35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived, the House will now be in Session. The chaplain for today will be the Reverend Dr. Frank W. Bumpus, Pastor, Bethel Baptist Church of Schaumburg. Reverend Bumpus is the guest of Representative Terry Parke and Representative Wojcik. Will the guests in the gallery please rise and join us in the invocation?"
- Reverend Dr. Frank W. Bumpus: "Shall we pray. Our heavenly Pather, we thank Thee for your goodness to America and to... and for your kindness and your... the prosperity and blessings we've enjoyed in our great state. We look to Thee for a leadership and we thank You for the privilege of praying in this Assembly today. We would remember those who by your providence have leadership over us. We pray for our Governor. We pray for these Legislators. give them wisdom as they go about the business of the day to help... continue to assure us of our prosperity on the one hand and our freedoms on the other. You to give them wisdom to know what is right and then the character to do it. And so we pray today your blessing upon the deliberations of this Assembly. We pray your blessing in Jesus' precious name. Amen. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Ropp will lead us in the pledge to 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. Yes, Mr. Harris, for
 what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My key is not in my box here, and I'd like to be Representative 'present'."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Right. Have you checked the drawer, your center drawer?"
- Harris: "Having ... Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk take the record. The III Members having answered to the quorum call, a quorum is present.

 Mr. Piel, are there any excused absences on the Republican side?"
- Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the record would show Representative

 Tuerk, and as I went to take his key out, I accidentally

 hit his button. That's the reason he's a 'no' up there."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. Representative Tuerk?"

Harris: "Yes, Representative Tuerk is excused today."

- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, let the record so reflect. Mr. Matijevich, anybody on the Democratic side?"
- Matijevich: "Representative Panayotovich is an excused absence, and Representative Grace Mary Stern is here, but she was late hitting her button."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Let the record so reflect with respect to Representative Panayotovich. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention. On the podium with me today is David 'Kemp', he's a resident ο£ Representative Parke's district in Bloomingdale, and he's a student at Lake Park High School. He has been selected the Youth Governor for the State of Illinois for the YMCA Youth in Government, and I think he'd like to meet us and greet And David, we welcome you as the Youth Governor of Illinois."
- David Kemp: "Thank you. Good afternoon. The opportunity to share with you a little bit about what Youth in Government is all about is one responsibility I take great pride in executing. I'm sure all of you have heard of the gangs in our cities, and it may surprise you, but I too am a gang leader. We are 850 students strong. Claiming members in

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

nearly every county of the state. Wе are a highly specialized gang consisting of youth Representatives. Senators, Lobbyists, Pages, Lawyers, Judges and even a Youth Press. Our Youth Legislature passed several during our invasion of Springfield, and although I feel a tremendous obligation to have these ideas heard. I realize the time limitations. And I am sending down a copy of our Bill book. It is my hope that some of you will seek out our ideas and our concerns. Almost every year, this year being no acception, there are more Bills pertaining to education than on any other topic. Without going into specifics, I think the message is consistent, and that is that education needs to be a higher priority of the state. Because of your support for Youth in Government, hundreds of Illinois students every year have the opportunity to experience first hand something that is not offered in any textbook as to what happens here in Springfield. one, firmly believe that one of the state's greatest resources is its youth, and by supporting the Youth in Government Program, you are developing the leaders of tomorrow. And in the process you are ensuring the very future of this state and nation. The positive results of this program are very real. One of your colleagues, Senator Greg Zito, is a prime example of this. Fourteen years ago, Senator Zito served the Youth in Government program as Youth Governor. Today, not only serving Youth in Government Program as all of you do, he serves the people of Illinois. In closing, I'd like to say that on behalf of all the past and all the future Youth in Government participants thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Satterthwaite, Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following Bills

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1995

were referred, action taken May 3, 1985, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' House Bill 1752-Representative Terzich, Chairman Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1985, reported the same with the following recommendation: 'do pass' House Bill 2421. Representative Currie, Chairman of the Committee on Select... the Select Committee on World's Fair, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 3, 1985, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass' House Bill 1681 and 1632_ Representative Levin, Chairman of the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 3, 1985, reported the same back with the following recommendation: *Interim Study Calendar* **#456**, **443**, 689, 1234, 1702, 1725, 2153, 2318, 2501, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508 and 2502. Representative Keane, Chairman of the Committee on Revenue, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 3, 1985, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 997; 'Interim Study Calendar' House Bills 315, 365, 445, 527, 602, 625, 726, 840, 956, 999, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1471, 1554, 1672, 1708, 1874, 1875, 1876, 2380 and 2430."

- Speaker Greiman: "On page 51 of the Calendar, Consent Calendar Second Readings. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Second Reading, Second Day.

 Bouse Bill 354, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal

 Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading

 of the Bill. House Bill 775, a Bill for an Act to amend

 the Boat Registration and Safety Act together with

 Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. House

 Bill 895, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

į

Aid Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 951, a Bill for an Act amend the Emergency Medical Services System Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 957, a Bill for an Act amend an Act and regulate the granting and assistance of indigent war veterans and their families. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 963, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 975, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code together with Committee Amendments #1 and 2. Second Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1299, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1363, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate ... regulation of pawnbrokers. Second Reading of the House Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act for the regulation of pawnbrokers. Second Reading of the House Bill 1365, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act for the regulation of pawnbrokers. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act for the regulation of pawnbrokers. Second Reading of the Bill. the next Bill, House Bill 1438, there's a request for a fiscal note. That Bill will be held on Second Reading. House Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1585, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1618, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend the School

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1654, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the House Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Chicago Park Districts. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1703, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act together with Committee Amendment #1_ Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1768, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act to amend Act in relation to the Department of Mental Health together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading the Bill. House Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act to amend the Blood Labeling Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 1938, a Bill for an Act relating to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1947, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insect Sting and Bite Emergency Treatment Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1956, a Bill for an Act to amend Act relating to stock breeders. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act to amend an relating to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and bovine brucellosis in Illinois together with Committee Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1958, a Bill for an Act to assume payment of wrongful cut Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1962, a trees. Bill for an Act to amend the Forest Products Transportation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1969, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to wild American ginseng. Second Reading of the Bill. House

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Bill 1971, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pharmacy Practice Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2035, a Bill for an Act to amend the Human Care for Animals Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2113, a Bill for an relating to swimming pool safety. Second Reading of the House Bill 2139, a Bill for an Act to amend Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill. That was House Bill 2129. House Bill 2189, a Bill for Act to amend the Dental Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2310. Bill for an Act relating to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act relating to private employment Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2523, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Second Reading of the Bill. Two Bills that have been removed from the agreed list are House Bill 16... 1618 1630. Both Bills have been removed from the Consent Calendar. 1530 that is."

Speaker Greiman: "Except for 1438, for which a fiscal note has been requested, Third Reading of the Consent Calendar. I see a familiar face out there. The Recorder of Deeds of Cook County, Illinois, Buzz Yourell, an old Member, a former Member of the Democratic Leadership. On page 44 of the Calendar, House Bills Third Reading Short Debate. On that Order, appears House Bill 31. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading Short Debate, appears House Bill 241. Mr. Ronan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 241, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Infrastructure Revolving Loan Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 241 is the Revolving Loan Fund for the Infrastructure Act. We've added some Amendments to the Bill. I'll be glad to answer any questions about it. It passed out of Committee unanimous, and I move for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "Does anyone stand in opposition? Yes, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."
- Hallock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not on this Bill, but when we're done I'd like to request a Republican Conference at 12:30, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "At 12:30. Okay, we'll get back to you at 12:30. There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill... Yes, I'm sorry. Yes, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Okay. Representative Roman, how are you today? How
 does this Bill work? Will the Gentleman yield or will he
 answer that question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "You can under our rules, Mr. McCracken, you can ask questions. Short questions for quick information."
- McCracken: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "I'm not going to answer your questions. I'll take it out of the record."
- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of House Bills
 Third Reading Short Debate, appears House Bill 301. Out of
 the record. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading
 Short Debate, appears... Yes, Mr. Bowman, for what purpose
 do you seek recognition?"
- Bowman: "Just to point out that House Bills 301 through 307 are a Special Order of Call, and they should all be taken out of the record."
- Speaker Greiman: "Fine. Thank you. Alright. On the Order of
 House Bills Third Reading Short Debate, appears House Bill
 375. 375. Mr. Hicks. Out of the record. On the Order of

35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

House Bills Third Reading Short Debate, appears House Bill 394. Miss Barnes. Out of the record. Alright. Page 45, we'll continue with next Bill. On the ... On the Order of House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 714. Miss Wojcik. Out of the record. I should make this observation if I may, the Chair would like to remind the Members that we will be going through the Calendar, but there will be times later on in the next two weeks when we will now get back to some of these Bills. So, my recommendation to you is that you... that you call these Bills as soon as possible. So far, we've had Bills called. So, we're going to continue on this Order of Business. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, page 45 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 739. Miss Parcells. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 739, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 739 deals with that part of the Illinois Library Code which refers to annexations of areas which are presently in no library district being annexed into an existing library district by referendum. The law presently states that this question of annexation will be decided by the majority vote of all those voting on the proposition. This Bill will require that the annexation will occur only if a majority of those voting both in the existing library district and a majority of those voting in the area to annexed vote in the affirmative. This will give a voice to those in small areas who might otherwise be annexed against The Bill is supported by the Secretary of their will. State and the Illinois Library Association. It came out of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Committee with a thirteen to zero vote, and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Parcells, has moved for the passage of House Bill 739. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

O'Connell: "What if in a situation where you have a territory that has no residents, for example, an industrial territory, is the resident to be... determined to be the employer or the owner of the industrial property. What do you do in a situation like that?"

Parcells: "This particular area that I am amending does not handle that. Although before this area in the law. It is handled and it says that the owners of that property must be notified, and they may, if anyone of them complains, they will not be annexed. That's in the law presently, and I believe it is the Article before this in the law. This law does not refer to that at all. This is just residential."

McCracken: "So, if one owner out of ten parcels of property says
they do not want to be annexed... he does not want to be
annexed, then it's not to be annexed?"

Parcells: "That's the way the law reads at the moment. I may have a copy of that here. But it is not in the Article that I am presently amending, that is not referred to. But the way that the..."

McCracken: "Well, the Article that you're referring to, is it strictly residential?"

Parcells: "Absolutely."

