bill."

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

Bowman: "Well, I would like to respond to the last Gentleman.

The reason that the Chinese's economy stagnated is because they imported Mongolians to build that wall. If they had used Chinese to build that wall, their economy would have moved forward, and that's what we're trying to do here. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will yield."

Piel: "I won't try to keep up with your seatmate."

Speaker Greiman: "But the question must be about this century.

Proceed, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "What rule's that covered? Never mind."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

Piel: "I notice that the Bill allows an exemption in cases where there is a sufficient number of Illinois laborers that is not available. Could you give me an example of such exemption please?"

Currie: "The exemption applies, Representative Piel, when you let out news that you are hiring people and no Illinois residents apply."

Piel: "Right, but I'd like a specific type of a thing. In other words, by reading this, I would almost say like Illinois wasn't qualified to have laborers in a specific area. I'm trying to figure out what area that we would... that this would stick in."

Currie: "If there is a fire and an oil pump on a derrick, for

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

example, we do not have people in Illinois who are competent to perform that particular task."

Piel: "A fire on an oil pump in a derrick."

Currie: "That's an example. You ask..."

Piel: "You're talking about an..."

Currie: "You ask for an example, I gave you an example."

Piel: "...your offshore well..."

Currie: "Well, off the-off the Lake Michigan Shore, for example."

Piel: "Okay. Yeah, I noticed all. I went out fishing off those oil wells off Lake Michigan many times. It also allows an exemption for no more than three nonresident executives, or technical experts for anyone firm employed on a public works project. Why do you have that? In other words, you can sit and say that we have to have all laborers from Illinois but the executives. We can ... We don't have to worry about the executives as long as there is no more than three executives from another state."

Currie: "Sometimes if there is a substantial construction project, the firm hired maybe one that does... that has sort of a national reputation or works in other places across the country. The particular expertise we require on the job may mean that the company that's hired to perform the project would have to rely on somebody who has the expertise within the company, but does not, in fact, live in the State of Illinois."

Piel: "What if it is a bi-state project, case in point, that if you had two states working together or even one state.

Let's say Illinois was working on a bridge that went across the Mississippi River happened to... or another type of a bridge that happened to be or a roadway that happened to be between Indiana and Illinois. How would that fit in when you're talking about two different states?"

Currie: "Well, that's not specifically addressed the Bill, but I

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

would assume that to the extent that we're using Illinois dollars for that share to construction project. Whatever proportion of the dollars that make up the total that are Illinois dollars, would require notice of this particular Act."

Piel: "In other words, what you're saying is that the Illinois workers who work up to the stateline, they are using Illinois dollars."

Currie: "No, no, I'm not saying that at all. No, I'm saying that
you would presumably, if 50% of a project were paid for by
Illinois taxpayers, then I would think 50% of the project,
of the workers of the project would have to meet the
requirements of this Act."

Piel: "Don't you think that something like that should definitely be addressed in this thing if you're going for concurrence?"

Currie: "Pardon me, Representative Piel?"

Piel: "Don't you think that should definitely be addressed in this if you're going with the concurrence?"

Currie: "Well, let me remind the Gentleman..."

Piel: "You say it's not specifically. I mean, you're talking about a major piece of legislation that says..."

Currie: "Let me remind the Gentleman that this is not a new piece of legislation before the Members of this House. In fact, the provisions contained in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3031 are precisely the provisions that were in House Bill 2836, which passed out of this House overwhelmingly during the month of May."

Piel: "Barbara, that's not what I'm saying. That's not what I'm saying."

Currie: "I believe there were more than 85 votes for ... "

Piel: "What I'm trying to say... I'm not talking about a Bill before. I'm talking about, you know, two wrongs don't make

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- a right, I'm saying, don't you think that that should be addressed in this before this is signed into law?"
- Currie: "I don't think there is any need to. It seems to me that
  you're creating a red hearing. There isn't a problem with
  a joint state construction project. I am suggesting
  further that this is not a new issue. The suggestions that
  we're coming up here with something that's brand new to the
  Members of the House, does not fit the facts."
- Piel: "Okay. Let me ask one more question. There are certain locals, and I'll pick one, for instance, that covers my area of the state. It covers Chicago and Gary. Now what... How... Are you going to sit here and say that that local can only employ Illinois workers if that local happens..."
- Currie: "Well, let me remind the Gentleman. I'm not sitting here saying anything."
- Piel: "I think you're violating labor law there."
- Currie: "I'm standing here and I'm saying that the requirements of the Act kick in only if unemployment is above 5% in two consecutive months. I do say that Illinois has had on the statute books for many years, a preference for Illinois labor on public construction projects. This is really to reiterate the General Assembly's commitment to the public taxpayer dollars on public construction projects should find their way back into the Illinois economy - help stabilize the Illinois economy by hiring people who live within the state when that's appropriate. This is not a new issue before the Assembly. The issue before us is to try to make sure that what we do, we do constitutionally. The statute book has contained language like this for a very long time. We're talking about stabilizing an economy that has been in serious trouble during these last six years of the Thompson Administration.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

I think this is the kind of effort that will help Illinois get back off the economic ground and put, not only stability, but some growth back into our way of doing business."

Piel: "That sounded fantastic, but you never answered my question. What do you do when you have a local? You're technically violating labor... their local labor organizations' laws, which you can sit here and cannot take a labor from Indiana, they've all got to be from Illinois when both the states are comprising that same local. And that's exactly what #2 states."

Currie: "Well, I don't think that it's up to us to say that any kind of agreement within a particular union ought to tell us what we may and may not do by statute. I would tell you, Representative Piel, that this Bill has strong support from organized labor in the State of Illinois."

Piel: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, whether you're for, or whether you are against this piece of legislation, I brought up some things that one could be classified technically unconstitutional to violating other You're infringing on labor union agreements and one thing and another. I think when you sit here - you look at you should definitely take a close look at the way you're voting for a Bill that has major defects. The Sponsor does not want to clear up these defects. well the intent of this is this, the intent of that. That is not the way that the law in Illinois is supposed to be written. We don't put in there saying think the intent is this. When you write laws in Illinois, they are laws that have to govern the people in Illinois. If we are going to pass legislation that certain intents

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

are implied, I think we're making a grave mistake, and I would ask at this time that you vote 'no', send this to the Conference Committee and clear up these problems. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic - Mr. Speaker). I'd like to speak in support of this Bill for a couple of reasons. Number one, we've seen an economic downturn in Illinois that is unprecedented over the last few years. 400,000 jobs were lost in Illinois in the last four this Bill seems to address and does so adequately is the fact that Illinois taxpayers money will be used on projects to hire Illinois people so they may become taxpayers and help the economy of Illinois. a very fine Bill. It's one that will help Illinois, and I urge your positive consideration of this Motion."

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

Hallock: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will."

Hallock: "This Bill kicks in, you said, at 5% unemployment?"

Currie: "Pive percent unemployment."

Hallock: "I think probably what you're saying in effect then for recent times and for the future that we may have this policy on the books for a long time unless the economy rebounds tremendously."

Currie: "Well, I would hope, Representative Hallock, that provisions in Bills like this might help our own economy rebound. Five percent used to be considered an outrageously high level of unemployment. I hope we can return..."

Hallock: "Well, it seems to me as we look at the nation as a

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

whole, 5% is kind of the optimum rate that has been achieved in terms of unemployment."

- Currie: "At the moment, I'm hopeful that changes in directions of Federal Government policy and perhaps, state policies across the country could bring us back to a time when 5% was high, not low figure."
- Hallock: "Well, President Reagan is getting us more in that direction, you're right, and I agree with you on that.

  Let me ask you one question. Isn't currently... doesn't it currently happen that when an employer from out of state receives a state public contract that he goes and hires local Illinois employees?"
- Currie: "Well, He may or may not. I think the provisions of Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3031 would ensure that he does just that. Let me remind you, Representative Hallock, that we've had this legislation on the Illinois statute books since 1939 without any kind of trigger at all. This is not a new issue. It's not new to the way we do business in the State of Illinois, if what you're suggesting is that out of state contractors are likely to employ Illinois residents. It's probably because they were abiding by the statute that already has been on the statute books since

Hallock: "Thank you very much."

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

Priedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the farther we go - the more the arguement about the Great Wall of China makes sense. This is the United States of America, and people and goods flow freely across state lines. We've got people in Illinois to go to other states and work. Now, it would be very simple once we pass this Bill. Every other state in union will pass a similar Bill, and you'll have people confined to their own state. That's just like it is in Russia. They

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

tell you where you can work, where you can cross a border, what you can do, what you can eat and everything else. How far down the road are we going to go in this United States to divide it and so to keep it as one great country?"

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

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. The Sponsor of the Bill was good enough to make this part her Bill. We passed this Bill out of the House, a Bill similar to this, out of the House by 85 votes less than month ago. We talked on this floor about providing jobs for the people that do not have jobs. This is unemployment relief, economic relief, to help the people that cannot find jobs. And if you're not going to start worrying about people in your neighborhood, and your county, and your district, you're going to go back and say that you did vote for a Bill that could possibly put them back to work, then you go back and do it. We need green votes on that We should have more than the 85 we had the first hoard. time a month ago on this Bill, and I urge a green vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, to close briefly."

Currie: "Thank you. Speaker, Members of the House. Mr. Amendment 2 to House Bill 3031 targets the Illinois worker. It says there will be a preference. It doesn't say that if an Illinois laborer is not available you can't hire anybody to get the job done. Although the issue is construction project, there are no walls being built in this provision. Most states have residential preference language on their statute books. We've had the same in the State of Illinois since 1939. I think the discussion today has been a picky discussion. It has not dealt with the real concept here, which is to say let's help our

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

economy grow. Let's make sure Illinois people have a chance to work on the projects that are supported by Illinois taxpayers. Let me remind you that Senate Amendment 1 deals with recommendations from the Advisory Committee on block grants to see to it that our reporting schedule to you matches the reporting schedule of state agencies and ensures openness, public hearings on the dissemination distribution of federal block grants in the State of Illinois. The underlying Bill, House Bill 3031, requires public hearings before distribution of Federal Job Partnership Training Act Funds in the state as well. I urge concurrence on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3031."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3031?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3031, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3036. Out of... Yes, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "With leave, I'll handle that Bill. Representative

Breslin asked me to handle it for her."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Does the Gentleman have leave to handle that Bill? Okay, you have leave. All right, Mr. Clerk, call the... read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3036, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Environmental Protection Act together with Senate

Amendments #1 and 2."

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

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 3036. The original Bill amends the Environmental Protection Act, and it provides that a State's Attorney or Attorney General may be awarded cost and reasonable attorney's fees when he prevails in prosecuting a person who has violated the Amendment... The Amendment... Amendment #1 said that if the awarding of attorney's fees to a State's Attorney or Attorney General where they have prevailed against a violator of the EPA, shall apply only where willful, knowing or repeated violations have been committed. Ιt deletes the provision providing for funds collected in a case where State's Attorney has prevailed to be retained by the county in which he serves. Amendment #2 requires... is the dioxins Amendment which passed this House earlier under House Bill 2401, and it passed by a substantial majority. This Bill... This Amendment requires the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations on the control of dioxin. I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for agreement on concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3036. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield for question."

Cullerton: "Representative Keane, as I understand the original Bill, it amended the Environmental Protection Act to permit State's Attorneys or the Attorney General to collect attorneys' fees in a successful prosecution of people violating the Act. Is that correct?"

Keane: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Now, Senate Amendment #1 says that those fees will

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

not be awarded unless there are willful, knowing or repeated violations of the Act."

Keane: "That's correct. That was... Amendment #1 was an Amendment that was requested by manufacturers."

Cullerton: "By whom?"

Keane: "Manufacturers."

Cullerton: "Okay. Now, that makes sense for the first part. Now
the second part of that Amendment deletes the Section that
says 'the county keeps the award'. This would be in the
case of, as I understood the Bill, the Attorney General
brought the award then the attorney's fees will go into a
fund, not the General Revenue Fund, but the Hazardous Waste
Fund, but if the State's Attorneys brought the action, then
the fees would go to the county, and Senate Amendment #1
struck that portion that says that, 'the county gets to
keep the award'. Is that correct?"

Keane: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Now where, then, does the money go?"

Keane: "I think by lack of statement it goes into EPA. It comes into the... My understanding is that money comes into the General Revenue Fund."

Cullerton: "Well, if you look at Senate Amendment #1... Look at that Amendment, on page two of the Amendment."

Keane: "Page two of the Amendment, I think ... "

Cullerton: "I think page two, lines 34 and 35."

