64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker McPike: "...Come to order. Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Randy Perry, Pastor of Gibson City United Methodist Church. Reverend Perry is a guest of Representative Tom Ewing. The guests in the balcony please rise and join us in the invocation."
- Reverend Perry: "Loving God, we thank You for the blessing of this day and the privilege of this hour. We stand here knowing there are so few buildings in our world where decisions will affect the lives of so many. So, we pray that Your spirit is with us, granting wisdom, direction, courage. assurance. We are so bombarded by words, words from lobbyists, pollsters, sponsors. counselors. journalists, voters. Help us discern to which words comprise Your word for us, that decisions might bring service to others and glory to You. We pray for each in Springfield and for the members of their Иe pray that You might bind their wounds, heal their hurts and grant them peace of mind. In the name Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "Be led in the pledge allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker NcPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the record. 118

 Members answering a Roll Call, a quorum is present.

 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call to place House Bill 1529 on October 16, 1985 Calendar on the Order

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

in which it appears today."

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to place House Bill 1529 on the October Calendar.

 Leave? Leave is granted. Attendance Roll Call will be used. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clark O'Brien: "House Resolution 604, offered by Representative Hawkinson - Tuerk and Saltsman; 605, by Satterthwaite; 606. 607, Hallock and Giorgi; Richmond: 608, Ewing: 609. Leverenz and Barnes; 610, Stephens; 612, Vinson: 613. Pedersen; 614, Mautino and Leverenz; 616, Hensel: 617, Hastert and McPike: 618, Pullen and Williamson: Giglio: 621, Washington. House Joint Resolution 83, by W. Peterson - Tuerk and Oblinger. House Joint 84. Panayotovich - et al. That's it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution... I have 612. I think Joe is looking for those others. I'll start with 612, Vinson, commends the City of Clinton. 613, Pedersen, congratulates Frank Whiteley. Mulca... Mautino, honors Representative Mulcahey. Hensel, salutes Florence Kroeger. 517. Hastert -McPike, asks the Auditor General to file a preliminary report regarding the Illinois Commerce Commission. Pullen, lauds the City of Des Plaines. 620, I don't may get to that here. 621, Washington, commends Doris Chandler. House Joint 83, William Peterson, recognizes the freedom of Illinois people. 84, Panayotovich, recognizes the General Assembly Softball Team. Do you have 620? 604. Hawkinson. congratulates Edward LeFevre. 605, Satterthwaite, congratulates Dr. Timothy Nugent. Richmond, congratulates the Pautler family. 607, Hallock, commends Arthur Rudelius. 608, Ewing, congratulates Patricia Clapper. 610, Stephens, congratulates Dr. Nathan.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

620... I've got Jack O'Brien as the Sponsor, but this is from all of us."

Clark O'Brien: "Giglio."

- Matijevich: "It congratulates Sam Panayotovich on his birthday.

 609, asks the Auditor General to conduct a complete audit

 of the Chicago World's Pair 1992 Authority. I move the
 adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative... General Resolutions."
- Clark O'Brien: "House Resolution 611, by Vinson. And 615, by Bullock and Homer."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignments. Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we would like to begin this morning on the Order of Nonconcurrences. are making a list right now at the Clerk's well. If you will come to the Clerk's well and give us the numbers of Bills you would like to have called on the Order of ... in which you intend to nonconcur, please do so immediately. We will then go to the Order of Concurrences. Remember the Order of Concurrences is an Order for passage. So, I would urge all Members to be in their seats and have looked over the Calendar and be prepared to vote on all Bills on the Order of Concurrences. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, good morning."
- Piel: "Two questions of the Chair, Madam Speaker. First of all, did we go through all the nonconcurrences yesterday?"
- Speaker Breslin: "We... we went through all those that were requested."
- Piel: "Okay, because I was asking if this is in addition to

64th Lagislative Day

June 28, 1985

yesterday's, but so in other words..."

Speaker Breslin: "This is..."

Piel: "... yesterday's were all cleared off. We're going with a new list today."

Speaker Breslin: "No. That's correct."

Piel: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, if you have Motions on the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences in which you intend to ask to nonconcur, please give us that number immediately. Come to the Clerk's well and give us that number. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Just a parliamentary inquiry. I think there appears on concurrence, some Bills in which nonconcurrence Motions prevailed yesterday. I noticed two of my own where we nonconcurred and they appear today on concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "Give us the number."

McCracken: "1977 and..."

Speaker Breslin: "It's on what page?"

McCracken: "Page 14."

Speaker Breslin: "Page 14. Okay."

McCracken: "And 2276 on page 15. We nonconcurred yesterday."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay... Okay, I understand that as to both of those, you nonconcurred in one Amendment, but did you... you did not... you've concurred in another..."

McCracken: "Oh. Correct. Correct."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again for the newcomers, if you have Motions that you wish to nonconcur in, please get them to the Clerk's well. We are going to begin now on those Bills where Members have asked to nonconcur. So, we are on the Order of Concurrences. The first Bill is House Bill 66. It appears on page three on your Calendar. Representative Peterson. Clerk... Excuse

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- me. Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Amendment 1... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 66."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 66. On that question, is there

 any discussion? Hearing none, the question...

 Representative Cullerton, on the question."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I would ask if he could please indicate what the Senate Amendment did. Maybe tell us a little bit about the Bill even."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "The Bill concerns the per diem of multi-township boards not to exceed \$25. That passed out of the House on the Consent Calendar. The Amendment asks that... or requires that those per diem charges be set by the electors at a special or town meeting. There is nothing in the statutes that provides for the electors to do so. It only can be done by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, I ask for nonconcurrence to the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 66?! All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 66. nonconcur Hause Bill 666 appears on page 6 οn your Calendar. Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. It makes a net reduction of \$324,725. And the Department... the Illinois Commerce Commission feels..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative. This is an appropriation Bill."

Barnes: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Speaker Breslin: "We understood that we were not going to do appropriation Bills at this time."
- Barnes: "Oh, I didn't understand that. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Out of the record. House Bill 730 appears on page 17 on your Calendar. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur in the... I move to refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to 730 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "My list here says that this is a House Bill,
 Sir. Is it a House Bill or Senate Bill?"
- Hoffman: "Senate Bill, I'm sorry, my mistake."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, this is on the Order of Nonconcurrence on page 17. He has moved to nonconcur. Have you explained..."
- Hoffman: "Yes, this is... this is a Bill that... that dealt with a formula and I put an assessed valuation figure in there.

 And this is going to become the vehicle Bill for the education reform package."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Since you are on the Order of
 Nonconcurrence on a House Bill... a Senate Bill, rather,
 your Motion must be either to recede or to refuse to
 recede. If you want to recede, that's final action."
- Hoffman: "I refuse... I refuse to recede and call for a Conference."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede to the House Amendments on Senate Bill 730 and request a Conference Committee. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, 'ayes' have it. And this House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 730 and a Conference Committee shall be appointed. The next Bill is House Bill 851. It appears on page eight your on Calendar.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill which affects
the Notary Public Act, and there is a typographical error
in the printing of the Senate Amendment. So, I would ask
that we nonconcur so we can take this briefly to Conference
Committee and clean up the technicality."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate
Amendments #1 and 2, Sir?"