McCracken: "What if there's a mixture of industrial and residential?"

Parcells: "I believe the residential would be allowed to come out

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

of that. Although, they would not probably be voting. I believe what would happen there is the residents of the area would be voting. Unless, they use it..."

O'Connell: "Well, if you got a mixture... If you got the residential and you've got industrial, one owner of an industrial parcel of property says no according to what you've just said the previous Article would preclude any affirmative referendum on the part of the residents."

Parcells: "Not all the residents. It says in the law that that particular landowner would not be included. The other areas, if they did not object, would be included. I mean if you're talking about a very large industrial area. One objection would eliminate that particular industry, but it would not eliminate the others if they did not object."

O'Connell: "It would not eliminate the residential part."

Parcells: "No."

O'Connell: "But it would eliminate all of the industrial properties."

Parcells: "Those that objected."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken.

I'll remind the Members this is on Short Debate. Mr.

McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, as I read the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the only change this makes is that when the referendum takes place by whatever means which is currently the law in which this Bill does not effect, that not only must a majority of the annexing district favor it, but also a majority of the annexed area must favor it. That makes the referendum more difficult to pass than under current law and for that reason I think that this is a very positive step in the correct direction. And if I remember correctly, it's your first Bill of the Session, isn't it, Representative

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Parcells?"

Parcells: "I knew you would remember that."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in 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 question there are 103... 104 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Brookins and Washington 'aye'. Madigan 'aye'. Mr. Brookins. Yes, we have that already. Mr. Soliz. Soliz, 'aye'. Mr. Richmond, also 'aye'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "I'd like to remind the Speaker that we have Republican Conference at 12:30, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, I know. 12:30 having arrived... what... how long will you need, Mr. Hallock?"

Hallock: "About twenty minutes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Hallock you'll need twenty minutes. So that we will return to the chamber at 1:00... 1:00. The Republican Conference in Room 118 immediately. We return to the chamber at 1:00. Thank you. The House will stand in recess. The House will order. The House will come to order. On page 45 of the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 621. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino in the chamber? Well, we'll take that out of We'll return to the Bill, however. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 743. Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz. Out of the record. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading,

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Short Debate, appears House Bill 929. Mr. Klemm. Excuse me, Mr. Leverenz, were you prepared to proceed on that? Alright. We'll return then. We will call your Bill, Mr. Klemm. House Bill 743, Third Reading Short Debate Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 743, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.

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. House Bill 743 would provide the mechanism for the Department of Law Enforcement to receive and send on further to the FBI, for the purpose of a fingerprint check, a fingerprint card and receive the money from a unit of local government, specifically we're talking about a municipality, for the purpose only of checking on a liquor license applicant. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote, and happy to respond to any questions anyone might have."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, has moved for the passage of House Bill 743, does anyone stand

in opposition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
McCracken: "Not in opposition. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He will yield for questions."

McCracken: "Your Amendment #1, added in Committee, deleted the permit so that that was at a DLE request is that right?"

Leverenz: "That was the Amendment asked for by DLE to limit it to a very narrow fingerprint only."

McCracken: "Alright, and it'd just be for the licensees."

Leverenz: "Rather than a broad area of permits of all kinds, right."

McCracken: "Okay, and the fee determination is made by the criminal justice authority, not DLE?"

Leverenz: "That, I believe, is the way the Amendment is."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

McCracken: "Okay. Okay, that's it. It's a good Bill. Thank you."

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 question, there are 113 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 929. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 929, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections to the Conservation District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. Klemm, on 929." Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. House Bill 929 amends the Conservation District Act to allow by referendum and by petition by the voters to allow conservation districts in Illinois to be similar in respect as some of our park districts and that they could have a levy by a frontdoor referendum to have programs concerning endangered species of fawna and flora, that's plants and animals. It is by voter approval. We're talking about the provisions that the conservation districts have. Many of them, of course as you know, would like to into the programs of providing these get educational projects for the fawna and flora except because 75 percent of their funds must be on hands projects of land acquisition. They really find it difficult to do the So, many private people have asked that the conservation districts be given the same authority by referendum as park districts and forest preserve districts

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

that they've asked for this Bill. The conservation districts of Illinois support the Bill. The Department of Conservation supports it. I know of no opposition, and I do ask for your favorable vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm, has moved for the passage of House Bill 929. Does anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed '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 guestion there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We passed over a Bill just before the next Bill which we will now call. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 621. 621. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 621, a Bill for an Act regulating the activities of loan brokers and providing penalties for violation thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, the Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."
 Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take House
 Bill 621 back to Second Reading for the purposes of
 Amendment #5."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, asks
 leave of the House to return the Bill to the Order of
 Second Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is
 hereby granted. The Bill is on the Order of Second
 Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, offered by Representative Mautino, amends House Bill 621 on page 1, line 9."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on Amendment #5."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 simply includes mortgage bankers who are licensed pursuant to our existing statute to be exempted from the proposal 621, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau has moved for the adoption of Amendment 5 to House Bill 621, and on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor...

 I'm sorry, Mr. O'Connell... are you now seeking recognition?"
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir,"
- O'Connell: "The term loan broker would that include entities such
 as a department store that might have other services
 besides selling merchandise, for example, a Sears and
 Roebuck or a Montgomery Ward?"
- Mautino: "Under this Loan Brokers Act, yes. It excludes those individuals like insurance companies that are brokers, bankers, credit unions, etcetera. And everyone who is currently licensed under the provisions that we now have in the statute."
- O'Connell: "Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Yes, I would like to suspend the appropriate Rule to have... heard."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino moves to suspend Rule 37(c) so that

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

the Bill may be heard on the Order of Third Reading today, does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave.

Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Bill 621 addresses a concern that was brought to the attention of the Attorney General as it pertains to individuals who broker loans in southern Illinois by virtue of calling together farmers who were in need of financial assistance. Basically getting the upfront brokers fees and then fleeing from the responsibilities and basically it was What this legislation will do is to provide a new section which loan brokers would be licensed excluding those individuals who are currently covered under our existing statutes. This... This provision means a person or a business in turn for a consideration to be paid upfront by the borrower before the loan broker or the individual broker has obtained a loan for a... and a commitment being made at that time agrees to do either of the following: to obtain a loan for that individual, to provide and assist that person in consideration for making have themselves licensed at least seven days before the borrower signs an agreement... excuse least seven days before the borrower gives the broker any consideration, whichever occurs first, the loan shall obtain an Assurety Bond, as in our existing statute, and establish a trust fund account in the amount of and in favor of the State of Illinois. Any broker who does not come under this provision or to have themselves licensed and... in the existing register will have a Class

35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

A Misdemeanor provision for failure to do any of those followings. So obtain and maintain the Assurety Bond to make accurate and timely filings with the Act, and we have omitted from this legislation, those individuals who are currently covered by the existing statute such as, banks, insurance companies, credit unions, all those individuals, and of course, mortgage bankers who do this as a regular business entities. It clarifies who loan... and defines who the loan brokers are and etcetera, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau moves for passage of House Bill 621, does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield for three quick questions?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he'll yield for questions, proceed, Sir."

Cullerton: "Does this legislation apply only to individuals who obtain and collect a fee prior to the disbursement of a loan?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Does this legislation exempt all operations presently licensed or regulated in Illinois?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Are mortgage bankers regulated by the Commissioner of Savings and Loan Associations exempt from the provisions of this legislation?"

Mautino: "Yes, and we've included in that provision their Amendment. The Amendment that was recommended by the Department of Financial Institutions."

Cullerton: "Thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

final action. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110... 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, appears House Bill 1013. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1013, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, on House Bill 1013."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 1013 does, is it permits people who use a pickup truck as their family passenger vehicle for non-business, strictly personal purposes to park that automobile on city streets in the City of Chicago. Right now by local ordinance, that's prohibited unless the person has a cap on the back of the pickup and has RV plates. The... It's permitted for Chevy Suburbans for example, but not for the same size vehicle without the top on it. And this would permit people use it for family purposes to drive a pickup as their family car. And it passed, Mr. Speaker, out of Transportation Committee, twenty to zero."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, has moved for the passage of House Bill 4013, and on that is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you. Representative Preston, this Bill applies to
 what were called 'mini-vans', right? Personal,
 noncommercial vehicles."
- Preston: "Well, not vans. Vans right now are permitted to do what this Bill would permit for small pickup trucks. Not a

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

van, but a pickup."

Braun: "It's a... It's a pickup truck."

Preston: "Right."

Braun: "Thank you, Representative."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

- Nash: "Mr. Preston, what license plates will these pickup trucks have? Will they have passenger plates or B plates which are a truck?"
- Preston: "That... That is really up to the Secretary of State. I

 can't answer that question. My assumption would be that

 just like... that they'd have passenger plates just like

 the Chevy Suburban does now or the van."
- Nash: "In order for this law to go into affect, if this Bill passes, you're going to have to amend some of the Vehicle Codes to allow B plate trucks to park on side streets."
- Preston: "This strictly affects nonbusiness vehicles. It does
 not... business vehicles are still going to be prohibited,
 but nonbusiness..."
- Nash: "Well, if it's a pickup truck, how can they use it for personal use? Pickup trucks are used for business."
- Preston: "Well, throughout Illinois in almost all the municipalities in this state this is currently the law.

 There are very few municipalities where this is not... prohibited."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Mr. Preston. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Vinson?"
- Vinson: "On a point of order. I've heard Bills mumbled through before, but I've never heard questions mumbled through before, and I wonder if we could get those questions better into the record so that the microphone picks them up."
- Speaker Greiman: "Do you have any questions you want to put, Mr.

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Vinson?"

Vinson: "I do. I have two interesting questions on this Bill just to inform me. On Lake Shore Drive in Chicago can you drive a pickup truck legally?"

Preston: "No, you cannot."

Vinson: "Would you be adverse to using this Bill as an Amendment to change that?"

Preston: "This Bill does change that, Representative."

Vinson: "It does?"

Preston: "Yes."

Vinson: "So you'd be able to drive a pickup truck on Lake Shore
Drive?"

Preston: "If it is a nonbusiness vehicle under 8,000 pounds that's used for personal use only, yes."

Vinson: "Is that just rice wagons, or is that American pickup
trucks?"

Preston: "That's American pickup trucks, 8,000 pounds or under."