Keane: "The Amendment that I have of Amendment #1 is a one page

Amendment with six lines."

Cullerton: "Maybe then... then let's look at the original Bill on page two. It says that any funds collected under this Subsection in which the Attorney General has prevailed shall be deposited in the Hazardous Waste Pund. Are you saying then that the State's Attorneys will not be reimbursed if they bring the action and that the money

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

would go to the Hazardous Waste Fund?"

Keane: "That's my understanding."

Cullerton: "Well that would seem to me to provide a disincentive

for the State's Attorneys to bring the action, and I

wondered if that was also requested by the manufacturers or

was it requested by somebody else."

Keane: "No, my understanding is that that the information or the... What was requested by the manufacturers was the willful, knowing or repeated violations of the Act."

Cullerton: "Well..."

Keane: "I am not sure the..."

Cullerton: "That's just the policy..."

Keane: "I don't..."

Cullerton: "...decision that people would have to make, think that this... The second part is... it doesn't make sense. It seems to me that our Amendment in the Amendment #1, perhaps. Amendment #2 offered or Representative Breslin, specifically set up this situation where if the Attorney prevails, the money went into the Hazardous Waste Fund, if the State's Attorney prevails, the money went to reimburse the county. I think it made sense, and I just don't understand why we're changing that Section in the Senate Amendment. And I think that ... I don't care so much about the manufacturer's request, but the second part the... is a bad policy, because it would seem to the State's Attorneys from bringing these discourage actions."

Keane: "It may... I don't know what went into the thinking of Senator Welch when he put this Amendment in. It may be that they wish to keep frivolous suits from being brought forward."

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

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise for purposes of a parliamentary

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

inquiry. Senate Amendment #2, page two, lines 31 through 34 would purport to amend Section V of the Illinois Administrative Procedures Act. Article IV, Section 8 of the Illinois Constitution, it states in part that a Bill amending the law shall set forth completely the Sections amended. That is not the case in regards to what this Bill does. Because of that, the Amendment is clearly out of order, and the Chair should so rule it as out of order."

Speaker Greiman: "We'll examine it. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Keane: "Yes. On a point of clarification. It just came to my attention that the rationale behind the questions that Representative Cullerton asked as to why the funds would no longer be retained by the county, where the prevailing State's Attorneys had brought the case, was so that those funds could go into the EPA clean-up funds and send it to reduce the number of... it was not intended to reduce the State's Attorney from entering cases for violation of problems, but rather than the money should go into the clean-up funds."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Marshall, Ms. Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic Mr. speaker) and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I would also rise opposition to Senate Amendment #1. I think that the thinking that the Senate displayed on that is entirely One of the reasons why I originally supported that Amendment that Representative Breslin had placed on legislation was because it gives them incentive to the local State's Attorney to go in and work on those cases that have to do with violation of landfill requirements. For example, when the Tazewell County areas, Tazewell County has become the first state... the first county in the State of Illinois to workout an agreement with

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, whereby the county can provide some enforcement (sic-assistance) to the IEPA, and the IEPA will delegate some of their authority to the local county state's attorney. And this Amendment would have allowed..."

- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Ms. Koehler. Mr. Keane, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Keane: "Yes, because of the questions on this, and the fact that

  I was... I felt that it would not be a major problem.

  This Bill was going to be an agreed Bill, and the Sponsor is not here. I would ask leave to take this out of the record until Representative Breslin returns."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Bill will be taken out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is the intention of the Chair to now take up appropriation Bills on the Order of Third Reading. We will be taking these up on orders by subject matter. The first subject matter to be considered is Community Development and Government Operation, and on that Order appears Senate Bill 1541. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 1541."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1541, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies and legislative commissions. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1541 is the Senate Bill that had the Senate's program in it, and now is the Senate Bill that has the House program in it, and it would include 4.197 million for the Legislative Service Bureau Operation that is known as the Daniels - Madigan plan. We did amend it for an additional \$25,000. If there have... Are there any questions, I'd be happy to answer them, if not, I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate
Bill 1541. And on that, is there any discussion? The
Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Nash: "How much was in this Bill when it came over from the Senate?"

Leverenz: "As the Bill arrived from the Senate, it had a voluminous \$8,949,412.00."

Nash: "And it was cut down to what?"

Leverenz: "That was just, I believe, part of it. The total was,

I'm sorry, the original total was \$12,822,812.00 Right

now, we are showing \$4,197,835.00."

Nash: "So you cut approximately \$8,000,000 off the Senate version. Is that correct?"

Leverenz: "Yes, trying to be very frugal and responsible as I'm sure you want to be to your constituents and your friends and to the Leadership of this House on both sides of the aisle. I would certainly solicit to Representative Nash, your 'aye' vote and total unfailing support."

Nash: "No more questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 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 Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin in the chair."

Speaker Breslin: "On the Special Order of Business dealing with Community and Government Operation appears Senate Bill 1552, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act making

- 141st Legislative Day

  Appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of
  - the Department of Central Management Services. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to bring the Bill back from Third..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment.

  Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, offered by Representative Barnes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Amendment #8 is offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, we're on Amendment #7. Amendment #7 is what is present."
- Barnes: "Amendment #7 adds \$85,200 to the Bureau of Personnel based on the withdrawal of Amendment #3. It's just a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady asks... The Lady moves that we adopt
  Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, is
  there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
  Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Could she... the Representative give an explanation of that briefly again?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Could you repeat your explanation,

  Representative Barnes?"
- Barnes: "It adds \$85,200 to the Bureau of Personnel based on the withdrawal of Amendment #3."
- Leverenz: "And what would that \$85,000 fund?"
- Barnes: "Amendment \$3 reduced the appropriation for the Bureau of
  Personnel by \$90,300 in General Revenue Fund to reflect the
  elimination of the technical assistants to local
  governments' unit."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Leverenz: "I seem to remember that. This, then just clears up the differences between Amendments."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston. Your light is on. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to speak. There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1552 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #8 would do the same thing, generally, that we did yesterday in reducing retirement, and that would be reduced by Amendment by \$66,900, putting it to 60% payout. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."

Tate: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to just request a Roll Call on this, so Members have an opportunity to be recorded 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1552 be adopted?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 78... 79 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and this Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

"Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #9 provides 6 staff and support lines for the Minority and Pemale Business Enterprise Division of the Department of Central Management Services. Por administration, the Minority and Pemale Business Enterprise Act, House Bill 3063, adds to personnel service, retirement, \$7700; social security, \$8800; contractual services, \$15,000; travel, \$8200; commodities, 3,000; equipment, \$4200; and telecommunications, printing, \$4,000; which is a total of a 160... \$176,700."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #9

to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, is there any
discussion? There being no discussion, the question is,
'Shall Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1552 be adopted?' All
those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In
the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the
Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative
Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1552 adds four staff to the Bureau of Personnel, Division of Examining and Counseling: one personnel technician I, \$11,900: one personnel technician II, \$11,900; one personnel assistant I, \$9800; personnel assistant II, \$10,800; one total personnel services, \$44,400; retirement, \$2500; social security, \$3100 for a total of 50,000. These four staff will and process examination for non-state employees. CMS cut

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- back this function in fiscal year '83 for reasons associated with a thought that unemployment would decline and fewer people would be looking at state jobs."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Would the Representative respond to a question or two?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."
- Leverenz: "What did you end it with, something about a reduction in jobs?"
- Barnes: "No. What I said was..."
- Leverenz: "Just at your end statement there, how your closed."
- Barnes: "I said that the reasons associated with the thought that unemployment would decline and fewer people would be looking at state jobs."
- Leverenz: "So we'd have to have more people to process the applications because fewer people would be looking for them."
- Barnes: "No. What I said, Representative, was that was the reason for last year, but this year now there are more people that are looking for jobs, and that's why we need these six executive recruitment staff."
- Leverenz: "So this year, more people are looking for state jobs.

  Will these people have to be qualified for these jobs,
  themselves?"
- Barnes: "I beg your pardon?"
- Leverenz: "Will the people that you employ in these four positions have to be qualified for those jobs, themselves?"
- Barnes: "Well, it... Anytime that I discuss having anyone get a state job, I know they have to take a test; and I know that they have to be qualified."
- Leverenz: "They'd have to be qualified. Correct?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Barnes: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "Would that include being able to decipher a precinct

map and vote totals and have a letter of sponsorship from

the proper person?"

Barnes: "Representative, you have your methods, and I have mine."

Leverenz: "I'll send my CMS 100's through your office. Thank you very much."

Barnes: "You're welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Bowman."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield to a question."

Bowman: "Representative Barnes, has the... the Bureau of the Budget approved this particular addition?"

Barnes: "Yes, they have, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Is... Was this a...a notification of this approval contained in a letter or memorandum signed by the Director, dated June 26, along with a list of other adjustments to appropriation Bills?"

Barnes: "Yes, it is."

"Well, Representative Barnes, I'm rising in opposition to Bowman: this Amendment because I find it rather remarkable that the Governor, who has control over the budget as introduced. would choose this time and place to add a very substantial list of items totaling several millions of dollars. is really only the first in a long line of Amendments that we will be seeing later this afternoon. So, although this is only about \$45,000, I think we ought to discuss what it is that we will be doing and how this fits into the larger pattern. We have been laboring very diligently in this House to keep the budget under control and to balance the We have even taken the unpopular and difficult budget. step of reducing the Senate appropriation request

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

retirement to the 60% of payout level. We have taken the very difficult and unpopular step of trying to limit the education budget. And all of these efforts on our part has been to try and balance the budget. Now recently, the ... there was some additional revenues which materialized as result of updated estimates, and suddenly, we're being presented by the Bureau of the Budget with a list of additions which, in my opinion, are intended to preempt legislative discussion of alternatives and an effort to gobble up those additional revenues for pet projects, and I object to that. And so, for that reason, I am rising in opposition to this particular Amendment and subsequent ones, which are on the list of pet projects and in hopes that we might be able to sit down and work these things out come up with a balance budget that is everybody. And I think since Representative Tate ask for a Roll Call on that personnel... retirement line - I think we ought to have a Roll Call on this particular one as well."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "I would ask for support on this Amendment. I think if a director of a department feels that this is what is necessary for him to do the job, then I would support the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House adopt
Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1552?' All those in favor
vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The
Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 39
voting... there are 40 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'no', and 1
voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any
further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative

141st Legislative Day
Barnes."

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Amendment #11, Central Manage (sic Management) Services is also requesting \$250,000 from the General Revenue Fund for Bureau of Personnel's contractual services. The legal fees expenditure account would hire counsel to defend the state in a comparable worth complaint American Nurses' Association versus the State of Illinois, now filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another one of those pet projects or add-ons or whatever you want to call them in the laundry list of BOB requests, which we got at the last minute and haven't had a chance to digest, and I again, would like... On the last one... I rise and object to this particular Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, I would merely ask for support of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 to Senate
  Bill 1552 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all
  those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted
  who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
  wish? Representative Matijevich one minute to explain your
  vote."
- Matijevich: "Yes, I would hope that more 'no' votes would occur on this side of the aisle on the arguments posed by Representative Woods Bowman. I think that he has taken the

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- responsible position on this, and I would urge Nembers on this side of the aisle to vote 'no' on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mays one minute to explain your vote."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to urge an 'aye' vote so that you will enable the state to adequately to defend itself on this comparable worth question. That's all the question is in this Amendment. If you want to emasculate the defense on this topic, you're going to get it by court 'fiat'. And I think the Labor and Commerce Committee has already rejected this concept previously this year. So I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 45 voting 'aye', 63 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative
  Barnes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, a request for \$500,000 from General Revenue Pund is for paying out awards arising under the Act to provide for representation and indemnification in certain civil lawsuits. This \$500,000 for attorney fees and small awards from civil courts that finds state officials and employees liable for some civil act such as discrimination."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "How was the 500,000 or half million dollar amount of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

General Revenue Funds arrived at and by who?"