Dunn: "Whatever. Yeah, that's fine."

Speaker Breslin: "In Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 851. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1... in House Amendments... in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 851?' Would you change the board, Mr. Clerk? It's a House Bill. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and this House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 851. The next Bill is House Bill 1850. It appears on page 12 on your Calendar. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1850. The problem with the Senate Amendment is that it deals only with DuPage County. It may be okay that the people of DuPage are willing to pay \$500 rather than the current statutory \$100 limit for vehicles left abandoned on county roadways, but there are some changes also in that Amendment with respect to variance from zoning ordinances which in certain cases would not require public hearings.

I'm working with the Senate Sponsor to see if there is a way to ensure that the... that the variance program would permit some kind of public participation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

#1 to House Bill 1850. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1850?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1850. The next Bill is House Bill 2418. It appears on page 15 on your Calendar. Representative Daniels. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. House Bill 2418 was amended in the Senate to provide that if coal... the Coal Development Board does not exist or cannot muster a quorum because of vacancies, that coal development projects may be implemented by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and it also made other changes. I would move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2418. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2418?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2418. The next Bill is House Bill 2440. It appears on page 16 on your Calendar. Representative Olson."

I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2440 for the simple reason that Senate Amendment #1 was a failed concept, Senate Bill 252. It substantially changes the intent of the Fire Marshal's Office, and hence I would move to nonconcur."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2440. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2440. House Bill 2444 appears on page 16 on your Calendar, Representative Ryder."

- Ryler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Amendment I added provisions related to the establishment of the Insurance Financial Regulation Fund of the Department of Insurance for whom I was carrying this Bill as requested and I will comply by moving to nonconcur with Senate Amendment I to House Bill 2444."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2444. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2444. Once again, Ladies Gentlemen, keep bringing your Motions to the well if you wish to nonconcur on Bills that are on the Order of Concurrence. This does not apply to appropriation Bills. House Bill 1977 appears on page 14 on your Calendar. . Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1977. I should have nonconcurred to both Amendments yesterday to move the Bill out. The objectionable portion was in Amendment #2, but it has to be rewritten and so, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 as well."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1977. Is there any discussion?

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' it, and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1977. House Bill 2276 appears on page 15 on your Calendar. Representative McCracken."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic Speaker), I made the same mistake on this Bill. We should have had an explanation for the older members as well. Senate Amendment #2, I also move to nonconcur in because Senate Amendment #1 has to be rewritten. I ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2276. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2276."

McCracken: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, while we wait to compile another list for those Members that wish to nonconcur, we are going to go to the Order of Speaker's Table. It appears on page 17 on your Calendar. The first one is House Resolution 202, Representative Koehler Panayotovich. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Therk Leone: "House Resolution 202, urges Congress and the President to take strong economic and diplomatic action against Japan to force Japan to establish a fair trading relationship with the U.S."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 202 encourages the Congress

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

and the President to consider those things that would induce the country of Japan to establish a fair trading relationship with this country. Unfortunately, what have seen in the last few years is a dramatic increase in our trade deficit, and I think that it is important that we here, in the State of Illinois and in our country, ask the Congress and the President to do those things and undertake those measures that would be helpful to us in reducing this trade deficit. One of the problems that we have incurred in the central Illinois area is that this particular deficit has been particularly detrimental to our farm products and to our manufacturing goods that we sell central Illinois. And I think it is important that we keep the pressure up on our Congress and the President to try to avoid building up this trade deficit and reducing it by encouraging the Japanese and those other countries to allow us more access to their markets. I would move for the adoption of House Resolution 202."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves the adoption of House Resolution 202. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Koehler: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, can you name me the country in the world that is the biggest buyer of agricultural products and American products now?"

Koehler: "I'm sorry, Representative Ropp..."

Ropp: "What... what country in the world is the biggest purchaser of American agricultural products and other industrial products now?"

Koehler: "I'm sorry, I can't... I can't answer that."

Ropp: "Well, maybe I can answer it. Japan. Why is it in this provision are you only stating it should be Japan when

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

there are other countries around the world that we do not have a plus balance, such as the European economic community that needs to be addressed in shaping up their concerns because of their very restrictive trade barriers that they have too? Why is this provision just aimed at one country?"

Koehler: "Well, Representative Ropp, the important point to point out that when this particular Resolution was introduced, it was at the time when the trade... the voluntary trade restrictions were lifted from our auto imports and at that time it caused the central Illinois area to lose were very hopeful of receiving, the Chrysler... the Chrysler plant that would have gone, perhaps, to Morton, Illinois. And one of the reasons given for the... for our losing that possibility was the fact that the President had lifted these trades... voluntary trade restrictions and was not taking an aggressive enough position as far as encouraging the... encouraging Japan to reduce our trade deficit with them. And I think by adopting this particular measure that it would encourage them to do even investing in our country so that it would reduce their massive trade deficit with us. ₩e are particularly concerned about the telecommunications and the pharmaceutical products in those areas even more than SO the agricultural products." Ropp: "Well, it would seem to me that if we're attempting to deal with a national problem, that we ought to more effectively address it on a national level dealing with all countries rather than to specifically identify one country that is our biggest current purchaser now. And in light of the fact that are are currently involved in the possibility of getting major industrial development from this country, I would hate to move too swiftly in this, in that it might cause

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

that particular country to consider going to another state or even another country. So. I would be a little bit hesitant about moving too swiftly, specifically, when identifying one country. If it was broader in nature, including all of the countries in the world that have trade barriers and restrictions, I could totally support it because I think the administration is attempting to deal with this in some parts; but, to pick out one country, particularly, the one that is, in fact, our biggest buyer of products from the United States, it seems a bit unfair." Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 202 pass?' Representative Panayotovich, to close."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen Representative Koehler came to me in Committee the House. me if I would Sponsor... and asked Cosponsor Resolution with her, and I'm glad to see that finally some people on the other side of the aisle are starting to realize. We hear this on the floor all the time about fair We talked about buy American. I don't think if we put the whole world on it, we'd get some people on other side of the aisle to wake up to what's happening overseas. These countries and especially in this case. Japan, with the trade deficit we have are subsidizing their They have their own protectionist legislation. It's okay for them to have it, but it's not okay for us to have it here in the State of Illinois. Look around your neighborhoods. I commend Representative Koehler on Resolution, and I hope that ... We have a 118 votes up Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, Shall House Resolution 202 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 81 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received the necessary Majority, is hereby declared adopted. House Resolution 203, Representative Didrickson."

- Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

 House Resolution 203 urges the Governor's Office of
 Planning to do an economic development study and report
 back this fall to us with regards to our competitiveness to
 other states surrounding us and within the fifty state
 union with regards to those business climate factors that
 we consider are important to compete. This is cosponsored
 with Representative Giglio."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Resolution 203. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House pass House Resolution 203?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And House Resolution 203 is passed. House Resolution 254, Representative Slater."
- Slater: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 254 urges Congress to extend the sunset on the issuance of agricultural development The bonds. agricultural development bonds will expire on December of 1984, and we're asking for a two year extension. These are monies which financed the Illinois Farm Development Authority."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Resolution 254. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 254 pass? All

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Resolution is passed. House Resolution 313, Representative Huff. Representative Huff."