Vinson: "Okay, now ... "

Preston: "Which... which again is used for nonbusiness, personal purposes. The same as Chevy Suburbans which are, in fact, larger than that now."

Vinson: "I think you got a good Bill."

Preston: "You mean this is not the worse heinous invasion of privacy that you've ever seen?"

Vinson: "No, you did that last week."

Preston: "Oh, okay. I'm confused."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, we're going a little far-a-field on Short

Debate, but Mr. Ewing, the Gentleman from Livingston."

Ewing: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Ewing: "Is a farmer from Livingston County driving his pickup truck, is that a business use or a private?"

Preston: "Depends on what the purpose is of the time their

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

driving. If the vehicle is not being used for business purposes and is being used for personal purposes, that person would be permitted to drive a 8,000 or under pound vehicle. Which is again the same size or less than Chevy Suburbans and wans now which are permitted to park anywhere they want."

Rwing: "So, if the farmer is in town for the opera, he can drive his pickup truck. That's a personal..."

Preston: "Did you say... Did you say, if a farmer or did you say if the Governor? I... I..."

Ewing: "Well, either one. I..."

Preston: "The Governor could a semi in my district and he'd be very welcome."

Ewing: "No, I would like the record to show though, that if the farmer is driving for personal use in Chicago, then he wouldn't be subject to fine."

Preston: "If it is in a vehicle that is under 8,000 pounds and just happens to not have a back on it, they would not be subject to fine, as long as it was not being used to... for business purposes. So, if the person is hauling wheat or whatever farmers like to haul, that would be for business purposes and would not be permitted."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The... Well, I take it we are off of Short

Debate. So, we will just... I wouldn't to stop anybody

from asking questions. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr.

Friedrich."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Mr. Preston."

Preston: "If I might, this Bill is on Short Debate."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, I know, but Members have asked to speak.

They can take it off, and we're just moving along..."

Preston: "But they haven't, Mr.Speaker."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Barger, the Gentleman from DuPage."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions.

Does this refer just to the City of Chicago, or are we trying to circumvent the zoning codes of all of the municipalities?"

Preston: "Provides that no municipality over 500,000 shall prohibit a second division vahicle under 8,000 pounds from operating."

Barger: "Then what we're trying to do with this Bill is to circumvent the zoning codes of the City of Chicago.

Because this normally..."

Preston: "That's correct, Representative."

Barger: "That's correct."

Preston: "That's correct."

Barger: "Okay, thank you. I was just trying to find out."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. Preston, you may close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is simply to permit personal vehicles, that happen to be trucks - the same as those personal vehicles which happen to be Chevy Suburbans with a piece of metal over the back, permits those same vehicles to drive wherever they want to drive as long as they're not used for business purposes. As long as they're personal vehicles that are used as the family car. As many places throughout the State of Illinois, pickup trucks are used as family vehicles. Bill came from a number of constituents. One of whom, best arguer of all, who had just moved to my district from the State of Ohio and just before moving purchased a thirteen or fourteen thousand dollar pickup truck that they use for ... for his family ... that's the car they had, and he couldn't understand why he kept getting tickets for parking it on a side street. And I explained to him, it's 35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

illegal in the City of Chicago to use that vehicle, but if you put a cap on the back, you could drive it and park it anywhere you want. I don't think we in Illinois should be in the business of requiring people to style their personal vehicles the way we would like, as long as it doesn't infringe on the load limit that a street should bear. That's all this Bill does. It makes Chicago and Decatur have the same parking and street usage laws."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is. 'Shall this Bill pass?' A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, the record. On this question there are 87 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 15 voting 'present'. This Bill. having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading. Short Debate, appears House Bill 1160. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. This Bill impowers the Comptroller of the State to question the legality of an expenditure if his opinion the documents filed in support of the expenditure do not substantiate payment of the warrant. Before making payment of such a warrant, the Comptroller investigation into the legality of may conduct an expenditure through examination procedures which considers to be necessary to determine whether expenditure is pursuant to law. The examination procedures may include any necessary field audits, investigations, or hearings. If upon initiating investigation the Comptroller postpones

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

the payment of a warrant for more than three working days, he shall inform the chief executive officer of the agency in writing of the reasons the warrant was not issued. The chief executive officer of the agency or his designee may file an affidavit with the Comptroller responding to the Comptroller's statements and further certifying that the expenditure is made pursuant to law. Upon receipt of the agency's affidavit, the Comptroller shall, and I emphasize shall... he has discretion at this point, make payment of the warrant, but even after the payment he may continue with the investigation. I ask the House for an Affirmative Roll Call on this good government legislation."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves for passage of House Bill 1160. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, thank you. I stand in opposition. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He'll yield for a question. Proceed, Sir."
- McCracken: "Representative Bowman, did Pat 'Quinn' bring this Bill to your attention?"
- Bowman: "I'm glad you asked me that question, because no, he did not bring that to my attention. This is a Bill that was brought to my attention by the Comptroller of the State of Illinois, Roland Burris."
- McCracken: "And... I'm correct in the Bill, there are no parameters drawn on the subject matter of inquiry other than legality, is that correct?"
- Bowman: "Absolutely, Representative. Legality is the issue. The Comptroller of the State of Illinois is directed by the Constitution of the State, not to draw warrants in the case of illegal expenditures. I mean that is precisely why we have a Comptroller. The problem is the statutes do not give him the authority that goes with that responsibility.

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

That is the instant issue."

McCracken: "Is he a Constitutional Officer?"

Bowman: "He certainly is."

McCracken: "Does the Constitution give him the authority to question the legality of the draw?"

Bowman: "The ... What the Constitution does, it gives him the question... it gives him the authority to legality, but does not give him the authority to withhold payment and the ... impending an investigation. And what this Bill does and the reason that I think you should withdraw your opposition is because what this Bill does is it provides a three day period during which he may investigation, and if the investigation is still pending, the Department Chief can certify that, yes it's a legal expenditure - he certifies by affidavit, and then the Comptroller must issue the warrant even if he continues with his investigation. I think this is a good Bill for clarifying responsibility and for ... to make sure that the machinery of government operates efficiently even when questions are raised."

McCracken: "Just answer the question, Mr. Witness. Let me ask you this..."

Bowman: "I'm not a witness. I'm a Sponsor."

McCracken: "In this situation about the pay raise where there have been questions of constitutionality and legality and there was a recent appropriations Bill and there's an ongoing debate, is it your opinion, as Sponsor, that this Bill would allow him to withhold payment for three days subject to the affidavit and then to continue his investigation on that issue?"

Bowman: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

35th Legislative Day

McCracken: "I think that there is a

May 7, 1985

the

good reason that

Constitution is silent as to the issue of how far Comptroller may go, and I suggest to you that it is for the following reason. The Comptroller, the Office of the Comptroller, is executive in nature. It is functionary. It is functional. It is the office which executes the results of policy and appropriations and decisions made other parties. It is responsible for keeping records. Ιt is responsible for drawing checks. It is responsible as a functionary. The reason I submit to you that the Constitution is silent on the issue of whether or not Comptroller has authority beyond that functionary authority, whether the Comptroller can hold checks pending investigation, whether he can demand of agency heads an affidavit satisfying him. By the way, his discretion not being limited as to the subject of inquiry, his discretion not being limited as to whether or not he is satisfied with the particular agency head decision or affidavit, because it ... it obviates his function. His function is no longer one of executing decisions other people make. becomes a policy maker, a defacto policy maker. The Constitution is wisely silent on point. The statutes should not expand his authority. I have great respect for the current Comptroller. I have great respect for the Office of Comptroller. I'd like to leave it where it Where it belongs, and I stand in opposition."

Speaker Greiman: "Very quickly. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Mr. McAuliffe, the Gentleman from Cook."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I would rise to echo what Representative McCracken said. I'd like to remind my Democratic colleagues on other side of aisle, that it's quite possible that Pat 'Quinn' will be a candidate for statewide office next year.

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

And it's possible, God forbid, that he could be elected If Pat 'Quinn' was Comptroller, he'd have a press conference everyday, everytime he didn't agree with a check that was going to be issued. He'd call a press conference. and he would invoke this provision that Representative Bowman is trying to pass now. Those of on the Democratic side of the aisle that are familiar with Pat 'Quinn' think about it. Do you want to give him the power to have press conferences called everyday, everytime he sees a check issued that he doesn't approve of. So. this is a Bill that we should not pass. I fully trust the current Comptroller with these powers, but I'd hate to think what would happen if Pat 'Quinn' got this power in his hands. I urge all my colleagues to vote 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Just an inquiry of the Chair. Are we on Short or Long

Debate?"

Speaker Greiman: "I think we're on medium-sized debate..."

Leverenz: "Modified short."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Bowman. Mr. Friedrich, were you seeking recognition?" Mr. Friedrich, were you seeking recognition?"

Friedrich: "I want to explain my vote..."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Alright. We'll let you do that.

Fine. Mr... Thank you for observing the Rules, Sir. Mr.

Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe there's a considerable amount of misunderstanding about what the Bill actually does. At the present time, if the Comptroller wants to holdup the warrants forever, the Comptroller might be able to do it if he can get away with

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

it in the popular press and if he doesn't get roasted to badly. This Bill, however, provides that question... in the event that there is a question about the legality from the Comptroller's respective, that he may do an investigation, which he might do anyway, but after three working days he's got to issue the warrant. Now, I wish that the ... my colleagues, especially on the other side of the aisle, who's spoken to this Bill would take that consideration. That the warrants may not be held up for more than three working days. However, Mr. Speaker, since thought I had worked out the problems on the other side with this Bill and apparently I hadn't, I'd like to take the Bill out of the record."

- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. Okay. On the Order of
 House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, page 45,
 appears House Bill 1163. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1163, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Saltsman." Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill authorizes the Farm Development Authority to loans available to agri-business for the research and development of agricultural products. This legislation proposes to further expand the scope of the Authority's Loan Program to include agriculture research development of products. The Bill would authorize the Authority to make loans for eligible businesses for financing facilities and equipment for research and development of the products, processes and equipment, for the production, processing, preparation and packaging of agricultural commodity and by-products. This is geared to be a joint venture between the United States Department of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Agriculture and private industry, and I ask for a favorable vote. $^{\prime\prime}$

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Peoria moves for the passage of House Bill 1163, does anyone stand in opposition? There being none, 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. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there 109 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, appears House Bill 1314. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 1314 puts back into our statute a situation that occurred when we eliminated certain license classifications two Sessions ago. We have not changed the gross weight on a vehicle, but we have redistributed that weight, current law says there can be no more than 18,000 pounds on front and rear axle. On trucks, for example, that haul pop and beer and other things you notice they have a stub nose and the trucks are built so that the axles carry weight on the rear than they do on the front. Therefore. all we have done in this instance was to increase the rear axle by 2,000 pounds, which is authorized anyway, over the rear axle weight and reduce the front axle weight by 2,000 pounds, and we have not changed at all the gross weight provisions. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, has

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

moved for the passage of House Bill 1314, does anyone stand in opposition? There being no one, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, appears House Bill 1318.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1318 is the Bill supported by the towing truck industry, and what it does, it's actually to professionalize the towing truck industry. They've... They came in a Committee asking that we look into their operation, and their acts be under consideration with the Illinois Motor Carrier Act. This truthfully may be a Bill in perpetuity because under the Sunset provision the laws are going to be written or rewritten later on this year. But if we can get this passed, it would give it some strength to have this implemented in the new Act. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, moves for the passage of House Bill 1318, does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Does this Bill say that under the... strike that.

Does this Bill provide that a tow truck operator will have

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

- to get authority through the Illinois Commerce Commission?"

 Giglio: "They'd have to... They'd have to perform within the rules and regulations of the Authority, and I don't see anything in this, John, truthfully, that says they have to get permission. They have to get the license and whatever provision it is to operate as a business."
- O'Connell: "Okay. So, this would not include someone who's a tow truck operator now from having to go before the Illinois Commerce Commission and get authority to haul... or tow vehicles."
- Giglio: "No. It is my understanding, as long as their under the rules and regulations of being a proper business entity in the State of Illinois. They can do just that."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. Mays, the Gentleman from Adams."
- Adams: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a first in a series of Bills that have been suggested by this Professional Towing and Recovery Operators of Illinois. I would like to point out that it does set forth the motion for regulation of the industry and for those that may believe that to be appropriate, I think they could vote 'aye'. I personally am unsure as to whether we should go ahead and set this ball in motion at this point. So, I'm going to vote 'present'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, 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 question there are 83 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 23 voting... Mr. Bullock, 'aye'. So, there are 84 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 23 voting 'present'.

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 45 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills Third Reading, appears House Bill 1.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1, a Bill for an Act in relation to passenger seatbelts for school buses. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on House Bill 1."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last year, I had a Bill which dealt with seatbelts on school buses. The Bill was narrowly defeated. And so, over the course of that year, I amended the Bill and worked with various groups who were in opposition in an effort to remove that opposition. Now, one of the groups that was in opposition was the school boards. They concerned that this Bill may, if passed, it would ve involved them with some litigation. So, I put an Amendment on that indicated that if they put seat.... in their new school buses... if they put seatbelts, they wouldn't have to worry about being sued. I also indicated to them that the cost of this Bill was relatively low. That is somewhere around 500,000 dollars. And it's something like this, this mandate that the state would easily and could very easily fund. It wasn't like a state mandate that was in the 12 or 13 million dollars where the state doesn't And I made it very clear... always fund it. continue to make it clear that this Bill should only apply... will only apply to new school buses. That is school buses not retrofitted, because that is to expensive, but rather only new school buses. The cost for each bus is approximately a 1,000 dollars per bus. The real important point, that I also changed, I noted of course that there is

35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

many ... much opposition to the mandatory seathelt law. the mandatory seatbelt law tells people that they have to wear a seatbelt. This Bill does not tell children that they have to wear a seatbelt. What this Bill says is that those children who are on a school bus should have the option to wear a seatbelt if they wish. They should have the right to decide for themselves if they want to wear seatbelt. Right now, there are no seatbelts on the large school buses. And so my child who has been taught to wear a seatbelt in our passenger car when she gets on a school bus, she wants to wear that seathelt but she can't under the current law. So, that's why this Bill is different than it was last year. It's a reasonable approach to start having our school buses be equipped with seatbelts. provides standards in the Bill for the installation and the quality of the seatbelts. It takes care of the problem of the school districts having to be reimbursed. It also clears up the fact that the school districts cannot be sued. And more importantly and I think most importantly, it says that it does not mandate the use of the seatbelt. It just mandates the availability of the seatbelt. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I would appreciate your support in this Bill. I think it's a very important Bill. It's the reason why I made it House Bill !. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, has moved for the passage of House Bill I, and on that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will. Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "Representative, do I understand your remarks and the Bill to mean that; number one, no child is required under

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

this Bill to wear a seatbelt in a bus?"

- Cullerton: "You're absolutely correct. That has been changed from last year's Bill. This Bill does not require the use of the seatbelt."
- Vinson: "Number two, a school district which has a bus with a seat in the bus, a bench seat in the bus, with two seatbelt apparatuses on that bench seat, may that school district carry three children on that bench seat?"
- Cullerton: "What's contemplated in this Bill is to... is to employ the systems they've used in about four different school districts already in Illinois. They put three seatbelts on every seat, and if two larger children sit on that seat, they only use two seatbelts. If three small children sit on that seat, they use all three seatbelts."
- Vinson: "But does the Bill prohibit a school district from carrying three children on a seat that only has two seatbelts?"
- Cullerton: "No it doesn't. It leaves that up to the local school district to decide whether they want to put two or three seatbelts per seat... per bench."

Vinson: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed,"

Vinson: "I believe that there is a very substantial difference between mandating that an individual wear a seatbelt and mandating that a motor vehicle, which travels upon the highways of the State of Illinois, have certain safety equipment like seatbelts in there or like airbags. I believe that that is a fundamental difference that has to be dictated by the nature of our philosophy about individual rights and our philosophy about state responsibilities. It's clearly a legitimate responsibility of the State of Illinois to ensure that vehicles have appropriate safety equipment. I don't believe the State of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Illinois has any business requiring an individual to save himself from himself. I think that that goes to the essence of individual liberty and individual rights. Cullerton's current Bill as opposed to some of his previous efforts in this regard. I believe it is permissable and in fact desirable under that conception of the role of the State of Illinois. I don't think there's anything at undesirable about the idea of making safety equipment available. And that's all that Mr. Cullerton's current And further, the way in which he has devised his current Bill does not impose undue an burden financially or in terms of regulatory conduct on the school districts of this state. It does not require school districts to increase by 50 percent the number of buses they have, because where they have in the past carried three children on a seat they can now only carry two. is not required. He recognizes that. That that would an undue burden. Nor does he require that every school bus driver and every school transportation program take responsibility for ensuring that every school child wears a seatbelt. And in fact, there is conflicting testimony about the desirability of students wearing seathelts on All he is doing is providing that safety equipment And I believe in this matter that is be available. certainly permissable under the law and under the Constitution and under any reasonable conception of the philosophy of individual rights. Now, I speak issue not as a party leader, I speak to it not articulating policy of any party in the state. I speak to it as a matter of conscious which I think the entire seatbelt controversy must involve. I don't believe this is something that can be dictated by a party position. I believe this is something that the individual must resolve

35th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1985
- in his own conscious. And in my own conscious, I think that this is a desirable Bill and I personally intend to vote for it."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Davis: "Representative Cullerton, forgive my ignorance, did you say in your opening remarks that this Bill had not been amended to exempt the State Mandates Act?"
- Cullerton: "No, I made it very clear that it's going to impose a cost on the state to reimburse the local school districts."
- Davis: "Was there a fiscal note attached to the Bill on Second Reading and was that answered?"
- Cullerton: "There was a fiscal note filed. That's correct."
- Davis: "What... What was the results of that fiscal note? I do not have it in front of me, and I apologize for that. What is the approximate or the estimated cost to the state for the next ten years or however the note was answered?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I'll run it down for you. There's approximately 12,000... Well, they say there's 12,412 buses in Illinois. The... They used a five year depreciation average. They used a 1,000 dollars per bus."
- Davis: "So, every fifth year 2,000 buses would go. It would be two million dollars a year for the next five years."
- Cullerton: "Right, but... but that's for buses that are owned by the school district."
- Davis: "I understand."
- Cullerton: "That's only about a third. The others are rented by school districts. So, now..."
- Davis: "Well, are those covered under this Bill, Sir?"
- cullerton: "Yes, they are. But the bus owner that owns a bus is not going to be entitled to recoup the cost of installing

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

that bus in the first year, because they're going to be renting it over at least a five year period. The average life, by the way, of a bus is seven years. So, I would estimate it to be... last year the fiscal note was 360,000 dollars, I estimate it to be anywhere, depending on how many new buses there are, between 500,000 to a million dollars."

Davis: "Well, thank you. I think the answer is adequate. However, it is a neat dodge around the State Mandates Act, one that I'd never heard in that the charter bus companies who by your words have two-thirds of the buses in the State of Illinois that transport children will not be able to recoup from the State of Illinois the extra cost of adding seatbelts into their equipment. But I can guarantee you... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That I can guarantee you that they will pass those costs along in higher contract cost to individual school districts at a time when that is probably not necessary to do, when we have been woefully lacking in funding transportation at all levels to the full degree that the formula requires us to do. But not withstanding that, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, this issue has a great deal of glamour. Your PTA's are probably for it, I'm not sure. I haven't heard from all of mine. But I can simply tell you that if you've listened in the Transportation Committee for the last three years or had the opportunity to hear the testimony from opponents of this measure, that the state-of-the-art of seatbelt usage for children in school buses is not really the way to go according to the opponents whom I believe. believe in capsulization or even just turning the bench seats around in the buses and facing to the rear is probably a greater safety mechanism than seatbelts could ever provide. To the contrary as a matter of fact, safety

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

belts or seatbelts when worn in buses in an accident for young children especially, have a tendency to create more problems than they would solve in the event of a tragic accident or a fire in the ability to unbuckle those particular students. Not withstanding that, the discipline problem of a school district that would mandate after the permissive nature of this Bill that indeed seatbelts should be worn in every bus. Who buckles them up and who unbuckles that five year old, that first grader, that second grader? I don't believe this is a good Bill, despite the glamour of this issue. And I intend to vote 'no', and I urge my colleagues throughout this Assembly to vote also 'no'."