- Barnes: "The Governor's Legal Counsel Office is the one that came up for the figure."
- Leverenz: "Well, they were talking in terms of two or \$300,000, and we heard about the half of million and it never went down, and I really don't see any justification for the Amendment at all. Now, do we have any idea of how many cases are going to end up getting settled? How many..."
- Barnes: "Representative, Representative McCracken has just come on the floor, and he has some in-depth..."
- Leverenz: "It's about time he got here."
- Barnes: "Right. He has some in-depth information on your questions, and I would defer to Representative McCracken, Madam Speaker.
- "Representative McCracken to answer questions." Speaker Breslin: McCracken: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. Excuse me. I was called away to the Senate. I've gotten information from a Mr. Tom "Lamont" of the Attorney General's Office, which he believes to be accurate for 1983, and as to their current caseload. They have approximately 600 to 700 cases currently on file under the Indemnification Act, two-thirds of those are civil rights cases, a third are personal injury cases. The average filings over the last year or two has been about 200 cases per year. In 1993, there were thirteen judgments, each in excess of \$100,000 for a payout on those major cases only, of over \$1,300,000. In 1984, based on that experience, they predict 10 to 12 cases with at least \$100,000 judgments each and 10 to 12 for next year."
- Leverenz: "Well, isn't it true that, for example, in the Court of Claims, after the Court of Claims goes through its processing and signed off by the Attorney General, then we find out how much the award is, and then we appropriate the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

money, and that should be the same way this operation should work, I mean, we're here every six months? The problem, as you indicated to me, was the Court of Claims wasn't processing the claims fast enough. Therein lies the problem. Why are we settling all the time? It's like the insurance companies that settle all of the time, and they never go to full distance and knock somebody out of the box, and so we don't have to pay anything."

McCracken: "Senate Bill 1928 did a couple of things. First, it recognized the fact..."

Leverenz: "Did it pass the House and Senate?"

McCracken: "It's in the Senate on concurrence. Senate Bill 1928 recognized that the Court of Claims has no jurisdiction make the awards in these matters, but also, it wanted or its intent additionally, was to set up a separate line item in the Central Management Services for the purpose paying these judgments. Now, that appropriation, in order to pay the judgments, is beneficial to the state for a couple of reasons. First, postjudgment interests runs on these matters - runs from the date of judgment to the date of satisfaction. That, on a \$100,000 case in six months at 12% interest, can come up to \$6,000. So it's pretty substantial. The second reason is because if you can settle claims promptly, the litigants are willing to take a reduced amount in return for a prompt settlement. And that was the thrust of 1928. This is the companion appropriation Bill. It creates the line item."

Leverenz: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Amendment. Proceed. The Amendment clearly, was a number as indicated to our staff and me yesterday and the day before. It was clearly pulled out of the air for which no rationale existed. We can do the same for Central Management Services that we can do for the Court of Claims.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

After the awards are made, we can find out what the real number is and plug that number into any vehicle Bill that is in motion. There is no need to take a half of million dollars and plug it in and hide it, so to speak, or squirrel it away, which is clearly what the administration wants to do in offering this Amendment. And finally to the last Gentleman that spoke, talking about the substantive Bill, we don't even have a Bill on the Governor's desk or signed that allows for this to happen in the first place. Therefore, I would ask a unanimous and 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken on the Bill."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Senate Bill 1928, which admittedly is in concurrence, had its thrust, as I've indicated, in two different areas. One, the Court of Claims and that procedure is no longer jurisdictionally sound. The second is that if we come back and appropriate only in response to judgments, we lose the function..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Leverenz: "The Gentleman said he wanted to speak to the Bill. We don't know which Bill it is, and we're on an Amendment in the first place and I think he spoke already."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Amendment #12, you may speak to
  Amendment #12, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, I am. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is Amendment #12 of an appropriations Bill which has a companion substantive Bill and is the reason for it. The point I m trying to make is that the argument that we can come back and appropriate at some later date after judgments have accrued, after interest has accrued, and after we've lost the use of that money for that reason, is not sound. The whole purpose of Senate Bill 1929, which is

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

the substantive companion Bill, was to avoid that. It's a benefit to the State of Illinois. This \$500,000 appropriated isn't going to be sitting in some shelf or some shoe box. It's going to be in the General Fund, and only when it's used, will it start not accruing interest, pursuant to the Treasurer's activities in that regard. We're not losing any money. We are very conservatively creating a new line item consistent with the substantive Bill. The purpose of which is to save money. So let's vote for it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Amendment is even worse than the last two, and it shares all of the defects of the last two Amendments and one additional one. These lawsuits haven't actually been settled yet. So what we're doing here, is we're padding the budget. We're squirreling cash away for no good reason. And it seems to me that this is, you know, irresponsible budgeting, because all we're doing here is tying up cash in useless ventures that may never require expenditures. I think that we shouldn't be squirreling dollars away here in this nook and dollars away there in that cranny. So I urge that we defeat this Amendment for a half of million dollars and put the money to good use elsewhere."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, Madam Speaker, I think there has been enough dialogue. I would merely ask for an \*aye\* vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 to Senate
Bill 1552 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all
those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 44 voting 'aye', 63 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative
Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1552 adds a \$189.5 (sic) adds back twelve months of funding for six staff and the Bureau of Personnel, Division of Executive Recruitment. Without the six executive recruitment staff, forty top management searches will be contracted out to private search firms, or the agency will proceed on its own."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman. Excuse me.

Amendment #13. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "At last, a good Amendment. We have no objection to this

Amendment. The Lady states the case very well. Thank

you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

Leverenz: "And just as an aside, the last Gentleman did not speak for me or a few other people. How many people then, will be restored with the Amendment?"

Barnes: "Six."

Leverenz: "For what?"

Barnes: "One, is an executive recruitment manager; one secretary
II; one executive recruiter I, two executive recruiter II,
one executive recruiters III. And then, there is money

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Leverenz: "Who was the last person this organization recruited of any worth or value? For example. I remember that the Executive Recruitment Division was going to go on states search for a new Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. And 10 and behold, we found one, I think, on a squash court or handball court. They were going to do this. Thev don't produce. How many people have they recruited for State Government?"

Barnes: "Well, what Central Management Services does, they recruit the people and they give the list for the people to be chosen. And, Representative, I don't know if they find them on squash courts or in your district or where they find them, but they do produce the list. And that is their job."

Leverenz: "Do you feel that this at all, the Executive

Recruitment Division competes at all with the private
sector?"

Barnes: "Probably so."

Leverenz: "Then Madam Speaker, to the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

"And certainly, there is no reason, especially on the Leverenz: other side of the aisle, that there should be any part of State Government that competes with the private sector. And that is one of the reasons that has long been launched why we shouldn't have this division in the first In the second place, for example, with of Connerce and Community Affairs. the organization that this would restore brought up about thirty applicants for the job, and no one listens to them anyway. So the right thing to do would be to kill the Amendment by voting \*no\*."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."
- Barnes: "Represent... Madam Speaker, since both, Representative Leverenz and myself, come from Cook County where this is the system, I am really shocked that he doesn't recognize that the state merely handles their recruitment in the same manner. I would ask for an 'aye' vote, and I appreciate Representative Bowman's support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amend... in Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1552?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 42 voting 'aye', 63 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. What is your pleasure,
  Representative Barnes? The Lady asks leave for immediate
  consideration of Senate Bill 1552. Would you read the Bill
  a third time, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Central Management Services. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
  Bill 1552 has to do with the appropriation for the
  Department of Central Management Services, and it
  appropriates \$351,678,700 for the fiscal year '85 ordinary
  and contingent expenses. And I would ask for an 'aye'
  vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1552. And on that question, is there any discussion?

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1994

There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1552 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

  Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye',

  1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Community Development and Governmental Operations, appropriation Bills, appears Senate Bill 1554, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1554, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes asks leave to return this

  Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of

  Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing no

  objections, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk. Are there any

  Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #7 by Representative

  Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to table an Amendment that we put on the Bill in Committee, and ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1554 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

is tabled. Are there any further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1554 by Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, I move to table Amendment #8. It will be replaced by Amendment 30, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Are there any further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #30, offered by Representative Breslin and Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "This would replace the Amendment we just tabled. It would provide \$75,000 or so much thereof as maybe necessary. We would appropriate that money to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant to the Village of Wedron for the purpose of drilling a new well to provide uncontaminated water to the residents of the village. I move to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #30 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #30 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #31, offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This would reduce in the General Revenue Funding in the appropriation line item for retirement by \$22,500, and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #31 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #31 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #32, offered by Representative
  Breslin and Mautino."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #32 appropriates \$20,000 to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to complete the three phase feasibility study as it pertains to the federal establishment of the Foreign Trade Zone concept that we passed in the House and is now law in the State of Illinois. The three phase provisions that are involved in the appropriations are the phase I for the preparation, et cetera, 2985. Phase II is the completion of the Port of Entry provisions, \$4,755, and phase III is the completion presentation to Washington, D.C. at 10,972 for a total of \$20,000, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #32 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

question is, 'Shall Amendment #32 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #33, offered by Representative Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Amendment #33 appropriates \$300,000 for administrative costs of the proposed Chicago Technology Park. This has to do with the not-for-profit corporation formed by the University of Illinois and Rush Presbyterian St. Luke's Medical Center pursuant to the Chicago Technology Park on the cities near westside. I would ask for an 'aye' wote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #33 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "Is this in addition to any other appropriation for something that might operate there?"

Barnes: "Yes, it is, Representative Leverenz. You and I had had
a meeting on this particular subject with the people
involved."

Leverenz: "I'm glad you said that because it did remind me that I thought we had a meeting on that, and it originally started out as something that we were going to spend \$10,000,000 on at 2020 Ogden which was a better opportunity for less money. There would be a project there for \$,000,000 and now, in the latest laundry list of add-ons, it had cleared through the Bureau of the Budget. We find that we're going to blow through the tubes at the last minute, an additional

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

\$20,000,000 of which this 300,000 General Revenue. Now we're going to do just a little more. So the \$8,000,000 project went to 8.8. Now we add \$300,000 more and now we're at 91, and I'm sure in the next three days, you or someone on your side of the aisle will find a reason that the Bureau of the Budget will probably approve a \$10,000,000 item price tag for the whole package anyway. And... It doesn't sound good, but here, you're starting your budget buster Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Well, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we keep voting out... you know, we're outvoted over on this side of the aisle, and we recognize that, and that's why I don't stand up. And I'm not objecting to some feasibility studies for Foreign Trade Zones, and I'm not standing and objecting to some Amendments for some well drilling, because we don't have the votes over here, but here we're talking about the City of Chicago and rejuvenating West \*Poke\* Street, West Lexington Street, West 'Plourney' Street and South 'Hoyne' Street, and we're talking about the Medical Center Commission, the Chicago Medical School, the American Society of Clinical Pathologist, the Board of Education, and we're always talking about trying to attract business to the State of Illinois and trying to rejuvenate the downtown of Chicago, and now you stand up and you object to spending the money for it. I don't understand you sometimes, Representative Leverenz. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this good Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
Amendment #33 to Senate Bill 1554?' All those in favor say
'aye', all those opposed... All those in favor vote 'aye',
all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1384

Representative Satterthwaite. Representative

Satterthwaite. One minute to explain your vote."

- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this money is in lieu of the fact that there was \$10,000,000 appropriated last year, but that money was not expended. And so, we will still have a much lower price tag by passing this, along with the Capital Development money that's in another Bill. In order to get this project off the ground and try to spawn new industry in the state. It's very much needed, and I would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz. One minute. Excuse me, I believe you spoke in debate, Sir."
- Leverenz: "No, I just sent a signal to somebody else."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer. Have all voted who wish?

  The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #34, offered by Representative
  Brunsvold."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #34 would add \$15,000 for the Rock Island punch card system election to the... and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #34 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "I didn't hear. It may be a very good Amendment, but I didn't hear the explanation."
- Brunsvold: "The Amendment would add \$15,000 for the trial of a punch card election system in the County of Rock Island which now has an optical scanner of which the Republican's

- 141st Legislative Day

  June 27, 1984

  been very anti to over the years."
- Hallock: "Is there any reason why that's not being paid for locally?"
- Brunsvold: "Well, we still owe about \$300,000 on the scanner, and that... I don't know where that money is going to come from if we abandon that system, and I'm asking for help from the state on the testing of the punch card system. So maybe next year we can go to that system."
- Hallock: "Well it looks like you have the votes, so you may get the help."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."
- Countryman: "Representative, can you tell me how old the optical scanner system is?"
- Brunsvold: "It's about, I would say, about six years old. I

  don't know the exact date it was brought in, but it was put
  in at that time, it has had some opposition through the
  years from your side of the aisle, especially, when it was
  started. It was questioned about the accuracy and so on,
  and Representative Olson over there can testify as to the
  problems that we've had with the system, and he... I
  talked to him about this Amendment, and he's very happy
  that we are going to try something else."
- Countryman: "Why should the State of Illinois now pay to correct the errors in judgment of Rock Island County?"
- Brunswold: "Well, I don't if it's an error in judgment. You try something new and hope it's better, and if it's not, it's not and you try something else."
- Countryman: "Is the system which you proposed to buy, the traditional punch card system that you used most elsewhere

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

throughout the state?"