- Huff: "Yes, Madam Speaker, House Resolution 313 directs the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to examine the issue of selling sludge to North African nations. This is an attempt to deal with the long term solution of famine in the North African or the sub-Sahara region of African nations such as Ethiopia. I move for the adoption of House Resolution 313."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Resolution 313. On the question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise in strong support of this Resolution. I think it's a fine idea, and I would... I can't think of anything more important for us to do than to get rid of our sludge in North Africa. I would urge 'aye' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff, to close."

Huff: "Just move for the adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House pass House
 Resolution 313?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those
 opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
 have it. And House Resolution 313 is passed. House
 Resolution 350, Representative Preston. Representative
 Preston. 350."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 350 asks the State Board of Education to develop a plan to use the Department of Children and Family Services to investigate reports of child neglect and abuse that occur at schools. The idea is to make a central repository agency for... being the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Department of Children and Family Services, which already has that obligation in other areas, to maintain that obligation for reports and to investigate reports at school."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Resolution 350. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House adopt House Resolution 350?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and House Resolution 350 is adopted. House Resolution 404, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 404 requests support for the 1985 Farm Policy Reform Act, which is incorporated in HR 2383 and Senate 1083. The Bill in the House is sponsored by my Congressman, Lane Evans, and I would ask for the adoption of House Resolution 404."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of House Resolution 404. And on the question, the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Well, Madam Speaker, I... with all respect to Representative Huff, I'd like to be recorded 'no' on House Besolution 313. I don't know if he is serious about that. It's pretty facetious as far as I'm concerned, and I don't think I'd like to be on the record of voting for such a Resolution. I don't think it's appropriate in this House."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Might I ask a question to the Representative?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."
- Ropp: "Can you give us a little clearer explanation of what the Farm Policy Reform Act is?"
- Brunsvold: "Okay, Representative, this incorporates a number of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

One, dealing with the loan program provisions. in which the main emphasis of the Reform Act would be a credit corporation which would give loans to farmers for products, et cetera, until at a time the market price goes up and they can sell those products on the That's the main provision. It would stabilize market prices for... by establishing price floors, balance production with need and a system management, promotes good soil and water conservation practices. would target small and medium size farm operators. Those are the main provisions, Representative."

- Ropp: "What affect will this Resolution have, if we pass it, on the final farm Bill that probably will be voted on in September."
- Brunsvold: "Well, this Resolution would be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington and to all the Illinois Congressmen urging them to support this program which is sponsored by my Congressman, Lane Evans."
- Ropp: "Do you remember or can you count the number of times that your Congressman supported the Presidency in anything last term?"
- Brunsvold: "I don't know if he supported anything that the President did last year."
- Ropp: "I don't think he did either. Well, since he had such a fine record before, I suppose if this passes it'll have just about as much influence as his votes did then."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 404 pass?' All favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the the Chair, the 'ayes' have opinion of it. the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 415. Representative Flowers."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Plowers: "Good morning, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution urges the school boards and the teacher labor organizations to negotiate their contract six months before the expiration date. We have all seen the effects of broken down contract negotiation on our school kids. And I urge your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House
 Resolution 415. On that question, the Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "She will."
- cowlishaw: "Representative, it was my understanding, when we enacted the collective bargaining legislation, that we were obliged thereafter to leave all matters having to do with those negotiations at the local level, to leave those items at the discretion of those local individual groups, including school boards, labor organizations and the like.

 Now, you are suggesting that we should tell them when they have to begin their negotiations, irrespective of what their own choices may be. Is that correct?"
- Plowers: "No, that's not correct. We are urging them to begin their negotiation. We're not requiring them to begin.

 We're just asking them, 'Would you please?'"
- Cowlishaw: "Very good. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 415 be adopted?' A11 those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the is adopted. House Resolution 425. Representative Pullen - Richmond. Clerk. read the Resolution."
- Clark Leone: "House Resolution 425, urges U.S. Congress to study

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the nation's money system. Third..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 425 urges Congress to study the money system of the United States and specifically to audit the Federal Reserve which has never been audited in its long history. It was approved... this Resolution was approved by the Financial Institutions Committee on a unanimous vote. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for adoption of House Resolution Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 425 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. and House Resolution 425 ís adopted. House Resolution 464. Representative Bowman. It does ... I understand it doesn't have to be read. Proceed, Representative Bowman."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 464 is a Resolution that was introduced to direct the Auditor General to conduct a study of the supply and demand factors for engineering graduates in the Now, the caption indicates that this part of the state. concerns a proposed engineering program in Northern Illinois University. The caption is a little misleading. If you read the Resolution, although it mentions Northern Illinois University, it does so only because the Board of Higher Education has made a recommendation to that effect. And so, that was the thing we hung our hat on, so to speak, drafting the Resolution. The Resolution does not ... well, actually goes way beyond the engineering school in Northern Illinois University. That engineering program has been approved by the Board of Higher Education. approval by the Board of Higher Education is sufficient

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

and of itself to create the program out there. This Resolution does not, in any way, affect that program. Ιt does not negate that program or suggest that program be negated. However, the Board of Higher Education. reaching the decision with respect to NIU, did overlook two major items that I think need to be studied further, and that is why I introduced this Resolution. Pirst point it did not really address the needs of minority engineering students and prospective students. Consequently, when the NIU issue was raised in the General Assembly. heard a we number of people, I think rightly, say that ... that these needs were overlooked and there was a move to set engineering college at Chicago State University as well. Well, I think we need, as we proceed to... in to design programs that meet all of our students' needs, we have some data and some statistics and some quidance on meeting the needs of minority students. In addition, the BHE acted presumably on the basis of a study it did pursuant to a House Resolution a year earlier. And, yet, they completely overlooked the excess capacity in the private sector. IIT has excess capacity. University has excess capacity. There's a Midwest Engineering. All the private sector, in its entirety, was overlooked. I believe that there's some significant opportunities for public/private partnerships so that we can make use of that excess capacity and provide... and doing so, meet the needs of students who are seeking engineering degrees. So, this Resolution simply Auditor General to study the supply and demand factors with particular attention to meeting minority needs and developing public/private partnerships. I move adoption." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption House Resolution 464. On the question, the Gentleman from

64th Legislative Day

June 29. 1985

Kendall, Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Hastert: "Representative Bowman, do you have plan for wheeling that excess capacity to other segments of the population?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, Representative Hastert. There is just a little noise on the floor. I didn't quite hear."

Hastert: "Do you have a plan for wheeling that excess capacity to other portions of the population?"

Bowman: "Oh. Actually, that's what I thought you said. I just thought perhaps I didn't hear it correctly. No, unfortunately, the higher education system doesn't lend itself to wheeling the same way electric generating capacity does."

Hastert: "Do you think it might put a 25 percent cap on this?"

Bowman: "No. This Resolution does not address the cap issue.

But I think we ought to, you know, put everything on the table and let the Auditor General make those judgments."