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

Levin. "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in favor of House Bill 1. This is truly a little people's Bill. This is a Bill that has been lobbied. I know this phrase that Representative Ronan likes to use, but I think it is very appropriate here. This is a Bill that's been lobbied by the parents, by the PTA's. Those that are concerned about their children. And I think Representative Cullerton has been willing to compromise and worked very hard on this legislation. And I think that it's in a form that we ought to pass it. It's going to do something for the children of our state. The children who we've been attempting to teach to use seatbelts. And when they into school, and they go on a bus that is not equipped with seatbelts, they're wondering what's going on. It runs counter to what we've been trying to teach them. I know my kids. They get into our car and the first thing they do is they put on their seatbelts. I think this provides some It makes some sense. It doesn't require that continuity. the seatbelts be used, and I urge an Affirmative Roll

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Call."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen This is a controversial topic primarily of the House. because people will attempt to make the transition from automobile safety to bus safety. Let me just say in... prefacing my remarks, there's no safer way to travel on the basis of experience then in a school bus under the present circumstances. I'd just like to share with you the results of two studies done in two different states in regard to the issue of seatbelts in buses. The first is from the State of Maryland and it says, after careful consideration many aspects of this issue. The Maryland State Department of Education concludes that seathelts would not enhance the safety of pupils on school buses to any appreciable degree, and may in fact present hazards to the safety of the children being transported. The State of Maryland. A study done by the legislative council of the State of Arkansas makes the following conclusion. appears on the basis of cost, lack of data, great fatality decline with the installation of seatbelts. the possible dangers which could arise to the installation of the seatbelts themselves, the outstanding safety record of school buses in general, the issue of seatbelts in school buses could be left as a decision to be made by individual school districts and should not be mandated by the Legislature. Now, let me just conclude by pointing out that the National Safety Council has done studies in this area... in fact there's a study out now or study in progress being done on the national level, and it seems to me that the weight of the evidence comes down on the other side of this legislation. Regardless of how carefully the Sponsor has attempted to craft the legislation, it is an

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

additional cost to the state. That's not the point as far as I'm concerned. The point... my point is very simply that this legislation may be counter productive, and it may in fact and probably is in fact on the basis of the evidence contrary to the best interest of little people. We can not make the transition from automobiles to buses. You are talking in reality, apples and oranges, as those of you who understand the issue know. And it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this legislation."

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

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kulas, moves the previous question. All those in favor of the previous question being put signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the previous question will be put. Mr. Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm aware of these studies that Representative Hoffman was referring to. Most of these studies can be refuted, have been refuted by the people who have working on this issue for many years. It's obvious that the bus manufacturers are opposed to the Bill, and thev lobbied, they sponsored some of these, so called, independent studies themselves. And I don't think very objective. If, however, you agree with those studies. them tell your daughter or your son not to wear their seatbelt on the bus, because you'll have that option. You'll have that right. On the other hand, if you believe as I do, that after we teach our children that they... ₩e mandate that they have to ... in a carseat and then in a seatbelt. And then they are mandated to get on a school

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

bus that they don't even have the opportunity and the right to put on a seatbelt as we as parents have trained them and that's obviously wrong. And that's what the Bill is all about. Now we've had a testimony in the Transportation Committee by ... I believe a nine year old girl from Skokie who came in and made as much sense as any witness has made in any Committee this year. She said that she wants to have this Bill passed. She has seatbelts on her school bus up there in Skokie and all of the children on that bus keeping that good habit of wearing their seatbelts. if you're unconvinced or uncertain as to whether or not it's safe to have seat belts in the school buses, you surely should provide the right for those parents who want to have their children keep that habit. We know that right now, we have the smaller school buses that have seat belts required. We know that we just had an accident a couple of weeks ago where it's unclear as to whether the children were wearing their seat belts, and I think that this is an issue that, as I've said before, may deal with life and death, and it's something which, as a result, we should give close attention to, and please, I would ask for your support for the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Priedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is nothing now to prevent a local school board from requiring that the buses they buy have seat belts. I happen to believe in local authority. We elect those people to run our schools, run the buses, hire the drivers and do everything connected with the schools, and I think we've gone way too far at the federal and state level, mandating

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

and telling them what to do. I think they do a pretty good job the way it is, and we've had no reason, in our area, to require seat belts. The other thing is, of course, this eventual cost has to... there's only one place for it go, and that's back to the taxpayer. There isn't any Santa Claus in my district or in the State of Illinois, or in Washington or anywhere else, and I ... despite what the Sponsor says, and I have confidence in what he says, I can quarantee if this Bill passes, it won't be a year until someone will say, 'Okay, you've got to have them on or you can't start the bus. That's the next step, and that's the way these things go, so you can... you can just depend the fact that if this Bill passes, the next Bill will mandate they be buckled up."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, one minute to explain her vote."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. In explanation of my 'no' vote while having cast a 'yes' vote with regard to the Transportation Committee Report, I did have a demonstration of a compartmentalized school bus for my local PTA, who was very much in support of this Bill. After that demonstration in our district office, we and the local PTA have concluded that this is not the way to go at this time, that the compartmentalized bus is indeed the best and the safest, and indeed, that is what I am concerned about school children's safety."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, one minute to explain your vote."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the Sponsor of this Bill is certainly very sincere in his effort to protect children and all of us who ride in vehicles. I do, though, disagree with one of the Members from our side of the aisle who think there's much

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

difference in whether you mandate equipment in a bus or a car, or requiring people to wear it. The truth of the matter is - and we have done this time after time down here - we don't mandate it at the beginning, we make it permissive. We make it easy to pass, easy to swallow, but very soon, we put a mandate on it. While I'm concerned about safety of children - and I happen to be convinced that this is not a safety measure for children - I am also concerned about tax dollars, and whatever we do, whether we pay for it as a mandate or we pass it on to the local schools to pay for, this is money that isn't available for educational purposes of reading, writing and arithmetic, and I think a 'no' vote is the right vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, for what purpose, Mr. Hoffman, do you seek recognition? You spoke in debate, if I recall."
- Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I
 want to make it very clear to the Sponsor and the other
 Members of this House that I have not had any discussion on
 this issue with anyone who makes or provides school buses."

 Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Regan. One minute

to explain your vote."

- Regan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On this Bill, that I've studied both sides of this issue very carefully. I've come to the decision in my mind that this is not safe for our children, and certainly, I'm one that's concerned about the safety of children. Also, the expense of the Bill, it does not warrant putting our lives of our children at risk in case of a fire or a turnover. I explain my vote as a 'no'."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from MacLean, Mr. Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I certainly appreciate the sincerity of the Sponsor in this legislation, but in a year of education reform, it is my

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

best judgment that we ought to be spending our dollars in reforming the quality of education, improving the teachers, the administrators and some of the curriculum that we are attempting to have instructed to these young people, and I certainly think that our priorities are not in order, if we insist that this Bill pass, and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 49 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'no', and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, requests that the Bill be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration, and it is so ordered. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading on page 46 of the Calendar appears House Bill 8. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 8, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to address the issues raised by House Bill 8, which adds sexual orientation to the Human Act in a series of questions and answers. I have five questions and answers that I would like for you to consider as you weigh your vote. Number one, how can we support gay rights? Would not civil rights for gays homosexuality? The answer: legislation to protect gay people from discrimination would not endorse or homosexuality."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Bowman, excuse me. Please give the Gentleman your attention."

Bowman: "Just as the inclusion of religion in civil rights laws does not indicate support for any particular religion or religion in general, or even an absence of religion, neither would gay civil rights legislation indicate support

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

for homosexuality, per se. Number two, wouldn't the gay rights Bills that we have here before us give homosexuals special rights and privileges? Will it take away employer's right to hire whomever he wants? proposed gay rights legislation would not give homosexuals special privileges. It would only quarantee the basic civil rights - rights that are taken for granted bу people, including you and me. An employer would still be free to hire and fire whomever they choose, providing the job qualification and performance is the criterian, and not some irrelevant private matter, such as sexual orientation. The proposed civil rights legislation not in any way require quotas or affirmative action, just as we do not now require employers to hire certain numbers of Lutherans or Norweigans or whatever. Number three ... Mr. Speaker, would you try it again."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Yes, please, let us... give Mr. Bowman your attention."

Bowman: "All I ask of this Assembly is to take the issue seriously. This is an issue that is very important to number of people throughout the state, and regardless of the probable fate of the legislation, I believe we owe it to these people to consider their predicament. three, would this legislation set a dangerous precedent? Absolutely not. The principle of civil rights legislation is not new. It has been around a long All it says is that people should be judged as individuals. rather than on the basis of group stereotypes. principle, hopefully, is becoming part of the fabric of American life. those cities where that principle has In been extended to include homosexuals, it has worked well. Despite the dire predictions by some, there have been no problems. And I speak as a Representative from the City of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Evanston. The City of Evanston has an ordinance on its books that's been there for several years, specifically with respect to the rental of housing, and there have been problems, repeat, no problems since that ordinance was adopted several years ago. Number four, would gay rights legislation force schools to hire homosexuals? The answer: issue of concern to parents is, rightfully, teacher misconduct, not sexual orientation. Teachers can be fired misconduct, with or without this law. Nothing in this law would circumscribe the authority of local school officials in that regard. Many cities have adopted ordinances quaranteeing civil rights for gays. ordinances have caused no problem because we do not protect Number five lastly, wouldn't homosexuals use their teacing positions to recruit children and turn them into homosexuals? This question has been asked me more than any other. And let me conclude with an answer, not in my own words, but from the President of the United States of America, Ronald Wilson Reagan, who has spoken on this has written on this issue in response † o constituent inquiries, and I quote to you from the words of President Reagan, 'As to the role model argument, a woman writing to the editor of a southern California newspaper "If teachers have such power over children, I would have been a nun years ago. ** Reagan continued. *Whatever else it is, homosexuality is not a contagious disease like the measles, and prevailing scientific opinion is that a child's teachers really do not influence this. Sexuality cannot be ... Now I'm ... That ends the Reagan quote. One final thought. Sexuality cannot be taught or learned like history or mathematics. Experts agree. Dr. John 'Money' of John Hopkins University asserts that a child's sexual orientation is determined by ages three or

35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

five... three or four, well before they enter the public schools. Dr. John 'Spiegel', then President of the American Psychiatric Association, commented, 'Some have feared that homosexual teachers might affect the sexual orientation of their students. There is no evidence to support this thesis.' Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have heard significant testimony in the Committee on the need for this legislation. I hope that I have persuaded you that there is nothing detrimental in this law. I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 8. On that, is there any discussion?

The Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Would the Representative please explain what he said at the outset by voting for this doesn't mean any indication of your support per se. I'm not an attorney, so what does that mean?"

Bowman: "What that means is that this law is not intended or should be construed to encourage, promote any particular life style. All we are saying is that a person cannot be discriminated against on the basis of an arbitrary condition that is not related to work or the rental of property or the like."

Leverenz: "Would there be any prohibition if you voted for it, to stop someone from zeroxing the synposis and digest at all?"

Bowman: "Representative Leverenz, I believe I know the incident you are referring to."

Leverenz: "You're right."

Bowman: "I think that was an example of misconduct, and I think misconduct, in all its forms, is properly circumscribed by law."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Leverenz: "Well, my opponent was not arrested and charged with misconduct."

Bowman: "Should have been."

Leverenz: "My opponent, however, leafletted the heck out of all of the church parking lots, and things of that nature. So I'm very confused now, and I will probably be forced to vote 'present'."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you very much. I appreciate the respect... the

House... with which the House has considered this issue.

I renew my urgent request for an Affirmative Boll Call."

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 question, there are 19 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', and this Bill fails. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 9. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill #9, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Levin."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Levin. I'm sorry. Mr. Levin. House Bill

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 9 is substantially different in its approach than House Bill 8, and I urge every Member of this Body to take a close look at House Bill 9 before you cast your vote. House Bill 9 stands for the proposition that an act of violence... violence - it's limited just to violence - should not be committed against an individual simply

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

because of his sexual orientation. There was a study that was done last year which found an unfortunate pattern of acts of violence against individuals, not only in the State of Illinois, but across the country, because of their sexual orientation. More than one in five men and nearly one in ten women said they were punched, hit, kicked or beaten because of their sexual orientation. one-third of the persons responding to the study indicated they had been verbally abused by relatives because of their sexual orientation. And more than seven percent reported having been physically abused as well. Almost one-half of the men surveyed and one-third of the women said they been threatened with physical acts of violence because of their sexual orientation. And 64 percent said violence is prevalent enough to cause them substantial fear for their personal safety. Last weekend. the President of the United States visited a Nazi cemetery in West Germany, which brought back all of the memories of the holocaust and the acts of violence committed by Adolf Hitler against various minorities in Europe. These minorities included many different ethnic groups represented in the General Assembly. It also represented the violence committed against gays by Adolf Hitler. One of the great things about this country is that we abhor acts of violence, despite the fact we may not agree with the individual's religion or his race or his background. but that we know that it is wrong to commit an act of violence against an individual simply because of who he is. I call your attention to the letter which I think many of you have heard, from the Cardinal of Chicago, in which he made clear that homosexuality is not something condoned by the Catholic Church, but he went on to point out that despite the fact that the Catholic Church does not condone

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

homosexuality, acts of violence should not be committed against individuals because of their sexual orientation. That is what House Bill 9 says. It is simply limited to that proposition. It is very clear from the last vote that there is a great deal of concern about homosexuality, and there is a great deal of concern among the Members of this General Assembly. I can only urge you to follow the of the Governor of California who, when Bills similar to House Bills 8 and 9 passed in California. He did not agree or condone homosexuality, so he vetoed the equivalent of House Bill 8, an Amendment to the California Human Rights Act. But the Governor of California, who I think everybody knows is a very conservative Republican, nevertheless, signed the Amendment to the Ethnic Intimidation Law in that state because he felt that there could be no justification for the commission of an act of violence individuals simply because of their sexual orientation. Wе passed the Ethnic Intimidation Law three years ago to protect various minorities to put a deterrent into the statute against commission of acts of violence because of one's religion, one's race, one's ethnicity. I urge the adoption of House Bill 9 to provide what this country stands for, that at the very least, violence should not be committed against individual because of who he is. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, moves for the passage of House Bill 9. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Levin would have you believe that our current law encourages or permits violent acts against gay people and their property. That just is flatly untrue. What this Bill would do is to say that if you damage my property, or if you hit me, or you commit a battery or

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

assault against me, that's one degree of offense, but if you do those things and you damage the property of a person because of sexual orientation, it ought to be a Now, nobody is going to stand here and suggest or even permit the notion that we ought to encourage violence against gay people. I think everybody would agree that where those incidents have gone on. they ought to be enforced to the full extent of the law in terms effect... of effective sanctions. But Representative Levin now wants us to pass a special Bill to say that even though my head hurts when you hit me in the head, that's only a battery. That's only a misdemeanor. But when you commit the same offense against someone else because of special circumstances, it's a greater offense. That simply doesn't make any sense. We ought to enforce the criminal that we have. If they don't contain effective sanctions. we ought to be able to increase those sanctions or increase those penalties. We have effective federal civil rights laws on the books that would permit effective civil remedies in this area, and what you really do if you vote for this Bill is not to say that we're down on violence against gays, but what you do by passing this Bill say they deserve special treatment. They don't deserve special treatment. All the laws of the State of this area and others ought to be enforced uniformly across the board, and certainly, we ought t.o discriminate against people because of sexual orientation and make... effectively permit... permit a particular degree of encouragement of that violent activity. We don't want to do that, but that Bill... this Bill doesn't do that, and you ought to vote 'no', if for no other reason than the fact that we believe that all the laws of ... of this state ought to apply to everybody. 1 urge a

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

vote."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Representative Johnson says is really correct. I agree with him that have a crazy system now of penalizing someone for an offense, giving them a greater penalty, because of the fact that they yell out a racial epithet or a sexual epithet a religious connotation. I think that when we passed this ethnic intimidation law, we made a mistake. However, that it's on the books and now that it's a law - and let me read this to you. This is current law. A person commits ethnic intimidation when by reason of the race, creed, religion or national origin of another individual, he commits assault, that it's a class A misdemeanor. really... It's really silly. The current law is silly. Now what ... However, what Representative Levin wants to to make this silly law consistent. And I... I wasn't sure if I was going to vote for this, but after listening to Representative Johnson, I think I will vote for it. because if we're going to say that it's ... you commit ethnic intimidation by assaulting someone while you yell out that they're a Jew or you yell out that they're a Catholic, we might as well make it ethnic intimidation by yelling out that they are gay. For that reason, I'll end up supporting the Bill as a result of our efforts to be consistently silly."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr.
Levin to close."

Levin: "This legislation... You know... The current law... I think Representative Cullerton is correct. The current law was intended to act as a deterrent, and I disagreed with him in terms of the wisdom of the current law, and the current law was passed with the strong support of many of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

the religious and ethnic communities in this state, because we wanted a deterrent against acts of violence directed at individuals because of their religion or because of their race or because of their marital status or their ethnicity. and we wanted a strong statement in the law that acts of violence, for that particular reason, because of who the person is, were ... into the State of Illinois. legislation simply adds sexual orientation to that. The gay community is daily facing acts of violence. We heard in Committee testimony concerning that, and I would that ΨO would follow the lead of the Governor of California, certainly no liberal, in seeing that at the least, we don't have to agree with the gay community. We don't have to accept homosexuality, but that we not be committing acts of violence against some individuals simply because of their sexual orientation. I urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The queston is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. This is final action. 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 19 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present', and the Bill fails. The Bill failed. The Chair said 'failed'. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading on page 46 of the Calendar appears House Bill 16. Mr. Ronan, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 16, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to leaded motor fuels. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When I introduced House Bill 16 five months ago, it was done after

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

there was a ban established in the City of Chicago and the County of Cook on the sale of leaded gasoline. were trying to do was to put the state in conformance with actions of the city and the county because of the tremendous health hazards that come from the use of Subsequently. since then. the Environmental Protection Agency at the national level has established national standards. I agree with those national standards, and I think they'll accomplish what I've been trying to do with this legislation, which is to raise the level of public awareness and hopefully do away, once and for all, with the use of leaded gas. ... What I did was, after established their national standards, I've done ... put my legislation to conform to the national standards. and I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning legislation. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan, moves for the passage of House Bill 16. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Mautino: "If you were successful in providing the elimination of leaded gas at the retail level, through this legislation, what vehicles would be affected by the fact that they could not... those individuals who own those vehicles could not purchase leaded gasoline?"

Ronan: "Representative Mautino, as I stated, the Environmental Protection Agency has already made their rulings, and those vehicles are going to be affected with or without this legislation. That's... That's a fact of life."

Mautino: "Well, is it your feeling, then, that farm implements
which use leaded gasoline, machinery equipment... moving...
moving equipment machinery which uses leaded gasoline would

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

now have no source at the retail level if, in fact... Is that the policy that you're going to provide."

Ronan: "No. What we're going to provide is the standards that have been established by the federal EPA, which states that July 1, 1985, the content would be five grams of lead per gallon, and in January 1 of 1986, it would be .1 grams of lead per gallon."

Mautino: "By '87, I'm assuming you'd have it eliminated totally."

Ronan: "That's... If that's what the Environmental Protection
Agency mandates, that's what's going to happen."

Mautino: "Then in fact, at the retail level, what would be available to both the consumer and the business customer at a gas station?"

Ronan: "There will still be other additives that can be used.

They can be mixed with gasoline for those individuals who have those vehicles."

Mautino: "In other words, you're saying that it would probably be either ethanol, which is considered gasohol, and unleaded gasoline."