- Brunsvold: "No, the punch card system this year, the total cost would be 30,000 for the rental, and I'm asking for half of that as a trial period this November, to see if it's going to work out. If it doesn't, we'll go, I guess, go back to the scanner, but if it does, we'll probably try to purchase the system the next year."
- Countryman: "What reason do you have to believe that the punch card system wouldn't work?"
- Brunsvold: "I don't have any reason to believe it would. county clerk has been wrestling with the scanner for last two years he's been in office, and we've had a lot of problems with it. It won't function properly. We tried to pass a Bill last year that would allow for collections so that we could scan them and put them in a computer and then report them after the closing polls, but that was opposed by both sides of the aisle because it was not uniform election procedures. And we're trying to work the problem out. It's been difficult. It's going to be a hard pill to swallow for the County of Rock Island, especially if they abandon this half of million dollars set up for scanning ballots which was adopted a few And I'm hopefully asking the state for some vears back. help on this situation."
- Countryman: "Why would it be in this Department of Commerce and Community Affairs' budget?"
- Brunsvold: "Appropriation Amendment is germane to all other
  Bills. Okay. They've change the title on it,
  Representative, so now it has a different title."
- Countryman: "Has this already been adopted into Senate Bill 1609?"
- Brunsvold: "I put it in that Bill, yes, also. Same Amendment."
  Countryman: "Has it been adopted?"

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Brunswold: "It's been adopted on 1609. I talked to Senator Carroll, and he indicated that he was questionable whether it would stay on that Bill or not."

Countryman: "Madam Speaker, to the Amendment, if I may."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Countryman: "I feel that this sets a dangerous precedent. I don't feel the amount of money is so great. Rock Island County came to the Board of Elections when I was on it and spent well over \$400,000 - as my memory of four years ago for the worst system in the world for elections, don't think the State of Illinois ought to go out and bail them out for errors in judgment that they made, when most of us on the Board of Elections advised them that they would do well to adopt the punch card system at that time. they became convinced that Westinghouse Company and some people who were well connected in the County Clerk's Office in Rock Island County knew a lot more about it than the State Board of Elections, and they proceeded to buy the system, and I have all due respect for the Representative and his Amendment, but I think Rock Island County ought to bear the burden. We gave them an election consolidation, the appropriate taxing authority in the county to raise money for these purposes, and it's up to them to expend money and do it wisely, and I think that they can do it, and I'm afraid we'll set a dangerous precedent. 1 would ask for 'no' votes in this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold, to close."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. I don't disagree with Representative Countryman. It has developed into a bad system, and I would agree with him totally. I'm... I wasn't in any position at that time to have anything to do with that

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

system. I'm simply here today to ask for some help for Rock Island County so we can get out from underneath this burden. Thank you. I would ask for your approval of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #34 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #35, offered by Representative
Braun."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Leave of the House to handle this Amendment for Representative Braun."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me?"

Bowman: "I would like to ask leave of the House to handle this for Representative Braun, who is indisposed at the moment."

Speaker Breslin: "Does the Gentleman have leave to handle this

Amendment? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave.

Proceed."

Bowman: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, appropriation of \$300,000 for the Auditor General for his responsibility pursuant to the Illinois Health Finance Reform Act, otherwise known as Senate Bill 495. This Act requires the Auditor General to review the financial statements of hospitals receiving State of Illinois Department of Public Aid Medical Assistance Program Funds in excess of 10 percent of the hospital's gross total revenue. Financial statements will be fauai var t o determine if state funds have been appropriately expended. I would remind everybody that the Bill that this

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

intended to implement passed unanimously with 118 'aye' votes. That's a very rare occurrence, so I hope that we can get something close to that for this Amendment. I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #35 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?'

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #36, offered by Representative Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Amendment appropriates \$250,000 to fund two pilot project grants for legal assistance to prospective Medicare and federal disability beneficiaries. These funds will provide legal representation through the appeals process for low income aged and disabled residents who have been denied Medicare or social security benefits. The disability appeals project would aid persons appealing denials or terminations of SSI, SSDI. The benefits to applicants who succeed in regaining their benefits would be increased cash medical benefits. The benefit to the state would be a decrease in state expenditures for general assistance and some AFDC benefits and medical benefits, the reason being, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that we pick up federal monies. That's the whole idea behind these appeals - that we're appealing these cases to capture federal monies. In addition to assisting the elderly through the appeals project, the major focus of the medicare assistance project would be to maximize Medicare payments when the medicare subscriber is also a medicaid recipient. Since medicare is 100 percent federally funded

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

through the Social Security Nedicare Trust Fund, while medicaid is 50 percent state funded, the financial interests of Illinois could benefit. Several other states have implemented similar projects and experienced as much as a 1.95 to 1.00 cash benefit ratio. I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #36 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #36 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #37, offered by Representative
Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 37 would appropriate \$250,000 to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant to the Chicago Symphony Orchestra to help finance the Orchestra's upcoming trip to Europe. Thank you, and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #37 to Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill... Shall Amendment #37 to Senate Bill 1554 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Barnes, what is

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

your pleasure?"

Barnes: "Immediate consideration."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes has asked for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1554. Is there any objection?

  There being no objection, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill a third time, please?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1554, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for Senate Bill 1554, which appropriates funds for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, to be approved at this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House pass Senate Bill 1554? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. there are 97 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' and 2 question, voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1572, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1572, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Prairie State 2000 Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1572 would appropriate \$250,000 of General Revenue Funds to start the Prairie State 2000 Fund.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

The... It would put together the administrative operation, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1572. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1572 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 85 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no' and I voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1576, Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
  Bill 1576 appropriates \$8,961,440 to the Illinois Racing
  Board for its ordinary and contingent expenses and the Task
  Force on Horse Racing for its ordinary and contingent
  expenses. I would ask for an "aye" vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, would you read this Bill a third time, please?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Racing Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1576. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1576 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1587, Representative Terzich.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

- Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I would ask leave of the House to handle this for Representative Terzich and pass the Bill for a dollar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich has returned to the floor."
- Leverenz: "We welcome him."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, would you like Representative Leverenz to handle the Bill for you?"
- Terzich: "Well, I don't know. It's for one dollar. I don't know if he wants to handle it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Does Representative Leverenz have leave to handle this Bill for Representative Terzich? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Proceed, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would provide an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for reimbursement to local governments. Since we have no demand for reimbursement at this time. this appropriate a... an appropriation of one dollar General Revenue to keep the program in motion at this time. ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1597. And on that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1587 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative Neff to explain your vote? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

speak. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Corrections and the Courts Appropriation Bills appears Senate Bill 1546, Representative Nash. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims and to the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash."

Nash: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to bring this back to Second Reading. As I promise for adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no
objections, the Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, offered by Representative Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #12."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #12. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative
Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #13 appropriates \$243,000 to the Court of Claims to pay debts of the Department of Aging. Payments are contingent upon a favorable opinion or denial stating that the only reason for denial is insufficient lapsing of funds or exhaustion of two percent transferability by the Department. There are 11 different providers which have

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

provided services to the Department, and we fully expect that these claims will be settled, and we need to have the money available to pay them promptly. And this is an arrangement we've worked out with Representative Oblinger when we opposed the placement of these monies on the Department of Aging Bill. We have no objection to the appropriation but think that this is the best Bill to put the appropriation on. I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1546. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1546 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #14, offered by Representative
Nash."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash."

Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #14 has one item that was left off Amendment 10. That's \$47,200 to the University of Illinois Replacement Hospital that goes to the Eastern Cyclone Industries. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #14 to Senate Bill 1546. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #14 to Senate Bill 1546 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1934

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Nash now asks for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1546. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk, would you read this Bill a third time?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims and the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash."
- Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1546... awards of the Court of Claims has awarded. I move for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage Senate Bill 1546. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question 1546 pass? All those in favor vote 'Shall Senate Bill 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1555, Representative Clerk, read the Bill." Hastert.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1555, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1555 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. As amended, the Bill now is \$365,000,000... it's \$365,825,500. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1555. And on that question, the Gentleman from

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Would the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Hastert: "Certainly."

Mulcahey: "Representative Hastert, how much above and beyond is this budget from last year?"

Hastert: "Representative, I can't hear your question."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'How much more is this budget than last year?' - percentage increase... or decrease."

Hastert: "Approximately 13 percent, Sir."

Mulcahey: "Approximately what?"

Hastert: "Thirteen percent."

Mulcahey: "How much is it over estimated expenditures?"

Hastert: "It's \$43,000,000 over last year's appropriation."

Mulcahey: "Which is about 19 percent. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the

Gentleman from Kendall, Bepresentative Hastert, to close."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Speaker). I'd just

ask for the affirmative vote on this appropriation Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1555 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question,

there are 109 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and 1 voting

\*present\*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1556,

Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1556, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Bill 1556 appropriates \$3,095,500 to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority for its Fiscal Year '85 ordinary and contingent expenses. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 1556.

And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1556 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1564, Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Senate Bill 1564 appropriates \$231,500 in General Revenue
Fund to the Judiciary (sic - Judicial) Inquiry Board for
its ordinary and contingent expenses for Fiscal Year '85.
I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 1564.

And on that question, is there any discussion? The

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "Now, I know this is a very delicate Bill to handle.

What is the total?"

Barnes: "\$274,800."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Leverenz: "To me... I think it should be \$336,400. It's not a lot of money, but I think that's what it is with the Amendments. One of... I think Amendment #1 was yours, that added money - \$43,000 in General Revenue, and Amendment 2 was my Amendment eliminating 1,100, bringing a new total of 336,400."

Barnes: "I accept the correction, Representative."

Leverenz: "I'm with you. Let's go."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz, Amendment #2 was not adopted. There being no further discussion, Representative Barnes to close."

Barnes: "I would ask for an \*aye\* vote, Madam Speaker, on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1564 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1573, Representative Hastert.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1573 is for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Prisoner Review Board. The total budget as amended is \$859,300. I would be happy to answer any questions, and...."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1573. And on that guestion, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

'Shall Senate Bill 1573 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' ... excuse me, passed. All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 103 4 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1649, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1649, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the State's Attorney's Appellate Service
Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would appropriate, now, a new total of \$2,634,856 to fund the State's Attorney's Appellate Service Commission for PY '85, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote to pass their budget."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1649. that question, is there any And on discussion? There being no discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 1649 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. the record show that Representative Breslin has a conflict of interest in this legislation and is, therefore, voting. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 102 voting 'aye', record. 'no' and none voting 'present'. Representative Markette asks to be voted 'aye'. There are, therefore, 103 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Appropriations for Officials appears Elected Senate Bill

- 141st Legislative Day

  Representative Reane. Clerk, read the Bill.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane."
- "Thank you, Mr. (sic Madam) Speaker. Senate Bill 1510 makes the appropriation to the Auditor General. Ask for a Roll Call... favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
  Bill 1510. And on that question, is there any discussion?
  The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Priedrich."
- Friedrich: "I just wanted to say it's a little refreshing that there's a decrease over the present fiscal year of \$176,000, and we don't get the chance to do that very often."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz, did you realize that there was an Amendment filed on this Bill?"
- Leverenz: "Whose Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "And this Bill is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Leverenz: "Who was the Sponsor of the Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: . "Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Oh, this is the show you've all been waiting for."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane, do you want to proceed on Third Reading? Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Leave to move 1510 back to Second Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "There are objections heard, Representative The Bill remains on Third Reading."
- Keane: "No. Roll the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The... Since there is no discussion on this appropriation... Representative Friedrich, do you still wish to speak again?"
- Friedrich: "No. I was going to support a Motion to bring it

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

back, but if he wants to roll it, it's alright with me. We could bring it back, I think."

- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1510 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1513, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1513, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
  the House. This is for the Office of the State Treasurer.

  The new total 445,598. Treasurer. Thank you. And I
  would ask for your 'aye' vote to pass the budget."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1513. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Klemm: "Representative, I'm going to ask you and... and I'd like
to ask you and everybody if you could maybe give us a
percentage how much more or less it was from last year. We
started to do that for a while. I see that it's been
neglected. I wonder if we could do that for all of them."

Leverenz: "Well, since you asked on this one, it's a decrease from last year."

Klemm: "Could you give us a percentage, somehow?"

Leverenz: "Roughly, two percent."