Hastert: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 464 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 492, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 492 concerns the recommendations which we anticipate will be made by the Governor's Task Force on Homeless Persons. This Task Force has been established by the Governor. It is due to report by August 15th. This Besolution directs the various code departments that will be involved in implementing the Governor's Task Force report to provide certain information to the Legislature by October 15th, such as information such as

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

interagency agreements and the like so that if legislation is required in order to provide a statutory basis for implementing the policies that are recommended by this Task Porce that we will be in a position during the Veto Session to take action. And consequently, I believe that House Resolution 492 provides for a sound basis for planning and for legislative action and; therefore, I move adoption of 492."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 492. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 492 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 494, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Madam Chairman (sic Speaker) and Ladies Gentlemen of the House, this Resolution urges DCCA and CDB to examine the uses for the Southtown YMCA in the Englewood community of Chicago. Efforts are underway to revitalize the economic development in this community. This particular building is vacant now but could be used toward this goal. And I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Resolution 494. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 494 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 40. Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic Speaker), Members of the General Assembly. Basically what this Resolution does, it asks the Federal Government to readdress itself pertaining to the expenditure of Hill-Burton funds.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Basically what it does is request the Federal Government to address itself to need instead of a formula. ranked fifty-sixth among fifty-six states. fifty-seven states and territories regarding federal funding. In the year 1982, Illinois expenditures of sixty-eight cents per capita for vocational rehabilitation was sixty-six cents below the national average of a \$1.34. There is a crying need that we address ourselves to this situation. Hopefully, that you'll concur with me and give me a positive vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Joint Resolution 40. On that question. is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 40? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution adopted. House Joint Resolution 53, Representative Pangle. House Joint Resolution 53 concerns the Department of Mental Health, Public Health and Aging."
- Pangle: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution #53 is for a study to be conducted on the pilot project for Alzheimer's disease."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gantleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 53. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 53 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 16, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Basically, Senate Joint Resolution 16 urges Congress to amend the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1984 to include apprenticeship and on-the-job training

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

programs. And I would ask for a favorable vote on Senate Joint Resolution 16. $^{\rm m}$

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 16. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. the question is. 'Shall Senate daint Resolution 16 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair. the 'ayes' have it, and Senate Joint Resolution 16 is adopted. Once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are ready to go to the Order of Concurrences in which people wish to nonconcur. If you haven't got your number on the list. please get it to the Clerk's well immediately. Order of Concurrences, in which people wish to nonconcur. the first Bill appears on page 13 on your Calendar. right. It's House Bill 54. Representative Preston. That's page three on your Calendar. House Bill Representative Preston, I understand you wish to nonconcur. Amends an Act concerning unidentified bodies, Senate Amendment #1. Do you wish to nonconcur?"

Preston: "Yes, I... I would ask that we nonconcur, Madam Speaker.

In the Senate Amendment, the Senate tacked on an Amendment that really completely changed the Bill from its original form, and I'd ask for nonconcurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 54. All those in favor say
'aye', all those opposed... Excuse me, Representative
Vinson, on the question."

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

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

Preston: "Mr. Vinson, I will not put criminal background checks on teachers on the Conference Committee Report, but I'll be glad to answer your question."

Vinson: "Thank you. I support the Gentleman's Motion."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 54. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aves' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 54. House Bill 514, appears on page five on our Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks. We'll take that one out of the record temporarily. The next Bill is House Bill 605. It appears on page five on our Calendar. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "No, that's out of the record. We're going to move with that..."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Out of the record. House Bill 694 appears on page seven on our Calendar. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, you all asked that these Motions be called, so please be in your seat and ready to present them. House Bill... Representative Cullerton, would you like to go forward on House Resolution... or rather on House Bill 694 on a nonconcurrence Motion. It's on page seven on your Calendar."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House. I wish to nonconcur with Senate
Amendment #2 or perhaps, we should take this out. I do
wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1. So, maybe we
should do this..."

Speaker Breslin: "Separately."

Cullerton: "... In another Order. Right."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

Amendment number... Excuse me, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I thought we were just going to do nonconcurrences."

Speaker Breslin: "We were... So, he... he asked that it be taken out of the record."

Vinson: "That's a good idea."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 1570... 17, appears on page 11 on our Calendar. Representative Giorgi Hallock. Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 1961, appears on page 13 on our Calendar. Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I

 move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
 1961."
- Speaker Breslin: "Can you please give us a reason?"
- McAuliffe: "The Amendment is technically incorrect according to the staff."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1961. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield to a question."
- Cullerton: "This Senate Amendment that adds a July 1st effective date, just what about it is technically incorrect?"
- McAuliffe: "I don't know. The staff says it's technically incorrect."
- Cullerton: "It's an effective date Amendment. Well, I'll read it to you. It says, 'Amendment #1, amend House Bill 1961 on page one by inserting after line 27 the following: Section 2, this Act shall take effect July 1, 1985.' Is he going to recede from that technically defective Amendment?"
- McAuliffe: "Maybe it's technically incorrect. I don't know."
- Cullerton: "Department of Cons..."
- McAuliffe: "I'll have the staff man come over and talk to you,

 Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Department of Conservation Bill. Okay, no, I think
 we should nonconcur. If it's technically defective, we
 should nonconcur."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

McAuliffe: "I appreciate your support."

Cullerton: "Alright."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1961?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1961. With leave of the Body, we'll now go back to Representative Giorgi's Bill, House Bill 1517. It appears on page 11 on your Calendar. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1517, because there are a couple of errors in the... in the varying rates, and it's too important to let... to try to correct without a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are you nonconcurring in Amendment #1, also?" Giorgi: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1517. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #... Representative Tuerk, do you wish to speak to this question? Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question if I may."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Tuark: "I just had a phone call this morning, Zeke, from our election authority, and apparently our..."

Giorgi: "That's the reason."

Tuerk: "Is it?"

Giorgi: "Yes, that's the..."

Tuerk: "I'd like to talk to you about it, yes."

Giorgi: "Yes."

Tuerk: "What's the problem on that Bill?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Giorgi: "We have to be sure that the city board of elections that exist in 13 cities are not affected by what we're trying to do with the county consolidation of levies and the sales tax thing."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1517?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1517. The next Bill is House Bill 2431. It appears on page 15 on your Calendar. Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I'm..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Excuse me, my list says... I said House Bill 2431. It's 2421."

Wojcik: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Representative,"

Wojcik: "I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2.

There is some technical problems with it and it had to be rewritten."