Ronan: "Right, but there are also other additives that are on the market that can be put in with either unleaded gasoline or ethanol, which gives the same lubricating... the same lubricating mechanisms of leaded gas."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "I'm sure the Sponsor is very concerned about the federal provisions as it pertains to manufacturing of leaded gasoline, and through his legislation, is providing the vehicle that will cut down the emissions, which we... I guess we all want to do, but by the same token, would eliminate a product from both the agricultural aspect as well as the consuming public. When in fact we end up with only two products - unleaded gasoline and in fact gasohol -

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

I think we do a disservice, not only to those individuals who have vehicles older than 1976 without the catylitic converter and do run on leaded gasoline, but those individual companies that use leaded gasoline for motors, high lift, high boys, et cetera, that are built specifically with leaded gasoline as a prerequisite. As we address the situation with the farming community, there are only two products that are available to them for use under existing conditions. One is diesel fuel and the other is leaded gasoline. Those motors as well manufactured in that vein. Although his actions are certainly laudable, it addresses the retail sales instead of the manufacturing, which is the basis for the federal implementation. I would hope that we would not make attempt to eliminate from the retail sales, leaded gasoline the State of Illinois until, in fact, the manufacturers are directed by the federal law if, in fact, that's the will of Congress to do so. I think you're going to be creating a hardship towards the consumers and users at this fact, and very reluctantly, I stand in opposition to the legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Ronan, if I understood your opening remarks, your
Bill is in accord with recent provisions established by the
Federal Government. Is that correct?"

Ronan: "Correct."

Cowlishaw: "If that is the case, why do we need this Bill?"

Ronan: "I just want to make sure that if there's a change at the federal environmental protection level, we in the State of Illinois have already showed our support for the standards

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

that they're proposing."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Roman: "I think it's very important that we, as a state, go on record that we want clean air and we want safety... safe environment."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, further discussion? The Gentleman from MacLean, Mr. Ropp."

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

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

Ropp: "Representative, in a little bit further question relative to those people who are in the agricultural industry, we're kind of in a unique situation, here. I think generally we support the usage of unleaded gasoline because it provides for other opportunities of products that many of us produce. The question is, though, that a lot of us have older equipment which I don't think we'll be able to get regular gasoline as we classify it, to continue to operate, and are there any provisions that allow this to phase in over a longer period of time, or what is the position on this?"

Ronan: "Representative Ropp, I had a couple of meetings with the Illinois Farm Bureau about the concern that you've raised.

However, once the Environmental Protection Agency gave out their standards, they obviously didn't feel it was necessary to pursue those negotiations with me, so that... that's what's happened."

Ropp: "Well, if we're going to comply with those standards, is
this Bill really necessary?"

Ronan: "I thought I just answered that question, but I'll be glad to answer it again. I think that we, as the State of Illinois, should be a national leader when it comes to a safe and clean environment and the health concerns of our children, and I think that if there is a change in federal

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

policy, we should be on record stating that we're moving in the correct direction."

Ropp: "Well, there's always a possibility that change might not be as restrictive as you're attempting to make it here in a rather brief time, which in the long run may be more economically feasible, as well as practical, in order to provide for that clean air that we're looking for, and I think maybe we ought to take a little extra time and allow this to take more time in a phase-in approach rather than to make it so abrupt as you have so indicated in this Bill."

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

McNamara: "Yes, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

McNamara: "On this particular Bill, will this ease the provisions of the EPA and its requirement right now to inspect the vehicles, as was passed in the last Session?"

Ronan: "No, it has nothing to do with those inspection standards."

McNamara: "So those inspections will still be maintained?"

Ronan: "Absolutely."

McNamara: "And there will be a problem not only for the farm implements and everything else, but also the antique cars and vehicles that are there, as far as getting leaded gas is concerned."

Ronan: "Right, well... you know, any... any vehicle that, at this point, uses leaded gas, is going to have those problems.

That's correct."

McNamara: "Okay. Reluctantly, I'll have to go against this Bill."

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

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

the House. I rise in support of this Bill. There are many different groups that could have been impacted by the Bill as originally introduced. Almost all of them, if not all of them, were contacted and consulted on the development of this issue. I think a reasonable compromise has been reached. What we're doing is tracking federal rules and regulations on this topic, so I think we ought to just go ahead and move this Bill right on out."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vitek."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Well, no one is seeking recognition. Mr. Bonan to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've discussed the legislation. I... I appreciate what Representative Mays has stated. worked with the Farm Bureau on the legislation. with the gasoline industry and some of their concerns that they raised. I felt that the legislation I originally introduced was an important step, but as I stated, after the Federal EPA acted, I felt it was not important to continue trying to set up such stringent standards. I think it's important that we do have public established for the State of Illinois to let the Federal Government know that they are moving in the direction, and if they decide to change their position, I want to make sure that we're already firmly established that we're concerned with a clean environment and the health aspects that come with the ban... an eventual ban on leaded gas materials. And I move for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 25. Mr. Giorgi? 25? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

clerk Leone: "House Bill 25, a Bill for an Act to revise the law
 in relationship to county clerks. Third Reading of the
 Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, all this does is, it requires a county clerk to appoint a chief deputy clerk, because now, in the event of the demise or the absence of a county clerk, the office procedure stops. You can't issue marriage licenses, you can't issue birth certificates, because of the notification by the county clerk, so it's a very simple Bill. I urge the support of the House."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago has moved for the passage of House Bill 25. 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 that he will."

Piel: "Representative Giorgi, basically, all this is doing is just giving them the authority where presently they don't have to appoint a deputy clerk. Am I correct?"

Speaker Greiman: "That's right."

Piel: "What... What counties would be excluded, if any, in the state?"

Giorgi: "Every county except Cook, I think."

Piel: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 27. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 27, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is strongly supported by the Health Association of Illinois and the Mental Association of Greater Chicago. This Bill directs Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to provide directly or through contract with not-for-profit organizations, and within the amounts made available by appropriation, so we... it is limited to whatever we decide An in-home care program and support to appropriate. demonstration programs. And I'm reading to you from the text of the Bill. It'svery short, and I think it says it all right in the Bill. The purpose of the program will be, number one; to provide direct care to mentally i11 and developmentally disabled persons, and number two: to enhance the family's ability to provide in-home to mentally ill or developmentally disabled And that's what the Bill says. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I think I'd like to ask you to reflect on another related problem, and that is one of homelessness. We a lot about people being out on the streets, and indeed, there are thousands. We don't know exactly how many,

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

everyone understands it's a serious problem. And many times the issue of homelessness is related ŧο deinstitutionalization. But let me tell you, I've read all the studies that I can get my hands on, including data collected on the of streets Chicago. Louis, St. Philadelphia. and other major American cities, and what they show ... remarkably consistent pattern, that half the people who are homeless are homeless because they could not get along in their family setting, that they were either kicked out of the house, or they chose to leave because of impossible frictions among family members. lot of people have mental problems, can't cope, and need some structure in their lives, and need some mental health support services, but are unwilling to go into a clinic or voluntarily admit themselves to a hospital, and just stay at home and get worse, and get worse, until the situation at home becomes so explosive, they wind up on the streets. This is a progressive piece of legislation which extends the concept of in-home care to the mentally ill, and I think it's... we've seen how well in-home care has worked for our aged population, and for our physically disabled population. think it is now time to turn our attention to the mentally ill, and see if we can't care for them in home-like settings in a better way than we seem now to be able to do. just say that the Mental Health Association of Illinois is strongly in support of this legislation. hope they've contacted you by now. They assure me that they've been making a lot of phone calls. I hope that support them and support this Bill. I ask for Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the passage of House Bill 27. And on that, is there any discussion?

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this fine Bill, which is a care-enhancing and cost-reducing piece of legislation that would make it possible, through this pilot program, to allow people in need of care to remain, whenever possible, in their own homes with their own families where, by right, they ought to be, rather than being relegated to, perhaps, institutional settings where they... which should avoided whenever possible. At the same time, the by-product of this good legislation is that it will indeed reduce the cost to the taxpayers, because institutional settings are overwhelmingly paid for by you and by me and by our families, and if we can at all make it possible to see that a person in need of care can remain in their own homes. that will reduce our cost and increase the benefit of good, decent care that people who need it will receive. So. I... I ask for and encourage your 'aye' vote on this remarkable legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill, due to the fact that most of the services mentioned in the Bill are already provided through the grant-in-aid dollars. Also, at the time the Bill was presented in Committee, we asked what fiscal impact there was. At that time, it was not known. To date, the fiscal impact would be approximately four million dollars. We feel that this should not be passed. It's already happening, and I ask for a 'no' yote."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr...

I'm sorry. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

NcCracken: "Representative Bowman, is there a practice to your knowledge within the department to provide these types of services on an informal basis?"

McCracken. I asked the department to supply me with some data, which they kindly did, and there are some smatterings of programs. However, I would indicate that the data was more specific and precise in terms of the developmentally disabled persons than mentally ill persons. And the volunteers from the Mental Health Association of Illinois called the various department regional directors and discovered that there was virtually no in-home services for mentally ill. And I think that's really what the Bill addresses itself to, is the mentally ill. I think you may be thinking more about the DD people."

McCracken: "The Bill addresses itself to the mentally ill?"

Bowman: "Yes, it is primarily intended for the in-home care for mentally ill persons."

McCracken: "But as written..."

Bowman: "It does include developmentally disabled."

McCracken: "It does include... "

Bowman: "You're... You're right. It includes both in the Bill, but the reason for the Bill, the motivation for the Bill is because of the MI problem."

McCracken: "Okay. Now, why is it that the department was unable to give you an estimate? Have you heard of this four million dollar price tag before?"

Bowman: "Yeah, it's my Bill, but I'm prepared to negotiate over the figure."

McCracken: "Pardon me?"

Bowman: "Yes, I believe Representative Wojcik is referring to a

Bill in Committee which is sponsored by me, so that's my

figure, and I'm prepared to negotiate over that. If she

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

thinks it's too high, I think we can sit down and talk about it."

- McCracken: "Alright. So you're prepared with an appropriation, and your cost estimate is four million dollars for the next fiscal year?"
- Bowman: "Well, Representative McCracken, that's what I would like to see. However, I am a pragmatic political person just as you are, and I'm prepared to negotiate with the administration."
- McCracken: "Well, what's going to dictate the price tag? I don't see any standards in here which would indicate the scope of the program, and I'm told that the department is unable to estimate its cost, for that reason. So, I guess the point I'm trying to make is, here is the authorization Bill, and it's parameters are very broad. What are we to expect of the appropriation Bill? You mean that's still subject to negotiation?"
- Bowman: "Representative McCracken, almost all appropriations are subject to negotiation in the normal course of things except entitlement programs. Now, if I had made this Bill an entitlement program, there would be people popping up all over the floor of this House saying, 'This is an entitlement program, and we can't afford this open-ended commitment and be locked in forever to zillions of dollars.' I mean, I think the responsible thing to do is to establish a program that is driven by the appropriations that you and I, with our votes, decide to provide to the administration."
- McCracken: "Then why don't we, since its intent and necessity is limited generally to the mentally ill, why don't we agree to an Amendment to limit it to the mentally ill and negotiate over only mentally ill, rather than the developmentally disabled, when we get to the appropriations

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Bill. Would you consider that?"