Klemm: "Alright. Thank you very much."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Leverenz: "It's like milk."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1513. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1513 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1534, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1534, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is for the Office of the Comptroller, and it would provide an expenditure level of... Will you not explain to me how to say these words? We have a request for \$26,180,900. The General Revenue Fund, as the Gentleman has asked, is up 10 percent. The average in General Revenue funding has been up two percent since FY '82. I would ask for the passage of the Bill - 1534."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1534. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 1534 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1547, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

- "This is for the ordinary and contingent expenses the General Assembly. The new total with the Amendments is \$17.740.600. It is increased from the Senate original appropriation of fifteen million. four nine oh. \$2,000,000 principally. the that are going to Leadership Office in the Daniels-Madigan Plan, and I would for the adoption - I m sorry - the passage of Senate Bill 1547. \*
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage Senate Bill 1547. And on that question, is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Ωn this question, there are 94 voting... 95 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1548, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1548, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the furnishing of legislative staff.

  Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the district office allowances. It reflects the change to the House's approach to the payment it would make it a level of \$27,000 for Nembers of the Senate and the House. I would ask for your 'aye' vote to pass Senate Bill 1548."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

"The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Speaker Breslin: Senate Bill 1548. And on that question. is there any There being no discussion, the question is, discussion? 'Shall Senate Bill 1548 pass?' All those in all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Ωn this question, there are 74 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority ... Representative Huff asks to be voted 'aye'. There are, therefore, 75 voting 'aye, 39 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Senate Bill 1566, Representative Barnes. asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Ladv have leave? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #3 is an appropriation for the Lieutenant
  Governor's budget. It increases retirement line by \$19,400
  to fund it at six percent of personal services."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has asked for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1566. And on that question, is there any discussion? Seeing... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."
- Rlemm: "Well, just the same question I've asked. Perhaps we can get a percentage of an increase or decrease on all these from the previous year."
- Speaker Breslin: "This is an Amendment, Representative Klemm. He withdraws his question. There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1566 be

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
  Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Amendment \$4, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would cut \$1,908 from the Lieutenant Governor's request on the retirement line items. I'd vote for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$3 to Senate Bill 1566. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment \$3 to Senate Bill 1566 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Lady now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1566. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the office of the Lieutenant Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Lieutenant Governor's budget passed out of Committee before these past two Amendments, it appropriated \$1,362,800 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Lieutenant Governor."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 1566. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Representative Barnes, who is the Lieutenant Governor?"

Barnes: "Pardon me?"

Terzich: "Who is the Lieutenant Governor."

Barnes: "George Ryan. R-Y-A-N."

Terzich: "Oh, thank you. Thank you. Great guy."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor.

Representative Barnes, is there any money in the Lieutenant

Governor's budget for a mushroom party?"

Barnes: "Well, we did have it in the original budget, but you said since Speaker Madigan has taken over, you have seen the light, so we cut the expense out."

Kulas: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to correct the record,
Amendment #4 was the Amendment that was just previously
adopted to this Bill. And for further discussion on the
Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."

Cullerton: "What's the increase in this particular Bill, here, for me... I mean, for George."

Barnes: "For George? Well, just about... "

Cullerton: "How much more am I getting this year, than last year."

Barnes: "You're getting everything you asked for, George."

Cullerton: "How much is it, Jane?"

Barnes: "It's about 3.5 percent increase."

Cullerton: "3.5 is all I'm getting?"

Barnes: "That's all he asked for."

Cullerton: "Nothing for Artie and Pete? How about my buddies?"

141st Legislative Day June 27, 1984

Barnes: "How about some what? George, do you have a cold?"

Cullerton: "Well, thanks for the increase. I appreciate it."

Barnes: "You're welcome."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1566 pass?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye'... Representative Vinson, do you wish to speak now?"
- Vinson: "Yeah, I just thought somebody ought to remind Representative Cullerton what happened when he did that one other time."
- Speaker Breslin: "On this... On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Appropriation Bills dealing with the environment appears Senate Bill 1549, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, could you please bring Senate Bill 1549

  back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment.

  Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, offered by Representative
  Barnes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1549 adds \$50,000 Capital
  Development Fund to the Capital Development Board for the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Department of Agriculture for rehabilitation of the roof, windows and structures of the Coliseum at the Illinois State Fairgrounds. It brings the total project cost to \$375,000."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1549. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1549 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Beading. The Lady now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1549. Are there any objections. Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave."

Would you read the Bill a third time, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1549, the Department of Agriculture budget, brings the
total, after the last Amendment, to approximately
\$45,368,400."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1549. And on that question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Ropp: "Representative, can you give me a progress report of the blacksmith shop on the fairgrounds?"

Barnes: "Representative Ropp, you are a Member of the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Appropriations Committee. I would have been very happy to have answered that earlier in the day. I do not have a progress report at this time."

Ropp: "Well, I think it's coming along very well, after about three or four years, and it should be completed. I just wanted you to be aware of that."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Speaker). I

realize that asking the Sponsor of this Bill is probably

not... it was not her Amendment. It was Representative Hicks' Amendment, and it's not for a lot of money, but I really am curious as to why we have to promote rabbit breeding and spend \$2,500 to do that. Would.... Does the Sponsor of the Bill know that, or would the Sponsor of the Amendment like to answer that?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Representative Karpiel, what it is, it's prizes and awards for the rabbit breeders."

Karpiel: "There are actually people in this state who deliberately breed rabbits?"

Barnes: "Representative, there are, and we give them prizes and awards, and it's very important to some of them."

Karpiel: "And we give them prizes to do this, yet?"

Barnes: "To some... "

Karpiel: "I know I'm kind of laughing about this, and I'm sure this is a very serious subject."

Barnes: "Well, some people think this is a very serious subject."

Karpiel: "Well, that's what I'm asking, you know."

Barnes: "And I already told you what the money is for."

Karpiel: "What do they do with the rabbits they breed?"

Barnes: "Oh, you are interesting. These are food producing rabbits."

Karpiel: "Oh, food producing rabbits. And then we give them

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- prizes, and then we sell them to be slaughtered?"
- Barnes: "This is Representative Hicks' Amendment. Maybe he would like for me to defer and stop eating his popcorn and answer Representative Karpiel, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is not seeking recognition. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I'd like to speak to the Bill. I think it's an outstanding Bill. We've loaded it up in moos and oinks, and even for the rabbits. To answer the Lady's question, on the blue ribbon rabbits, they give them people's feet, little..., on little key chains."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Klenm."
- Klemm: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."
- Klemm: "I noticed, Representative, we've had about a hundred million dollars... or \$100,000 to renovate the Lawrence City's 4-H Center. Is this normally an area that we add monies to help 4-H organizations in our county?"
- Barnes: "Representative, the Amendment was introduced, and it was passed, and it was added to the Bill."
- Klemm: "But, is this a normal appropriation to put in here, because I know many of us and I'm kind of new on this but, many of us have 4-H centers, and I was wondering, is this a normal thing we should be doing, is adding to our Department of Agriculture's budget?"
- Barnes: "Well, Representative Brummer and Representative Dwight

  Friedrich requested that this Amendment be added."
- Klemm: "The Department supports this?"
- Barnes: "I think the Department has to deal with these grandstands every year, and while at one time, they insisted that all the grandstands have insurance and that the fairs handle their own appropriation, it seems that we

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

do let some of these on each year, if that answers your question, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "All right, well thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."
Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the previous question."
Speaker Breslin: "That won't be necessary, Representative Piel.

The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Senate Bill 1549, at all its different stages, has been discussed at great length on this floor, and I would ask for its passage at this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1549 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

  Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1558, Representative Barnes.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act making Appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment.

  Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Leverenz, amends Senate Bill 1558 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment would reduce, in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, a total of \$28,900,

- 141st Legislative Day

  June 27, 1984

  cutting the retirement level to 60 percent. I would move
  for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment... Representative Van Duyne, on the question."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."
- Van Duyne: "I thought he said, very quickly, that we are now cutting the appropriation one more time for retirement?"
- Leverenz: "No, we re cutting it for the first time. Thank you."
- Van Duyne: "But this has to do with retirement the state's participation in the retirement system."
- Leverenz: "The answer to your question is, "yes". You asked if
  we were cutting it again. The answer is "no". We are
  cutting it for the first time, \$28,900, and I would move
  for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 to Senate
  Bill 1558 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
  those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
  'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
  any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Daniels Madigan Barnes, amends

  Senate Bill 1558 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daniel... Barnes.

  Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Representative Daniels Madigan Barnes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1558 adds \$400,000 from the General Revenue Pund to fund the study by State Water Survey for a ground water study. The study will identify

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

the quantity of ground water being withdrawn and the uses the water is being put. Data from the study will delineate areas of potential ground water conflict and help determine proper ground water management. This is part of the Governor's \$20,000,000 hazardous waste cleanup initiative that was announced yesterday."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1559. And on that question, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes ... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Brummer: "Is it contemplated that a portion of the study will address the issue of whether ground water is being polluted by salt water brine - brine from the oil wells that is being pumped down in various areas of the state?"

Barnes: "Part of Representative Currie's funding will handle that problem, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Shaw: "Did I understand you, Representative Barnes, to say that this is a \$10,000,000 water cleanup?"

Barnes: "I said this Amendment, Representative Shaw, was \$400,000 from the General Revenue Fund."

Shaw: "And what is this for? That's what I'm trying to find out."

Barnes: "The study will identify the quantity of ground water being withdrawn and the uses the water is being put. Data from this study will delineate areas of potential ground water conflict and help determine the proper ground water management."

Shaw: "Okay. Is... Will any of this money be spent up around

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Chicago? Is this all over the state?"

Barnes: "This is all over the state."

Shaw: "I just wanted to point out that I stil have some wells in my district, and I was wondering - and we have a lot of hazardous waste management up there - and I wanted to make sure that a portion of this money would be spent testing around those waste management sites up there, and in some areas, hazardous waste. Do you... What do you say about...

Barnes: "Representative Currie's Bill answers your problems,

Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "But none of this money will be spent in my area. Is that what you say?"

Barnes: "Yes, it will. This is throughout the entire state."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "That's not necessary, Representative Piel. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1558 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Excuse me. We are voting on the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1558. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #11, Barnes, amends Senate Bill 1558 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to withdraw Amendment #11."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #11. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Lady now asks leave...

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Excuse me. Representative Hannig is recognized for the purposes of a Motion. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

- Clerk Leone: "Motion. 'I move to table Amendment #4 to Senate
  Bill 1558, filed by Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

  This week, we found that this Amendment was offered and adopted in Committee in error. I have already adopted an Amendment to this Bill to address that but inadvertently forgot to table this... this Amendment and now would move to do so."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #4

  to Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, the Gentleman

  from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In our analysis, it shows that
  Amendment #4 was withdrawn, but Amendment #5, which does
  what this Amendment does, was adopted. Are we square as
  far as which Amendment we want to table now?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you advise us as to the status of Amendment #4?"

Clerk Leone: "House Amendment #4 remains on the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "If that's the case, our analysis is incorrect."

Speaker Breslin: "Is incorrect. That's correct. The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1558. There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1558 be adopted?' All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say... be tabled, rather. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1558 is tabled. Are there any further Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Now, Representative Barnes asks

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1558. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave. Would you read the Bill a third time, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act making

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of
the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Third
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1558 is the Fiscal Year \*85 appropriation of the
Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and as amended,
it is approximately \$75,465,811."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw. Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Will the speaker yield? I'm sorry. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor will yield for a question, yes."

Shaw: "Yes, Representative Barnes, I noticed that you decreased the line item for the Chicago Arts (sic - Art) Gallery by \$148,000, in the Bill. Why did you do that?"

Barnes: "Representative Shaw, that was added back to the Bill."

Shaw: "Where is... Where is that added back to the Bill at? What
Amendment does that?"

Barnes: "Amendment #2 restores the Department's request for the establishment of the new Chicago Art Gallery to its original funding level of \$233,900."

Shaw: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1558 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no'

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1571, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1571, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Madam... Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1571 is the fiscal year appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. The amount as amended is \$1,101,900."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1571. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1571 pass?' All those in favor vote 'a'ye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Appropriations, Financial Regulations appears Senate Bill 1551, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1551, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
  Bill 1551 addresses the Fiscal Year \*85 appropriation for
  the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. As amended,
  the total is \$6,008,780."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1551. And on that question, is there any discussion?