Speaker "The Breslin: Lady moves to nonconcur Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2421. A11 those... there any discussion? Hearing none, question is, the *Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2421? The next Bill is House Bill 2437. Ιt appears on page 16 on your Calendar, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2437. When we passed the Bill out, what it did was repeal two Acts. It's been amended and it's not acceptable to Representative Farley, and my agreement was that if we do not... you know, we will not do anything that is unacceptable to Representative Farley. So, I move to nonconcur."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2437. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2437?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2437. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to go to the Order... Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Representative Parke has two nonconcurrence Motions which he's just bringing in. I wonder, could we stay and do those?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative, we'd like to go to the Order of Concurrences. Иe mау break in order αo Representative Parke's Bills later. Ladies and Gentlemen. on the Order of Concurrences, on page two on your Calendar. starting at the beginning, House Bill 48. Representative Dunn or Representative Bullock. It is the intention of the Chair to start at the top of this Order of Call and go straight through. The first Bill again, is House Bill Representative Dunn or Representative Bullock in the chamber? Representative Dunn is here. Remember the form. Bill is not read again. When your Bill is called on the Order of Concurrence, you should get up, immediately present what the original Bill did and what the Senate Amendment did in your Motion to concur, as briefly as we can, so that the Members are informed but that we do not take up too much time. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 48 originally provided for an Amendment to the Enterprise Zone Act to provide for treatment of partnerships and Subchapter S corporations the same as general corporations and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

individuals for the purpose of investment tax credits. Amendment #1 adds a limited sales tax exemption within enterprise zones only if the county or municipality which ordinance has established an enterprise zone and. further, only if such county or municipality has by ordinance granted identical exemptions under its county or municipal sales tax, its home rule sales tax, with regards to certain items. This Amendment is a business Amendment and has been drafted substantially to meet the needs of LTB is an Amendment which will help basic steel, and it manufacturing in our state. And I would ask that the House concur... concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48. Is there any

discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

O'Connell: "Does this... this Amendment have anything to do with the investment tax credit?"

Dunn: "The original Bill does. The original..."

O'Connell: "Is that still in there?"

Dunn: "Yes. The original Bill provides for applicability of investment tax credits under the Enterprise Zone Act to Subchapter S corporations and partnerships. These two groups were not included when the original enterprise zone legislation was prepared. It was an oversight and this is corrective legislation. This will mean that individuals, corporations, partnerships and Subchapter S corporations would be treated alike for investment tax credit purposes."

O'Connell: "Was there some sort of a constitutional problem with individuals and partnerships not treated the same as a corporation?"

Dunn: "Not that I know of."

O'Connell: "Why were they left off in the first instance?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Dunn: "I'm not familiar with that history. I do know that it was called to my attention by a constituent in my district who was doing income tax returns and discovered that that was not the case. I prepared legislation and, to the best of my knowledge, it was an oversight, but I really don't know."
- O'Connell: "Okay. Alright. So, now what does the Amendment do then?"
- Dunn: "The Amendment provides a sales tax exemption within enterprise zones where the... with regard to certain items of property and with regard to businesses located within the enterprise zone which make investments causing the creation of at least 200 full-time jobs in Illinois or make investments leading to the retention of at least 2,000 full-time jobs in Illinois."
- O'Connell: "So, the Amendment is adding certain items that would be subject to the sales tax exemption."

Dunn: "That's correct."

- O'Connell: "Okay. So, it does nothing to enterprise zone... the provisions of the enterprise zone statute except adding other items for sales tax exemption."
- Dunn: "That's right. It does not change the basic structure of the Enterprise Zone Act in anyway."

O'Connell: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Woodyard: "Representative, is there a definition of tangible personal property? John?

Dunn: "Yeah."

Woodyard: "Is a there definition of tangible personal property consumed?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Dunn: "Yes, the Amendment relates to tangible personal property used or consumed in the process of manufacturing or assembling tangible personal property for sale or lease, wholesale or retail. It includes repair or replacement parts for machinery or equipment used primarily in the process of manufacturing or assembling tangible personal property for sale or lease. Also included are equipment, manufacturing fuels, materials and supplies used in maintenance, repair or operation of such machinery and equipment."

Woodyard: "I guess what I'm getting at, this includes the exemption of tangible personal property consumed in the operation of pollution control facilities. What does that mean?"

Dunn: "Are you reading from the Amendment?"

Woodyard: "No, no. I... Just from the Digest, John. It says that... The Digest says, it also exempts from sales taxes tangible personal property to be used or consumed in the operation of pollution control facilities."

Dunn: "I don't see any such language in the Amendment. It may be an interpretation that it does..."

Woodyard: "In the Digest... I think what I was trying to get to... Would this exemption also..."

Dunn: "Yes, the language is in the Amendment."

Woodyard: "I'm sorry."

Dunn: "There is such language in the Amendment. Subject to the provision of Section 1(f) tangible personal property to be used or consumed in the operation of pollution control facilities is defined in Section 1(a) within an enterprise zone."

Woodyard: "I don't know what that means, but..."

Dunn: "I think it means that the exemption would include the property to which... tangible personal property to which

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

you refer."

Woodyard: "Thank you. What I'm getting around to... bottom line
was, do you think that this would include exemptions of
sales tax on gasoline as well as..."

Dunn: "No."

Woodyard: "...as sales tax on other items?"

Dunn: "No."

Woodyard: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are !!! voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 49, Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Bill... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 49. House Bill
49 creates the East St. Louis Development Authority. This
Amendment deletes from the Bill the ability to acquire
property by the Authority by eminent domain, and that
Amendment that was put on by the Senate is an Amendment
that I recommended. So, I move to concur with that
Amendment, Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 and 2?"

Younge: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "...Of House Bill 49. On the question, the Gentleman... Is there any discussion on the question? 1 and 2. She is acting on 1 and 2. On the question, the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Gentleman from Kane, Representative Kirkland.

Kirkland: "Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of questions. Our analysis indicates you've deleted a provision that state's that this Act is not a limit upon any home rule unit. Where is that provision and why was that change made?"

Younge: "That provision is found on page 21, line number five...

lines number five and six. This was taken out because
there is nothing in there... in the Bill that attempts to
be a limit on the powers of home rule units. So therefore,
it was a useless and superfluous writing and it was taken
out for that reason."

Kirkland: "Are any of the towns that the Bill affects home rule units - or all of them, or is it a mix?"

Younge: "The City of East St. Louis is a home rule unit."

Kirkland: "Are other towns around it not?"

Younge: "No other town involved in this Authority is."

Kirkland: "Okay. And what brought on the language about limiting the Authority to developing land within three, rather than a ten mile limit?"

Younge: "The Bill originally made land development possible within a radius of ten miles of a municipality, and I changed it to three miles in conformity with the Municipal Codes."

Kirkland: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Piel: "Yes, first of all, Madam Speaker, could I ask a question of the Chair? We're going to concur on #1. Can you give me what the present status of #2 is, please? Have we already nonconcurred with 2 or have we already concurred with 2? I'm..."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you give us the status of Senate
Amendment #2? Okay. We... both of those are before us

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

right now and there is a Motion to concur in both, 1 and 2.0

Piel: "Oh, 1 and 2?"

Speaker Breslin: "That's correct."

Piel: "Pine. Will the... Let's try it one more time. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, she will yield to a question."

Piel: "What is the... Representative, what is the amount of bonds that this Authority would be able to issue?"

Younge: "The Authority can issue only revenue bonds and the amount of the bonds would be set by the board."

Piel: "Well basically, in other words, what we are doing by enacting this legislation is granting authority unlimited uses of these bonds, unlimited power as far as issuing bonds. Am I correct?"

Younge: "The board consists of three heads of the departments of the State of Illinois. The head of IHDA..."

Piel: "No. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. That wasn't my question. My question was basically what we're doing..."

Younge: "And, therefore, they're... limiting a power in reference to this particular board."

Piel: "We're giving them unlimited bonding authority. Correct?"