Bowman: "Representative McCracken, I would consider it. However,

I'm not going to take the Bill out of the record, because

if that was a genuine issue, I think someone would have

brought it to me before now, but I would certainly leave

all doors open."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you,"

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to say that I think that we have all been impressed with how well in-home care programs have worked in the Department on Aging and Department of Behabilitation Services, for the populations they serve. And I think we need to do more in the area of mental health. There is much concern over the proper community care for the mentally ill, and I believe those of you who share this concern with me should feel that augmenting our service delivery system by expanded in-home care programs for the mentally ill is the wave of the future, and I think the time is now to adopt this enacting legislation, and we can talk about the money later. I move for an Affirmative Roll Call."

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

Voting is now open. This is final action. The Gentleman from Jersey, Mr. Ryder, to explain his vote. One minute, Sir."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this receives the requisite number of affirmative votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

35th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1985
- record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and Mr. Bowman asks for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Keane. McPike.

 Panayotovich and Tuerk. No further."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Byder, you wish to verify the Affirmative Roll Call? Is that right?"
- Ryder: "Correct."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed to verify the Affirmative Roll Call."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Berrios.

 Bowman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Keane, 'aye'. Leverenz,
 'aye'. Pangle, 'aye'. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Is that right?

 No. No. Mulcahey does not change his vote. Mr. Richmond,
 for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Richmond: "Change my vote to 'present', please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Richmond, 'present'. Clerk, proceed with the
 verification of the affirmative vote."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative. Braun-Breslin. Brookins. Brunsvold. Capparelli. Christensen. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. DeJaegher. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Homer. Huff. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. Oblinger. O'Connell. Pangle. William Peterson. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Rea. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Stephens."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Stephens... Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Stephens: "I wish to change my vote to 'no', Mr. Chairman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Change Mr. Stephens vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative.

Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Washington.

White. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr.

Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Mautino, 'aye'. Mr. Laurino?
Yes, Mr. Laurino asks leave to be verified. Does the
Gentleman have leave? He has leave. Mr. DeLeo votes
'aye'. Mr. Ryder, do you have questions of the Affirmative
Roll Call?"

Byder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before I do that, it's my understanding we have 63 affirmative at this moment. Is that correct?"

Speaker Greiman: "That's correct. 63 affirmative votes."

Ryder: "Thank you. Alexander?"

Speaker Greiman: "Alexander is in... I believe she's in her seat.

She is in her seat."

Ryder: "Thank you. Berrios?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Berrios is in his seat."

Ryder: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brunsvold is in his seat."

Ryder: "Bullock?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock. Mr. Bullock in the chamber? How is Mr. Bullock recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded ... "

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock is at the door."

Ryder: "Capparelli?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Capparelli is at Mr. Dunn's seat."

Ryder: "Christensen."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Christensen is at his seat... at his chair."

Ryder: "Farley?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley is in his seat."

35th Legislative Day May 7, 1985

Ryder: "Flinn."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Ryder: "Flinn."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Klemm, did you say?"

Ryder: "No, Representative Flinn. I see him. I see him."

Speaker Greiman: "Oh, Flinn. Mr. Flinn is standing at his desk."

Ryder: "Thank you. I see him. Representative Krska?"

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Krska? Representative Krska.

Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Krska.

How is Mr. Krska recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove the Gentleman."

Ryder: "Huff. Representative Huff?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff. Is Mr. Huff in the chambers? How is Mr. Huff recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Huff from the Roll Call."

Ryder: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Braun. Is Representative Braun in the chambers? Representative Braun. How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Bemove Ms. Braun from the Roll Call."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, is the... We have a count of 59 affirmative.

Is that correct?"

Speaker Greiman: "Not correct, Sir. 60 votes,"

Ryder: "Representative Homer."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer in the chamber? How is

Mr. Homer recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Homer from the Roll Call."

Ryder: "Representative William Peterson, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr... Mr... Representative Peterson, did you

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

say?"

Ryder: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Peterson. Is Mr. Peterson in the chamber? Mr. Peterson. How is Mr. Peterson recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "As voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Peterson from the Roll Call."

Ryder: "No further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Richmond... Mr. Richmond votes 'aye'.

Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike votes 'aye'. Excuse me, Mr.

McCracken. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Point of order. We concluded the verification, and now you're opening it back up for a Roll Call. Absolutely out of order. We want to reopen the verification."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr... Mr. McCracken. Mr. McCracken, if you'll please... Mr. McCracken, the rules... Mr. McCracken, under our rules... Mr. McCracken, so that you understand what the rules are, until... until there is a time... until the Roll Call is announced, any Member has a right to seek recognition at any time until the Roll Call has been announced and change his or her vote or be recorded. Nov. Mr. Clerk, what are the numbers? On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 33. Out of the Record. Order of ... On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 44. Out of the Record. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 49. 49. of the Record. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 60. Out of the Record. And on the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 63. Mr. Vinson, do you wish to proceed? Out of the Record.

35th Legislative Day

May 7. 1985

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Keane? Mr. Keane, proceed."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the Body to suspend the posting rules for Revenue Committee tomorrow on House Bills 1919 and House Bill 2499. I've discussed it with the Minority Leadership, and they've signed off on it."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, moves that the... moves to waive the appropriate posting rule so that House Bills 1111 and 2499 may be heard in the Committee on Revenue tomorrow. Ooes the Gentlemen have leave? Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Mr... Mr. Ronan in the chamber? Mr. Ronan? For what purpose do you seek recognition? Yes, Mr. Ronan, if your concern's been addressed, is that... We waived the posting requirements on House Bills [111] and 2439."

Ronan: "I'm ecstatic. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "You're ecstatic. Fine. Glad we could help you out. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Executive Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room 114. We have just one piece of legislation to handle. I would appreciate all Members being present so we can get in and hear the Bill and adjourn pretty soon. That's room 114, the Executive Committee, right after adjournment."

Speaker Greiman: "Immediately after adjournment, Executive Committee will be meeting. The Chair would advise the Members that the tickets for the gridiron dinner on May 15 are on sale now from members of the Illinois Legislative Correspondence Assocation. That's the gridiron dinner.

Nr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 338, DeJaegher; 339, DeJaegher;

35th Legislative Day

May 7, 1985

340, DeJaegher; 341, DeJaegher; 342, DeJaegher; 343, Mays; 344, Pangle; 345, McMaster; 346, Pangle; 347, Terzich - et al; 348, McPike; 349, White - et al. House Joint Resolution 43, Kulas - et al; 44, LeFlore; 45, DeLeo - et al; 46, Parke. And Senate Joint Resolution 46, Cullerton - Kubik."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago on the Agreed Resolutions."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 338, by DeJaegher, congratulates Margaret 339, by DeJaegher, wishes a happy birthday. 340, by DeJaegher, tells... tells about a golden anniversary. DeJaegher's 341 congratulates 'Dale Shelley'. 342, by DeJaegher, commends Carolyn Charlotte 'Thecklin'. 343. Mays, recognizes Brian 'Darr'. 344, by Pangle, honors Max Gibson. 345, by McMaster, honors Charles 'Macintosh'. 346, by Pangle, lauds the Kankakee Community College. Terzich, commends the Kiwanis Club. 348, by McPike. recognizes Rosemary 'Wellner'. 349, by White, honors the boy scouts. House Joint 43, by Kulas, urges Congress to adopt House Resolution 264. LeFlore supports the veterans. DeLeo's 45 recognizes veterans' efforts. 46, by Parke, notes veterans benefits. And Senate Joint 46, by Cullerton - Kubik, honors Hugh 'Muncie'. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are winding down now, and we will shortly be adopting an Adjournment Motion, but I wanted to make it quite clear that we are... that Adjournment Motion brings us back here tomorrow morning at 11:00. We are accustomed to coming at

35th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1985
- 12:00. We are coming at 11:00 tomorrow morning. Mr. Lewerenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Leverenz: "Yes, the Appropriations Committee tomorrow morning will meet at 9:00 a.m. Appropriations I at 9:00. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. So the Appropriations, 9:00. The third House Legislators' golf outing is Monday, May 13.

 You might see Joe 'Luco' if you're interested in that.

 Now, Mr... Mr. Clerk, General Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 350, Preston et al."
- Speaker Greiman: "Committee on Assignment. Mr. Cullerton, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Judiciary Committee on the Schedule is scheduled to meet at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. This is the Judiciary II Committee. We are going to meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning to consider the Bills dealing with the drunk driving package. So that we will meet at 9:00 a.m. in room D-1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Judiciary II, therefore, will meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow. Mr. Cullerton, are you seeking recognition still? Alright. Mr... The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 11:00 tomorrow. 11:00 tomorrow. 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 stand adjourned until the hour of 11:00 tomorrow."

09/14/85 15:38

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

MAY 07, 1985

	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	45
	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
HB-0025		PAGE	61
HB-0027	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-0241		PAGE	8
HB-0354	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	RECALLED	PAGE	15
HB-0621	THIRD READING	PAGE	17
HB-0621	MOTION	PAGE	16
	THIRD READING	PAGE	9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	13
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-0929		PAGE	14
HB-0951		PAGE	5
HB-0957		PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	29
	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-1364		PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-1366		PAGE	5
HB- 1585		PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-1654		PAGE	6
HB-1655		PAGE	6
нв-1670		PAGE	6
HB-1703		PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND BEADING	PAGE	6
HB-1930	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1938	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1947	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB- 1956	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1957	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1962	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1966	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-1969		PAGE	. 6
HB- 1971	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2035		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2129	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2189		PAGE	7
HB-2255		PAGE	7
HB-2310	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	JECOMU BEAULMG	PAGE	7

08/14/85 15:38

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

AGB

MAY 07, 1985

SUBJECT NATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1 ,
PRAYER - REVEREND DR. FRANK W. BUMPUS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
RECESS	PAGE	12
HOUSE RECONVENES - GREINAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	12
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	72
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	74
A DJOURNMENT	PAGE	74