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1551 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1559, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1559, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Senate Bill 1559 is the Fiscal Year \*85 appropriations for
the Department of Pinancial Institutions. As amended, it
is \$3.262,000."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1559. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1559 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1577, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1384

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
  Bill 1577 is the Fiscal Year '85 appropriation for the
  Commissioner of Savings and Loans. As amended, it is
  \$1,164,300."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1577. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1577 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. The Gentleman from Winnebago, one minute to explain his vote. Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "I'm not going to explain my vote, Madam Speaker, but I
  wish the Sponsors of these Bills again would give us a
  percent increase of this year's budget over last year's
  budget. You know, education this year is getting a 1.3
  percent increase elementary and secondary ed.
  Corrections went to 19 percent, and there's all sorts of
  increases. I wish they would let us know what percent
  increase this year's budget is over last year's, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey, your point is well taken. Would all Sponsors of appropriation Bills give us the percentage increase and decrease on the Bills that they are presenting. Mr. Clerk, take the record. question, on Senate Bill 1577, there are 110 voting \*aye\*, 3 voting \*no\* and 3 voting \*present. This having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby On the Order of Appropriations for Higher declared passed. Education there appears Senate Bill 1595, Representative Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis for Fiscal Year 1985. Third Reading of the

141st Legislative Day Bill."

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, the Bill as amended in its current form incorporates the Senate level appropriation of \$162,431,500. that is 5.8 million dollars for Representative Mulcahey, above the level of expenditure in FY '84. If you want to calculate that out. it comes to somewhere in the three - three and a half percent range. We also added some minor Amendments in the We restored \$1,370,000 to be added to the equalization in grants and spread across the districts that receive those, and we added some \$20,000 for East St. Louis College, added \$2,000,000 Community and we Representative Leverenz for assistance in computer programs. I know of no opposition to the Bill at this time and ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 1595."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1595. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1595 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1597, Representative Matijevich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Leone: "Senate Bill 1597, a Bill for an Act making Clerk appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Natijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1597 is the appropriation Bill for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. As it left the Senate, the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Bill appropriated 189,715,100 dollars. Net increase by an Amendment that we adopted on the floor was in a very insignificant amount - oh. let's see I have it somewhere - of 12,000 dollars. It appears that this is a significant increase from last year. However. virtually of the increase is in the amount a 1 1 because of the reimbursement, 39 million increment for loan reimbursements and its corresponding 942.300 increment for administrative support from the Student Loan Fund to address aniticipated increase in a number of loans to be repayment stages during PY \*85. As to the General Revenue Fund, the... it's a seven percent increase. I want to. presenting for consideration of this appropriation Bill. add my comments that I want to personally congratulate the Director of the Scholarship Commission. In his tenure. there has been a significant improvement in the operation of that agency. Many of you know that we very often stalled this appropriation in years gone by, because the agency did not respond to many of our concerns. Also, the Director has in a, I think, very responsible way tried answer the shortcomings that, in the past, the Auditor General had in his reports. So, I want to personally Yes, went from 45 recommendations and now only 5. So. he's done a great job. And with that, I'd like to see unanimous support for the good job that has been done with this agency."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1597. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1597 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

\*present\*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1599, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1599, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for retirement purposes of higher education institutions and agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the appropriation for the University Retirement Systems, and pursuant to an Amendment adopted on the floor, the Bill now contains monies for the General Assembly Retirement System and the Judicial Retirement System. The aggregate amount is in \$78,121,500. The figures for each of the retirement systems represents 60 percent of payout, and I move for passage of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1599. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1599 pass?' All those in favor... Representative Mulcahey... Excuse me, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman, there has been a request made of all Sponsors of appropriation Bills to give us the percentage of increase or decrease over last year."

Bowman: "Right. The problem is that this particular Bill includes both the General Assembly and judicial figures, and I don't have that analysis. Hang on a second. It's approximately nine percent increase."

Speaker Breslin: "Would you repeat that, please?"

Bowman: "Approximately a nine percent increase. You see, one of the... Let me just add, last year you may recall that the payout was below 60 percent. The payout last year was below 60 percent, and so one of the reasons that it is a nine percent increase is, we're... we're getting to... we

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

went up to 60 percent. Now, a lot of people around here wanted to go above 60 percent, but I do want to point out, take this opportunity that this is an advance over last year. We're making progress, Ladies and Gentlemen."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1599 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no' and 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1600, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1600, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State University Civil Service System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The appropriation in Senate Bill 1600 for the State Universities Civil Service System is \$695,000. We restored money that... about \$32,000 that the Senate had cut out. This represents an approximately seven percent increase over last year."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1600. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1600 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Order of Appropriation Bills dealing with human services appears Senate Bill 1550, Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1550, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic Speaker), Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1550 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse. The total appropriation is \$53,713,800. It's an increase of 13.7 percent over last year's expenditures."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage Senate Bill 1550. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the guestion 'Shall Senate Bill 1550 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Oπ this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1568, Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act making
- appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
  the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no
  objections, the Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Hastert, amends Senate Bill 1568 as amended."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is 1.5 million dollars in general revenue funds to the Medical Center Commission's budget for the development to the 'Med Tech' Park in Chicago. Last week, the Governor announced his plans to appropriate \$10,000,000 to various agencies for the 'Med Tech' Park. We've seen some of these Amendments come through. This is the money that has passed through to the Medical Center Commission so that they can purchase that land."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1568. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm consulting my handy Bob Mandeville add-on list for this Session, and I see 1.5 million dollars for the Medical Center Commission, here. This isn't something that they were looking for in their budget. This is something that they're being told that they ought to have in their budget, and I think that we shouldn't be called upon to deal with these add-ons in this way that we're... as I say... said before, we're struggling to balance the budget. Maybe this is a good item, maybe it isn't. It certainly requires further discussion and further consideration, and I urge the House to reject this Amendment at this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Priedrich."
- Priedrich: "May I say to the last speaker, Madam Chairman (sic Speaker) that is she... if he doesn't think they're asking
  for it, he doesn't know 'Park Livingston'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Bullock: "Representative Hastert, do you have any idea in what district this project is located?"

Hastert: "I'm not sure. I know the geographical area of the district. It's, I think, in the... Senator D'Arco's and Representative Domico's area. It's the..."

Bullock: "And Representative Huff's."

Hastert: "And Representative Huff's area. The Taylor Street area immediately around St. Luke's Pres. Hospital and the Illinois Medical Center complex - that area."

Bullock: "Representative, this new initiative that we're talking about in land acquisition, does this have the support of the chief executives of both units of government involved?"

Hastert: "I... Yes, it does. And let me expand a little bit upon Representative Bowman, in his speech a few minutes ago, said that this is just a quick grab, but I have a letter, here, that ... dated March, and the commerce... or the Commission itself - the Medical Commission - says that this was a necessary thing for them. There... They have lease to 'Amgem', which is a leading California-based biogetics firm, and when the lease was finalized. guaranteed that they would bring more high tech business in around ... in to surround them so that we have a high tech complex. Now, I'm not that familiar, geographically, with area, but I know that a lot of buildings and stores and some businesses that are not even there any more to be replaced, and we're actually revitalizing that area. I think... I get into Chicago once in a while. I live the country, but you know, we get the horse saddled up and drive in there, and I've been through there and of course, that I talked to Representative Cullerton you know yesterday, and we're looking for things to help the state

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

all across the state, and I think that this is certainly something that would help areas that are very important to some people who represent the Chicago area."

Bullock: "One last question, Representative. Is it your understanding that the Medical Center Commission has said that this project is of such a vital nature to the near west side in Chicago, that absent GRF funds for land acquisition, they are prepared to proceed without it? They're that much committed to the project?"

Hastert: "Well, Representative, they can't proceed without it, and one of the things because they can't buy the property without this appropriation, and one of the problems with it is that if we don't progress with this, we're liable to not only lose a new industry coming into the area, but the contracts that we have already entered in with with companies like "Amgem" and other California areas. So this is a pretty important Amendment, and it's a pretty important appropriation if we want to see progress in that area."

Bullock: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Domico is not on the floor, but in his absence, he asked that I would stand and speak in support of this Amendment. This Amendment #3 to 1568 is absolutely essential to the economic recovery on the near west side of in support of it. I'm sure all of the Chicago. I stand people from the Chicago-Cook County area should stand in support of it. It's long overdue. That is a model medical center, not just in Chicago and the midwest, throughout the United States, and I support the Gentleman's Amendment."

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

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

rise, not in opposition to the project that is the focus of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1568, but to the process that bring this Amendment before us on June 27, 1984. project has been in the works as long as Representative Hastert suggests that it has been, why in the world did the Governor not include this money in his budget? Why did he not brings this Amendment to when the House Appropriations Committee considered Amendments to Senate Bill 1568 during the ordinary course of our Committee work? The Governor has expressed a concern for the bottom line of his budget. I'm concerned about the bottom line of If we are to add this million and a half budget, too. dollars for Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1568 am willing to think that maybe we should, at some point in the process - I'd like to know from the Governor from the Bureau of the Budget, where we're taking a million and a half dollars out. The issue before us, as we are asked to consider Amendment 3 to this Bill, is not, we support the program of the medical center on the west side of Chicago, but can we, at this point, without better information from the Governor and the Bureau of the Budget, consider the Amendment today. I think the answer, if we are responsible budgetmakers in this chamber, has to 1001-0

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Currie, in a sense, said what I was going to say. I think any Legislator, be he or she Republican or Democrat, ought to take a personal affront to this process right now. If Bob Mandeville wants to run for legislative office, let him run. We are the ones that ought to be making these decisions. For him to come up to us at this 11th hour and say, "Here, here are the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

additional dollars you add onto the budget. Take it or My God. All of you ought to take a personal affront to that. I'm sure... You know, Bon Stierney used to get up on the floor when the medical center was in his district, and I supported him. He was elected from that district. But to have this come to us by the Bureau of the Budget Director - I don't care who you are, you ought to be against it. We are going to work hard in the end process if these funds are available, to make sure they're there. But anyone, and particularly anybody on this side of the aisle, ought to be against that process. I'm sure that going to protect everybody on this side of the aisle. and when the decisions are made, I'm sure we're try to do our best for everybody. But I don't like this process. I don't care if it's a Democrat Bureau Budget Director or a Republican. And let's defeat this Amendment and show that we are the elected Representatives, not Bob Mandeville."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

Representative Hastert to close."

Hastert: "Well, thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Speaker). little bit of affront from my good friend from the other side of the aisle, Representative Matijevich. live there. but certainly, I do have interests of people across the state. and I think I've... iust appropriate as anybody else to bring an Amendment before this Body that says we're going to do something to bring business into Illinois, that we're going to bring dollars and try to develop something in some of the depressed neighborhoods in our largest city in this state. And for those people, certainly, who live between Congress and Polk Street in Chicago, and along Harrison and 'Fauntelrov' Street and 'Oakley' Boulevard, they certainly think this

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

might be important to development to bring dollars into Chicago, to bring jobs into Chicago. You know, on this side of the aisle, and all due respect to some previous speakers, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we have to take an overview that we want to see the state progress in total. and I think this is verv Amendment. I've seen some Amendments come down here in just the last hour and a half that spends millions of dollars to send some organizations overseas, and certainly, that was not a long term plan. I think sometimes we have to act when the opportunity arises, and this is certainly the case, and I ask for your affirmative support of this good Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$3 to Senate Bill 1568. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it, and the Amendment is lost. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Hastert, would you like to consider this Bill immediately on Third Reading? Yes, the Bill has not been amended, and the Gentleman may proceed on the Order of Third Reading. Would you read the Bill again, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We now have a Bill before us somewhat crippled, because it can't produce exactly what was intended to do, but we do have a .9 percent increase over last year's expenditure. I certainly would ask for

141st Legislative Day

Clerk

Leone: "Senate Bill

June 27, 1984

positive consideration of what's left of this Bill and what this Commission might be able to do with that money."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1568. And on that question, is there discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1568 pass?' All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1574. Representative Hastert. Clerk. read the Bill."
- appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

1574, a Bill for an Act

- Hastert: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am pleased to bring before you Senate Bill 1574. Senate Bill 1574 is for the 1985 appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid. The 1985 budget request, as amended in the House is excuse me while I choke \$3,199,616,400, or 4.1 percent above last year's appropriation level. I certainly would be happy to answer any questions and ask for affirmative movement on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1574. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1574 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."