Younge: "No, we're not. The bonding authority is... will be available for only four years. The people who serve on the board have the first right to issue the bonds from their state agencies and this Authority can only issue them if the other agencies like IHDA and DCCA and... don't issue the bonds and the bonds have to be approved by the whole board. And I think that in that frame of reference, there is a great deal of limitation set."

Piel: "So, basically what you're... Well, what you're... what you're basically stating then, if I'm reading you correctly, in other words, if all these other agencies turn

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

down the bonding authority, then it's giving them the authority to issue the bonds themselves. So in other words, what you're saying is they have power to overrule any decisions that are made by other... like IHDA, et cetera, et cetera. Just the groups you were saying, correct?"

Younge: "And in addition to that, I'm saying that the people who sit on the board have eight... are over agencies that have the power to issue bonds; and, in that frame of reference, I think that there will be a great deal of prudence and careful consideration of a particular bond issue."

Piel: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, this is very innovative. I would Piel: ask that you look at this Bill very closely. We are voting right now on final passage. If we vote passage of this Bill, it goes to the Governor. What we're basically voting on right here, we're stating that if we establish this Authority, the Authority applies for bonding through other state agencies, the other state agencies do not feel the bonds are necessary, do not feel the bonds are warranted, it still gives this Authority the right to issue bonds. It gives them, timewise, as she said, only four years. four years, it's giving them unlimited, unquote, 'unlimited' bonding authority for a vast array of And I think, you know, we are developmental projects. opening up a pandora's box, and I would ask for a negative vote on House Bill 49."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge, to close."

Younge: "The only bonds that this Authority can issue are revenue bonds and that has to be based on the credit of the particular private developers. And so, there isn't any risk here for the state. There is nothing to be afraid of.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

And I ask for the concurrence on these two..."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #! and 2 to House Bill 49?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Piel: "Two questions. One, if this should receive the requisite number, I'm going to verify; and, second, is this 60 or 71 votes needed for passage?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, in answer ŧο your question, this Bill appears to require 60 votes for passage because it authorizes the issuance of revenue bonds by a separate authority. So, 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Piel has asked for a verification of the affirmative. Representative Younge has asked for a Poll of the Absentees. Poll the absentees, Representative Piel, while we wait, would you Mr. Clerk. give Representative Bowman leave to be verified? He has leave."
- Clark O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Before you begin that, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are people in the gallery that would like to take still photographs of the Assembly. Do the... It is the Boys Scouts of America. Do they have leave? They have leave. Proceed."
- Clark O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Krska. McNamara and Panayotovich. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "Poll the Affirmative."
- Clark O'Brien: "Alexander. Berrios. Bowman. Braun. Breslin.
 Brookins. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen.

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Cullerton. Curran. Currie. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanniq. Hartke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Panayotovich wishes to vote
 'aye'. Representative Shaw, for what reason do you rise?"
 Shaw: "Leave to be verified."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw asks leave to be verified.

 That is granted. Representative Pangle asks leave to be verified. That is granted. Representative Flowers asks leave to be verified. And that is granted. Proceed, Mr.
- Clerk "Hicks. O'Brien: Homer. Huff. Keane. Kulas. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McPike. O'Connell. Mulcahey. Nash. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any questions of the affirmative, Mr. Piel?"
- Piel: "We're starting with 64, correct, Madam Speaker?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Correct. Representative Young asks leave to be verified. May he have leave? Representative Anthony Young. He has leave. Representative O'Connell asks leave to be verified, and that is granted. Representative Braun asks leave to be verified, and that is granted."
- Piel: "Okay. Representative Christensen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen is in his chair."
- Piel: "Representative DeLeo."
- Speaker Breslin: "Fepresentative DeLeo. Representative DeLeo. Representative DeLeo is voting 'aye'. Remove him."
- Piel: "Representative Farley."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Bepresentative Farley.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn is in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him. "

Piel: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff. Representative Huff. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane. Representative Keane.

The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey is right in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative Nash."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash. Representative Nash. The
Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him.
Representative McNamara is in the chamber and wishes to be
recorded as voting 'aye'."

Piel: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rea is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Soliz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Soliz is by his chair."

Piel: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Washington."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Washington, Representative

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Washington. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove
- Piel: "Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton is in the chamber. Do
 you really want to verify off Representative Cullerton?"
- Piel: "If the tables were changed, he'd probably do the same thing. So, I just want to make sure he's here.

 Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi. Representative Hannig has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call. Representative Giorgi is in the chamber. Representative Wash has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call."
- Piel: "No further questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "What is the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments and 2 to House Bill 49, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Dunn has filed a Motion on a Bill that we have just taken. Since it is so fresh in our memories. leave of the Body, we would like to go back to Representative Dunn on the Order of Concurrence, on page your Calendar on House Bill 48. That Bill just passed moments ago. Representative Dunn, what is your Motion?"
- Dunn: "Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 48 passed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Dunn is the Sponsor of the Bill. He moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 48 passed. This requires 60 votes for adoption. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

take the record. On this question there are 80... there are 90... The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye'. This is only a Motion to reconsider. There are 94 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And this House does reconsider the vote by which House Bill 48 passed. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Now I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment, I think, is \$1..." Is there only one?"

Speaker Breslin: "It is."

Dunn: "Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves... Can you tell us why?"

Dunn: "Yes, because I got marching orders to do so."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 48. And on that question,

Representative Leverenz, with more marching orders."

Leverenz: "Tell me... Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "Is it now for you?"

Dunn: "Well, House Bill 48 is for the people of the State of Illinois. And they're... what's going to happen with the Amendment, I don't know. I hope it will be good."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. What, then, is the status of Amendment #2? Are you concurring in that?"

Speaker Breslin: "There is only one Amendment listed on the Calendar. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, on the guestion."

Piel: "In other words, what the Sponsor is saying is everything that he told us that was good about the Amendment before, all of a sudden turned bad, right?"

64th Legislative Day June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "No, he indicates it is still good, but..."

Piel: "He wants to make it better."

Speaker Breslin: "Right, I quess so."

Dunn: "I want to stand by and see what happens. The Amendment is fine with me, but there are... there are people in the lower chamber who are bent out of shape and want this to go to Conference Committee, so let's humor them."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 48. The next Bill is House Bill 52. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen House Bill 52 is a Bill that requires criminal the House. background checks on day care facility employees. The attached an Amendment at the request of Senate the Department of Children and Family Services which makes this a better and, in fact, a stronger Bill. I just spoke to the Director of DCFS to discuss some of the aspects of the... the Amendment. It's a good Amendment and it help protect children and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 52. On that question, is anv discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 52?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris, one minute explain your vote. The Gentleman indicates he does not Is there any further discussion? There being wish to. no further discussion, the Clerk will take the record. Oπ this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received ... House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 60. Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 62. Representative Greiman. Out of the record. House Bill 83. Representative Wait. Remember, explain the Bill and then the Amendment."

Wait: "Yeah, House... House Bill... 93 would provide for a special assessment deferment and it would piggyback onto the property tax deferment which we passed last year. The Amendment that was put on in the Senate would simply say that they had to apply within 30 days and the Department of Revenue would have the final say. I'd move to... for adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 93. On the question, the
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "The Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "I thought you were going to have somebody from the Department of Revenue come over and explain the Amendment to me."