Bowman: "Just to ... Just to point out that although public aid

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

caseloads have been rising and are projected to rise in this Fiscal Year \*85 budget, that this is a very modest percentage increase over last year."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1575, Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1575, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hastert: "Thank you, I'd like to bring before you Senate Bill 1575. House. Senate Bill 1675 (sic - 1575) is for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. The total on this budget is \$191,000, and it's an increase of 1.8 percent over last year. Excuse me, Madam (sic - Speaker). Chairman I made a mistake. It's \$198,000, and it's a 1.8 percent increase over last Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of

question, Senate Bill 1575. And on that is there discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1575 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This having received the Constitutional is Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1583, Representative Oblinger. Clerk, read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1583, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker, Members of the Bouse, this is appropriation for the contingent and ordinary expenses of the Department on Aging for the amount of \$91,277,100. Ι want you to listen carefully to the next part, if you will. It's an increase of 18 percent, and that sounds terrific -\$13,000,000. This is for the Community In-Home Care Program which... over which we have no control, as it's entitlement program. But on the opposite side of the ledger, it has saved the Department of Public Aid 950,000 in nursing homes, which is a saving of over 28,000,000, so we've saved you twice as much money as are giving us, and I certainly would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate 1583. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate 1583 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those Bill opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none 1 voting present. voting 'no', and This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of appropriation Bills dealing with labor and retirement appears Senate Bill 1553. Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1553, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Civil Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate
Bill 1553 appropriates 327,100 dollars to the Civil Service
Commission for its fiscal year '85 ordinary and contingent
expenses. This is a five point two percent change in
dollars. It's approximately 17,000 dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1553, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1553 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1567, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1567, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Local Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1567 deals with the funding for the Local Labor
Relations Board. It is 1,250,000 dollars, and since this
is a new agency, there hasn't been any fiscal year '84
appropriation to speak about."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1567, and on this question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall...'

Excuse me. The Gentlemen from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."

Tuerk: "I presume this 1,000,000 dollar expenditure for the Labor

141st Legislative Day

June 27. 1984

Relations Board is a result of passing collective bargaining for public employees. Is that true?"

Barnes: "It is true, Representative."

Tuerk: "I thought so. I knew at the time when we said it was going to be costly not only to local government but also to State Government, this just proves the point."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1567 pass?

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. The Gentleman ... Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'.

This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1579, Representative Barnes. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act to making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate
Bill 1579 is a fiscal year '85 appropriation to establish
the State Labor Relations Board. The fiscal year '85
budget request as amended is one million dollars from
General Revenue Fund. No funds were appropriated for
fiscal year '85. It will be established to fulfill the
mandate of Senate Bill 536, the collective bargaining
rights Bill for governmental employees."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1579, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1579 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

record. On this question, there are 83... 84 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1581, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1581, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Public School Teachers' Pension and Betirement Fund.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1581, is the fiscal year '85 budget for the Chicago
Public School Teachers' Pension and Betirement Fund. It is
3,580,800 dollars. It is a 12.7 percent change from '84
which totals 404,500 dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1581, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, on the question."

Huff: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during the discussion of House Bill 569, which was the question of divestiture of South Africa investments of public funds, it was revealed that the Chicago Teachers Union ... A question of the Sponsor at..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

Huff: "Representative Barnes, does this affect the Chicago
Teachers' Union Pension Fund? I don't want to be..."

Barnes: "No, it is a supplemental in the sum of 3,130,800 dollars... it's appropriated for the purpose of repaying that 20 percent of the amount that the state's contribution to the Retirement System was reduced in 1983. Is that what you are concerned about?"

Huff: "No, no, that is not the question I am asking. Will any of

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

this accrue to the Chicago Teachers' Union?"

Barnes: "These are people that already retired on a minimal retirement."

Huff: "Thank you. My statement was about to be inappropriate. I stand corrected."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1581 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting
'aye', 5 voting 'no' and 8 voting 'present'. This Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Senate Bill 1582, Representative Barnes.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1582, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Teachers' Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1582 appropriates 25,526,200 dollars for the downstate
Teachers' Retirement System. It is a change of 14,398,200
dollars, which is a 129 percent change. Forty-three
percent of the total appropriation is to repay 20 percent
of the amount. The appropriation for fiscal year '83 was
reduced plus the interest."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 1582, and on that question, the Gentlemen from Peoria,
Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Tuerk: "This amount to me seems unusually small for downstate

Teachers' Betirement. This will meet the normal pay out

level for the Teachers' Retirement System?"

141st Legislative Day June 27, 1984

Barnes: "This is a supplemental..."

Tuerk: "Ah."

Barnes: "...appropriation, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen from... There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1582 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Appropriations dealing with public safety appears Senate Bill 1557, Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Speaker) Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring before you Senate Bill 1557. Senate Bill 1557 is for the ordinary and contingent expense the Illinois Emergency Services Division Disaster Agency known as ESDDA. What this is, it's 18,709,300 dollars. It's an 19.9 percent decrease or 4.3 million dollar decrease over last year's appropriation. Two million of this is General Revenue and the rest of it's federal. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1557 and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Leverenz: "Just wanted to make sure. We tried to put a meeting together for June 11th up north with Mr. Jones, the Director, and a lot of local agencies. A meeting is now planned for July, and you'll use whatever clout or power you have to make sure Mr. Jones follows through with that meeting."

Hastert: "Well, Representative, I talked to Mr. Jones, and he was anxiously awaiting the meeting June 11th. And he was very disappointed when that wasn't held, and he has given me his solemn word that he will be at any meeting that you might call in July."

Leverenz: "Super. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1557 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. On this question there are 104 voting
'aye', 8 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Senate Bill 1565, Representative Barnes.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1565, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Senate Bill 1565 is the fiscal year '85 appropriation for the Department of Law Enforcement, and it is approximately 122,457,300 dollars as amended. And it is approximately a 12 percent change from the fiscal year '84 appropriation which was 109,417.4 dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1565, and on that question, is there any discussion?

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1565 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. 112 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting there are \*present\*. Representative Ewing asked to be voted There therefore... and Representative Wait and are. Representative Nelson. There are, therefore, 115 voting 102 (sic-2) voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1656, Representative Leverenz. Clerk read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Law Enforcement for the Illinois State Enforcement Agencies to Recover Child (I SEARCH) Program. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, for clarification of the record on House Bill 1565, there were a 115 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'no'. Proceed Mr. Clerk. Have you read the Bill?"
- Clerk Leone: "The Bill has been read a third time."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative Leverenz, on Senate
  Bill 1656."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1656 would appropriate 1,858,500 dollars in General Revenue Funds to the Department of Law Enforcement for grants and the administrative expenses for the State Enforcement Agencies to Recover Children Program, commonly known as I SEARCH starting July 1st of 1984, and I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 1656."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1656, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1656 pass?' All those in favor vote

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Supplementals - Appropriations appears Senate Bill 1474, Representative Friedrich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Priedrich: "Nadam Speaker, Members of the House, this is a 45,000 dollar appropriation to the Reference Bureau. Ten thousand dollars of this is for ... to buy statutes from other states for the library, and 35,000 dollars is supplemental for the printing of the Digest. At the time the budget prepared, it is impossible to tell what the printing cost are going to be. For one reason, you can't tell how many issues are going to have to be printed. So this is a supplemental based on the present information we have regarding the printing. Incidentally, that printing has been reduced. You may not realize it but a couple years ago the size of the print was reduced substantially. The Digest is a very expensive item. I'd appreciate your support for this supplemental."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill a third time, please?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1474 a Bill for an Act amending Sections of an Act making appropriations for certain officers and agencies. Third reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has already described the Bill.

He has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1474, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1474 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Voting is open. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Appropriation Bills that have not yet been called appears Senate Bill 1396, Representative Richmond. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 1386 appropriates 1,245,000 dollars the House. from a Capital Development Fund to the Capital Developement Board for permanent improvements at the Touch of Nature Environmental Center at Southern Illinois University. This 31 acre Touch of Nature Environmental Center. is a T+ 1 s located on a little grassy lake, and the Center is operated by Southern Illinois University of Carbondale and offers outdoor education programs to the handicapped children. adults and juvenile offenders as vel1 as normal populations. They serve some 12 to 20,000 individuals each These funds are badly needed to renovate the camp, to make it available for year round use, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1386, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in the support of the Gentleman's Motion.

We've had a lot of testimony in Committee on this particular project. A lot of people came to tell us what a fine project it was. They sat around all day. They

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

were very patient. We heard testimony from people from Chicago, as well as from downstate. This truly benefits people from all over the state, and I am happy to support the Gentleman and his Motion."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1386 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting \*aye\*, 37 voting 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1450, Representative Leverenz. Out of the Senate Bill 1460, Representative Tuerk. record. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act to appropriate 10,000 to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for the Illinois Valley Central High School participation in International Band Festival. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tuerk."

- Tuerk: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, actually this appropriation was amended downward 8,000. It was for Valley Community High School Band. which participated in the Band Festival in Finnepeg just recently. Their budget for the trip was 32,000. They raised 22,000 of that amount. The precedent set in years was that we would underwrite the cost at about 25 percent; and therefore, the amount of the appropriation is 8,000, which is 25 percent of the budget at 32,000. I would ask for your favorable support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1460, and on that question the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

141st Legislative Day June 27, 1984

Brunner: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

Brummer: "It is a little noisy over here. I am sure
Representative Tuerk explained this fully but I cannot
understand. Has the band already taken this trip?"

Tuerk: "It has taken it."

Brummer: "And now ... Okay. Go ahead."

Tuerk: "As I recall the exhibition was during this last week of June. So this is the 27th. They are probably on there way back but may get stalled unless we appropriate this money."

Brunmer: "Were did they go?"

Tuerk: "Winnepeg, Canada. They were the only band in the State
of Illinois invited to participate. They were one of 16
bands throughout the world."

Brummer: "Did they charge their tickets, or how are they getting back?"

Tuerk: "They borrowed the money."

Brummer: "Okay. Thank you."

"There being no further discussion, the question Speaker Breslin: is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1460 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1562, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1586. Representative Nash. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1586, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain officers and agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash."

Nash: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic-madam speaker), Ladies and

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1586 appropriates 325 dollars to the Comptroller to help man the Lincoln Celebration. House Amendment #1 appropriates 10,000 to the City of Chester for the purchase of fire equipment for the following three mental health centers; Menard Psychiatric Center, Chester Mental Health Center, Menard Correctional Center. House Amendment #2 appropriates 75,000 dollars to the Chicago Eisenberg Boy's Club to support the purchase of Dental Equipment. The Club has dentists who donate their time to the clinic, and they don't have any equipment. And I move for a favorable Boll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage o£ Senate Bill 1586, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 1586 pass?\* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Ωn this question, there are 62 voting \*aye\*, 46 voting \*no\* and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate 1609, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1610. Representative Out of the record. Representative Matijevich is recognized for the purposes of a Motion."

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for a Motion that has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I would ask leave in the use of the Attendance Boll Call relative to Senate Bills 1450, 1609, and 1610 that Rule 37(g) be suspended whereby 35(g), the deadline for appropriations Bills, is the third Wednesday in June which is today and that these Bills can be heard indefinitely to the end of this spring Session. I would

141st Legislative Day

ask leave in the use of the Attendance Boll Call for that

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call on House Bills... Senate Bills 1450. Senate Bill 1609 and Senate Bill 1610 and suspension of Rule 37(q), and that the deadline for these Bills extended indefinitely until the end of this spring Session. Is there any discussion? Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave and the use Attendance Roll Call for the extension of οf the consideration of these Bills Representative Barnes, for the purposes of a Motion."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I
  would like to exercise the proper Motion so that the
  Department of Insurance Budget for fiscal year '85 can be
  heard tomorrow."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady ask leave to extend the deadline for the consideration of Senate Bill 1562, which is the appropriation for the Department of Insurance, until tomorrow at deadline... rather at midnight and that date is June 29th. Does the Lady have leave and the use of the Attendance Roll Call? June 28th, excuse me, midnight, June 28th. The Lady has leave and, therefore, this deadline will be extended for Senate Bill 1562. Representative Cullerton is recognized for the purposes of a Motion."
- Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that for the following Bills we extend the deadline till the end of the spring Session for consideration of these Bills; Senate Bill 1733, Senate Bill 1790, Senate Bill 1850, and Senate Bill 1893 and Senate Bill 1889."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Johnson."

Johnson: "I object."

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hawkinson. Representative Hawkinson objects also. Representative Cullerton, what is your pleasure?"
- Cullerton: "I will take that Motion out of the record at this time. Perhaps Representative Vinson might be recognized."
- Speaker Breslin: "That Motion is taken out of the record.

  Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "I was just going to ask the Gentleman if he might hold that Motion for a few moments."
- Speaker Breslin: "He has consented to do so. Representative
  Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Madigan: "To ask the Chair to go to Supplemental Calendar #1 and to consider the Motions which are on that Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen on the Order of Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Motions, HJR 172, Representative Madigan. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk Leone: "Motion. "I moved to bypass Committee and place

  House Joint Resolution 172 on the Speaker's Table for
  immediate consideration."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Madam Speaker, the Motion simply would take the question of this Resolution from the Committee and place it on the Speaker's Table for consideration tomorrow. I would move for the adoption of the Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "Well, the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 172... made an appropriate Motion. The Gentleman from Dewitt, Representative Vinson, on the Motion."
- Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion, so that he can get the Bill in a posture for us to consider tomorrow."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Gentleman have leave by use of the Attendance Roll Call to bypass

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Committee and place HJR 172 on the Speaker's Table for consideration tomorrow? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave for the use of the Attendance Roll Call. On the same Order of Business - Motions appears HJR 174, Representative DiPrima. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to bypass Committee and place House Joint

Resolution 174 on the Speaker's Table for immediate

consideration.'"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Madam Chairman... Speaker, I would ... House Joint
Resolution 174, pursuant to Rule 43(a), I move to bypass
Committee and place House Joint Resolution 174 on the
Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. The
Resolution has been reproduced and distributed on the
Members' desk."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DiPrima, do you wish to have this Bill heard today or tomorrow?"

DiPrima: "Well, I can hear it now if you want to get it out of the way."

Speaker Breslin: "That's fine. You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the Motion, Representative Ryder, is recognized."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Speaker), I wish to draw attention as a point of personal privilege that other Representatives indicated offering this indicates that Jin Reilly apparently is still part of the General Assembly and there is a number of others. I wish to, as a point of personal privilege, to inquire the reason for that."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, there has been a corrected copy distributed. You are looking at an old copy. A corrected copy has been distributed."

Ryder: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House bypass

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Committee and place HJR 174 on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries by use of the Attendance Roll Call. And now, would you read the Resolution, Nr. Clerk?"

- Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution 174 offered by Representatives DiPrima, Mays, Hawkinson and Greiman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Yes, well Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I am a little disappointed with the verbiage of the opponents argument but rather than play around, pitter patter, I would like to get it over with and make a move that the House Joint Resolution 174 be accepted."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 174, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 174 be adopted?' favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. who wish? On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 'present'. and the Motion is Representative Cullerton is recognized for the purposes of a Motion."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would renew my motion to extend the deadline on the following Senate Bills for consideration to the end of spring Session. Senate Bill 1733, Senate Bill 1790, Senate Bill 1893, Senate Bill 1889."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the deadline on the following Bills until the end of the spring Session.

  They are Senate Bills 1733, 1790, 1850, 1893 and 1889. And

141st Legislative Day

- June 27, 1984
- on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "I object and also ask the parliamentary inquire as to the number of votes that it takes to suspend the rules."
- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill requires...This Motion requires 60 votes for passage."
- Johnson: "Where do you find that in the rules?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson, unless stated otherwise it takes 60 votes to suspend all rules. And it is not stated otherwise as to this kind of Motion. If you have no further discussion, the Gentlemen from Knox, Representative Hawkinson, is recognized."
- Hawkinson: "Madam Speaker, I also object as to Senate Bill 1790."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne. Representative Van Duyne on the Motion."
- Van Duyne: "Is that a tentative name? I just want to know if this

  Parliamentarian would instruct me as to whether I should

  ask for a 2534 to be on the same list which is also on the

  concurrence now. Just kidding, Mike."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson, on the Motion."
- Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a
   question."
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, the Gentleman will yield for a question."
- Vinson: "Representative, would you amend your Motion so that those deadlines are only extended until midnight tomorrow night?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, be happy to."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman, therefore, amends his Motion so that these Bills have the deadline extended on them until midnight tomorrow evening. Representative Vinson, do you still wish to speak on the Motion? Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly, I rise in the support of Gentleman's new Motion, and I do so because

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

these issues deserve deliberate attention. If we are going to reject the Gentleman's motion then what will inevitably happen is we are going to stay in here until two, or three or four in the morning. And we are going to be in a posture where we are voting in a verv tired condition and not considering these things in a rational We ought not dispose of what are some of the most manner. important issues of this Session late at night away from public scrutiny, when we are tired. We ought to deal with these in a rational fashion which we can do tomorrow. I don't see how that imposes on anyone. Everybody can vote against the Bills that they wish to vote against. against the Amendments they wish to vote against, and they can do so without compelling members who are perhaps in weakened health to have to stay here. I've always been concerned about the prospect by forcing us to stay in here all night. Someday someone is going to have a heart attack in this chamber, and I don't see why we can't deal with this matter in the course of tomorrow."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Vinson.

Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I appreciate the support of Representative
Vinson. I would like to amend my Motion one more time
though to extend the deadline with respect to Senate Bill
1893, until Friday at midnight."

Speaker Breslin: "And that is June 29th. Is that correct?" Cullerton: "Right."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. The Motion now before us is, 'Shall the House extend the deadline on Senate Bills 1733, 1790, 1850 and 1889 until tomorrow midnight, June 28th, and as to Senate Bill 1893 to Friday, midnight June 29th?' And on that question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Johnson: "This really isn't a question about deliberative consideration, and it is not a question about people's What it is, is that there are three or four issues where six or seven people in this chamber, and five or six people in the Senate and the Governor's Office want to make a decision for a 177 people. In the fact that we extend the deadline, it'll give us three or four more days to make a deal where the Membership of this chamber will have no control over the process. If that is what you want to do, you ought to go extend the deadlines and just tell your constituents that you are really impotent down here. If you want to follow the deadlines that we set and consider these things the way every other issue ought to be considered, you ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing, on the Motion."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, I thought we were extending these until the end of Session. Now you've changed that. What Bill is extended until tomorrow night?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Bills that are extended until tomorrow night are the following; Senate Bills 1733, 1790, 1850 and 1889."

Ewing: "And 1893."

Speaker Breslin: "That has been extended. The Motion is to extend it until Priday, midnight, June 29th."

Ewing: "And the others are for June 28th."

Speaker Breslin: "Are, Thursday, midnight, June 28th.

Representative Daniels, on the question."

Daniels: "Madam Speaker, we did not agree to extend 1893 to
Priday night. We agreed to extend those Bills until
tomorrow night, midnight. We expect to have our work
done."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Senate Bill 1893 unlike the others is on Second Reading; and therefore, it is necessary to have one more day to consider Senate Bill 1893 in the orderly process that Representative Vinson spoke about. So that is the reason for that Bill having to be extended until Friday."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "It was my understanding that 1893 has already been read a second time; therefore, you could amend it tomorrow if there is an agreement. If the Speaker decides to lead on this issue, we can have an agreement, and if the majority of the Members of this House approve we can pass it tomorrow, because it has already been read a second time."

Speaker Breslin: "Speaker Madigan on the Motion."

Madigan: "Mr. Daniels is correct with one caveat which is that if that Bill is amended tomorrow then it will 71 require votes, to consider it on the same day. It is a Bill of major significance. I think if people are in tune with the current mood of the Body relative to the Bill, they know that there are cross sections of opinion which today leaves in a situation where the Bill will not pass, regardless of what is in the Bill, until we move toward an agreement. So you wish to put yourself in a position where there are Amendments to the Bill, and then you will be up against a 71 vote requirement to proceed with the Bill, then what you are doing. Just so everybody understands what you are doing."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daniels, once more on the Motion."

Daniels: "Unless you move to extend the Bill again tomorrow until Friday night, it takes 60 votes. We presume, of course, that you will want to negotiate on behalf of your City, on behalf of the people of Illinois and stay reasonable, then we can assist you in the position that you maintain on the

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

World's Fair. We are waiting for you, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Mr. Daniels, my position on the issues are very clear. I have enunciated them to you many times."

Daniels: "I am ready."

Madigan: "If you wish to extend it again tomorrow, that is okay with me too. You know, I am very easy to get along with.

You know that."

Daniels: "I know. Okay, Buddy."

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen you have heard the Motion stated one more time. We are moving to suspend the rules to extend the deadline on the following Bills until tomorrow, midnight, June 28th. That is Thursday. Senate Bills 1733, 1790, 1850 and 1889. And we are moving to extend the deadline on Senate Bill 1893 until Friday, June 29th, at midnight. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "In a effort to move along here I'll be happy to amend the Motion again so that Senate Bill 1893 is only extended until tomorrow night, and then if we have to extend it until Priday, we will do it again tomorrow."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. The Gentleman has amended Motion to include all five Bills to extend the deadline until tomorrow, midnight, June 28th. All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 60 votes for adoption. That is correct. This is a Motion. It takes 60 votes for adoption. A 1 1 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present', and the Motion passes. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1122, Wolf; 1123, Panayotovich;
  1124, Shaw et al; 1125, Churchill Didrickson Ronan;
  1126, Doyle; and House Joint Resolution 173, DiPrima."

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Natijevich: "Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1122. Wolf. congratulates Karen Costello on receiving the Jefferson Award: 1123, Panayotovich, congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Podgorny on their 50th Wedding Anniversary: 1124, Shaw - et al, commends Chicago State University Avers: 1125, Churchill - Didrickson - Ronan, congratulates all who participated in the annual Churchill-Didrickson Golf Tournament; 1126, Doyle, congratulates the City of Northlake on it's 35th Anniversary: House Joint Resolution DiPrima, congratulates Lillian E. Cyborski on her installation as Illinois Department President of the Ladies Auxiliary of the VPW. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr.Wright, Secretary. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Mr. Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to House wit: House Bill 3090. together with the hereto, and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representative, to wit: passed the Senate, June 25th. 1984. Kenneth Wright Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the Secretary. House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur in the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills 1735, 1538, 1522. 1864\_ 1870, 1430, 1644, 833, 1924, 1933, 1179, and 1844,

141st Legislative Day

June 27, 1984

action taken by the Senate June 27, 1984. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Purther Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of Bills with the following titles together with the attached Amendments and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; House Bills 2530, 2610, 2626, 2631, 2633, 2636, 2637, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2654, 2663, 2664, 2729, 2765, 2769, 2776, 2785, 2546, 2547, 2624, 2627, 2638 and 2653, passed the Senate as amended June 27, 1984. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike moves that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. This House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries."

09/27/84 14:55

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 8 3RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 27, 1984

HB 1474	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	2
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	58
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	3
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	45 40
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	52
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE .	7
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	11
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	12 15
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	19
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
HB-2856	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	28
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	35
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	35
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	36 37
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-2950	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	77
	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	85
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	96
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	108 113
	THIRD READING	PAGE	194
	MOTION	PAGE	197
	THIRD READING	PAGE	195
	THIRD READING	PAGE	193
	THIRD READING	PAGE	152
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	153
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	154 113
	RECALLED	PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	147
SB- 1547	THIRD READING	PAGE	155
	THIRD READING	PAGE	155
	RECALLED	PAGE	159
	THIRD READING	PAGE	160
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	176
	RECALLED	PAGE	169 115
	THIRD READING	PAGE	129
	THIRD READING	PAGE	185
SB- 1554	RECALLED	PAGE	130
	THIRD READING	PAGE	142
	THIRD READING	PAGE	147
SB- 1556 SB- 1557		PAGE	148
	THIRD READING RECALLED	PAGE	190
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	163 168
SB-1559		PAGE	170
SB-1562	MOTION	PAGE	198
	THIRD READING	PAGE	149
SB- 1565	THIRD READING	PAGE	191

09/27/84 14:55

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

PAGE 2

JUNE 27, 1984

	0000 27, 1334		
SR- 1566	RECALLED	PAGE	156
	THIRD READING	PAGE	157
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	186
	RECALLED	PAGE	176
	THIRD READING	PAGE	182
	THIRD READING	PAGE	169
	THIRD READING	PAGE	142
	THIRD READING	PAGE	150
	THIRD READING	PAGE	183
	THIRD READING	PAGE	184
	THIRD READING	PAGE	143
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	170
SB-1579	THIRD READING	PAGE	187
SB-1581	THIRD READING	PAGE	188
SB- 1582	THIRD READING	PAGE	189
SB-1583	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	185
	THIRD READING	PAGE	196
SB- 1587	THIRD READING	PAGE	144
SB- 1595	THIRD READING	PAGE	171
	THIRD READING	PAGE	172
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	174
	THIRD READING	PAGE	175
SB-1609		PAGE	197
SB-1610		PAGE	197
	THIRD READING	PAGE	151
	THIRD READING	PAGE	192
SB-1733		PAGE	201
SB-1790		PAGE	201
SB-1850		PAGE	201
SB-1889		PAGE	201
SB-1893		PAGE	201
HJR-0172		PAGE	199
HJR-0174		PAGE	200
HJR-0174	ADOPTED	PAGE	201

#### SUBJECT MATTER

1
1
1
6
9
10
10
83
37
114
206
207
208