Wait: "John, I'm trying to get ahold of Marsha right now. I talked with your staffer there, Ron, and he thought we ought to try and concur with it and if there's any problems, that we could correct it next year."

Cullerton: "Okay, well, that might be the case. If I could just have a few minutes to talk to him about it, I'd appreciate it, so could you please take it out?"

Wait: "Okay, okay, sure. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 83? All those in favor vote... Representative Wait."

Wait: "Please take this out of the record for a minute."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 137,
Representative Churchill. Out of the record. House Bill
146, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you... Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 146, which merely says that the... if a Social Security number is indicated or asked for by an election judge at the time of voting that the Social Security number is listed as being voluntary on the ballot application. And I would ask for adoption of this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 146. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 146? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there voting 'aye'. 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Bill 146, and this Bill, having received the House Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 157, Representative Ropp. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Explain the Bill and the Amendments... or Amendment."

Ropp: "Okay, the Bill, House Bill 157 attempts to unify the speed limits in the State of Illinois for all vehicles.

Currently, the state law says that trucks of 9,000 pounds

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

or over only may travel 50 miles per hour. I'm attempting to make it uniform by allowing all vehicles to go the state speed limit of 55 on secondary highways. The Senate Amendment made the effective date July 1, 1986, and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 157, and on the question, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Brunsvold: "Representative, we passed a Bill last week that forgave tickets from 55 to...what, ten miles over? Was that the Bill?"

Ropp: "Did I?"

Brunsvold: "We passed that Bill, right, forgiving... no reporting
to the Secretary of State for tickets that were less then
ten miles an hour over the speed limit?"

Ropp: "That may be. I... I don't think I supported it, but it's possible that it passed."

Brunsvold: "One of the provisions of the analysis was that truckers would probably be exempt from this because they were... they were at a speed limit of 50 miles an hour. So, are you, in fact... would this Bill then put them into the provisions where they could not receive a report... or not get a report off to the Secretary of State if they were... had excess number of speeding tickets?"

Ropp: "I'm not sure. This doesn't really deal with that. This just allows them to go 55 miles an hour and if they would come under the same provision as to the Bill that we did pass, then they would come under that provision."

Brunsvold: "Are they supportive of this measure?"

Ropp: "The truckers are supporting this Bill, yes, Sir."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Representative."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion... excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz. Okay, there... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "I'm sorry. I was momentarily off the floor. What...

 and I just heard some dialogue regarding reporting to the

 Secretary of State. What does this Amendment do?"
- Ropp: "The Amendment changes the effective date to July 1, 1936."

 O'Connell: "Alright, and the original Bill, is that still intact,

 where it increases the maximum speed limit outside an urban

 area from 50 to 55 miles per hour with an 8,000 pound

 truck?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

O'Connell: "Does this have anything to do with reporting requirements to the Secretary of State?"

Ropp: "No."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I rise in support of the concurrence Motion. It simply eliminates the differential between cars and trucks, the... the old 55 mile versus 50. Lets everybody run at 55. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 157? All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 157, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back now to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 62, Representative Greiman."

Graiman: "Thank you, Speaker. I would move to nonconcur with Senate Bill... House Bill 62 on Amendment #1. The... We're... The essence of this is being put into the large education package and there's a piece that deals with one of the school districts in New Trier with respect to leasing of property that there's need to use this Bill for. So, I would ask then that we nonconcur."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 62. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 62?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 62. House Bill 202, out of the record. House Bill 204, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Out of the record, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 241,

Representative Roman."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. incur to Senate... concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 241. Basically what it does is the same measure that I put on in the House on... on House Bill... Bill... I don't remember which one it was, but this is the infrastructure plan. This puts it in the same conformity that... that I passed the Senate Bill out of the House by last week. Basically what it does is it puts in two revisions that were requests from the Capital Development Board and the Governor's Office of Planning. So, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 241. Is there any discussion?

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 241? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Representative Brunsvold, would vote me 'aye', please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', Il voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 241, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. House Bill 264. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to

House Bill 264. Senate Amendment #1 simply changes a word

from action and Senate Amendment #2 amends it that

defendants in forcible detainer actions must give security

for a finding of rent due to gain a continuance and I would

move for its concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 264. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "I must reluctantly rise in opposition to the Motion concur to Amendment #2. This establishes an absolutely horrendous principle of the law, that you have to to get a continuance in a situation where there has not been an adjudication that you are guilty. It provides that you have to put up a bond if you want a continuance in a forcible case, be it... you know, you come in... somebody may come into court the first time and they ask for a continuance because they want to get an attorney or they want to get a continuance to try to work out the situation and under the provisions of Amendment #2, they've got to put up a bond. We're not talking about a rich corporation

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

here being required to put up a bond. We're talking somebody who probably doesn't have the money in the first place. So, the... the net effect of this Amendment is deny the opportunity of a defendant in a forcible case for continuance. Now, you know, maybe I ought to be for because. you know, I do a lot of forcibles on behalf of condominium associations, but I think it's wrong in any be it... it's wrong for condos, it's wrong for context. This is a terrible principle, tenants. and I know it's well intended in terms of trying to ... terms of why it was offered, but you know, I think we ought to take look at this and at this point, I urge that we not concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young, Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I also agree that Amendment #2 is a bad Amendment. House. The practical effect of this Amendment will be... would make someone post a bond for future rent when there has been no determination that the past rent is due. There are several defenses recognized in the law right now that would allow someone to come into court and file a counterclaim against the landlord. Based on this Amendment, if they do so and the case needs to be continued, they would up a bond that they surely do not have. Also, the way the Amendment is drafted, it's possible that the landlord himself could ask for a continuance and based on the landlord requesting a continuance, place the tenant position where he would have to put up a bond before he could have his rightful day in court. Under the law as exists right now, tenants as well as landlords both are entitled to day ... their day in court. This Amendment would make it possible for a landlord, in certain circumstances, to deny the tenant his right to have

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

legitimate complaints heard without first posting money that he probably does not have. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "A Parliamentary inquiry. Is the Motion to Concur in both Amendments?"

Speaker Breslin: "It is."

McCracken: "I stand in support of this Motion. I have cases in the Cook County forcible detainer courts and I can you that it is a problem of getting possession back. The Forcible Detainer Act was originally enacted for protection and promotion of the peace. Prior to that, the law gave the owner of property a right of forcible entry if he could do so without actual conflict with the right was taken away by this Act and forces the owner of property to go in and commence a court action to back what is rightfully his. Typically in these courts continuances are granted as a matter of course. Jury demands are made as a stalling tactic and often possession, rightful possession to the plaintiff or the owner of the property is delayed and delayed and delayed. Now, the context of commercial cases, that delay is very common. the context of personal cases, it is less common, but it is All this seeks to do is where the defendant asks for a continuance that the period of time between commencement Ωf the action and the trial date be compensated by the way... by the means of a surety bond. This does not necessarily require a bond for all of the claimed deficiency or back due rent. It's for a period of during the pendancy of the action and only applies where the defendant makes the motion for the continuance, where the plaintiff makes the motion for the continuance. There is no allowance made for that in this

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill. So, it's a fair Bill and I move that the House... well, I... I second your Motion, Representative Terzich. It's a good... it's a good idea. It's necessary."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I've had an opportunity to... to look at this and I... I think that it's possible, had we had an opportunity to review the Senate Amendment in a Committee, that we could have, perhaps, worked something out that would have ... would be fair. In reading this though, does, I think, have some deficiencies in that if it ultimately is determined that no rent is due, tenant would have been forced to come up with the money and post his bond when he was not at fault and Representative McCracken characterized it as money that was... that was due, that was rightfully due, but that was what is to be determined by a court. Again, I know that there are problems with continuances the and that sometimes injustices can occur. I happen to be a landlord myself and I also used to be a tenant and I think I have a pretty good perspective on the thing, but I just think that this goes a little bit too far. I think that the best way to do this would be to nonconcur and to sit down with the parties involved and see if we can work out a compromise. would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek."

 Vitek: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm glad to listen to these
 lawyers because they have made up my mind that I will vote
 to concur in House Bill 264 and support Terzich's Motion.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is... excuse me. Representative Terzich, to close."
- Terzich: "Well, yes, as was stated, actually this... what it

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

does is basically that if the tenant requests a continuance, not the plaintiff, that the courts would determine the amount of money and actually, all that amounts to is what the rent would be for that particular time that the tenant or the... asked for a continuance under that which could be a month or a week or so on and it's nothing more than what the rent would be due since the individual is still living in... on the premises and I would move for its concurrence."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 264?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Representative DeJaegher, would you vote me 'no', please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Excuse me. Representative Shaw, for what reason do you rise?"
- Shaw: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm the hypenated Sponsor of this

 Bill. I'd like my name removed as hyphenated Sponsor
 leave of the House."
- Speaker Breslin: "You want to be removed as the hyphenated ${\bf Sponsor?"} \\$
- Shaw: "Right."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to be removed as the hyphenated Sponsor on this Bill., Representative... and vote Representative Shaw 'no'. Representative Mulcahey, for what reason do you rise?"
- Nulcahey: "Madam Speaker, please change my vote from 'no' to
 'aye', please."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman wants to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Vote Representative Mulcahey 'aye'.

 Representative Flowers, for what reason do you rise?

 Representative Flowers changes her vote from 'aye' to 'no'.

 Mr. Clerk, Representative Huff changes his vote from 'aye'

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

to 'no'. Representative Brookins changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Giorgi changes his vote from lave! to 'no'. Representative Turner changes his vote from *no*. 'aye' 50 Turner. Clerk, what's the count? Representative Rice changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. don't know what the record is. Representative Satterthwaite changes her vote from 'aye' to 'no'. There are, therefore, 80... Terry Steczo changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. There are, therefore, 86 voting 'ave', 29 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 264, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 264, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "We just finished 261... 265, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "It's House Bill 265. Proceed, Representative."

Terzich: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 265 and it just corrects errors by striking three commas and I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that we concurate that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 265? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' none voting 'present'. And this... And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 265, and this having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 270, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, I move that we concur with Senate Amendment...

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate... No. Amendment #1 to House Bill 270. This Amendment is simply is coordinating the terminology. The Amendment, according to the Amendment, lines 2 and 3 should be deleted and according to the copy of the Bill, it should be... the proper lines to be deleted should be 1. 2 and And that's all it does and I would move for concurrence." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 270. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 270? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 270, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 275. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Just give me a second, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative..."

Terzich: "Oh, we made a deal on this, so I'm supposed to nonconcur with this one,"

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 275. Can you tell us what the deal is?"

Terzich: "I'll let you know a little later."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, on the question."

Bowman: "Oh, I'm sorry. I'll support the Motion to nonconcur.

Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House... the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, on the question."

McCracken: "I don't have to know what the deal is, but who is it

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

with?"

Terzich: "Cullerton."

McCracken: "Okay, alright, I support it."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 275? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 275. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to a Special Subject Matter Call on the Order of Pensions. Special Subject Matter Call on the Order of Pensions. The Bills are as follows: House Bill Representative Curran, House Bill 202, Representative Satterthwaite, House Bill 357, Representative Saltsman, Bill 398, Representative McGann, House Bill 561. Representative McGann. House Bill 306, Representative Krska, House Bill... excuse me, that was House Bill 1306, Representative Krska and House Bill 1966, Representative Ewing. Hopefully, the Sponsors will be prepared to go forward on this Special Subject Matter call of Pensions. The first Bill, House Bill 60, Representative Curran. is on the Speaker's Table. They are all on the Order of Concurrence. Excuse me. Page... this Bill is on page 3 of the Calendar. Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment on House Bill 60. The Senate Amendment redefines the term salary in downstate firefighters Article of the Pension Code to put the definition in compliance with a recent Supreme Court decision which extends the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act to state and local governments. I don't know of any opposition. I move to concur."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 60. Is there any discussion?

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Hearing none, the guestion is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 60? All those in 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 60, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Representative Satterthwaite's Bill, House Bill 202-Ts the Lady in the chamber? She is not. We'll take this Bill out of the record. Oh, yes. She has returned to the chamber. Representative Satterthwaite, House Bill 202. appears on page 5 on your Calendar. Excuse me. that must 3 on the Calendar. Yes, page 3 on the Calendar. Proceed, Representative Satterthwaite."

- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 202. It applies to the portion of that Bill relating to the group insurance program and assures that that portion of the program, if it is adopted by the pension system, would not be considered a pension benefit. It's consistent with our intention as the Bill left the House, and I would move for approval of the Senate Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for concurrence in Senate Amendment #! to House Bill 202. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #! to House Bill 202?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are !!4 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #! to House Bill

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

202, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 on your Calendar appears House Bill 357, Representative Saltsman.

- Saltsman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 357."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 357. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 357?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Vote Representative Breslin 'aye'. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 357, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill... On page 4 in your Calendar appears House Bill 398, Representative McGann."
- "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly. McGann: move to concur with Amendment #1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 398-Amendment #1 provides an optional retirement formula for Chicago laborers and retired board employees. Amendment #2 takes care of the group health program for retirees and #3 is an Amendment that... exempting the state from reimbursement liability under the State Mandates Act and I'd ask for its... their approval."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 398. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 398?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 398, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 on your Calendar is House Bill 561, Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill... or House Bill 561, I'd move to concur in... with the Amendments 1, 2 and 3. They are similar, dealing with the Chicago Employees Annuity Fund and I'd ask for their acceptance."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that this House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 561. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there ar 95 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 561, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on page 10 on your Calendar is House Bill 1306, Representative Krska." Krska: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1306.

House, I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 1306. Amendment #1 clarifies the language in the Bill by providing that when a physician or medical facility has received a notice from a municipality that they will assume liability for medical care given to a policeman or fireman injured in the line of duty the physician or medical facility may not attempt to collect payment from the policeman or fireman, nor from their family or estate."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2, Mr. Clerk... excuse me, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1306. And O D question, is there any discussion? There being discussion, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1306? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is This is final action. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1306. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 14... Excuse me. On page 14 on your Calendar appears House Bill 1966. Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which is merely a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1966. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just thought we were following a procedure where the Sponsor would briefly indicate what the Bill does and..."
- Speaker Breslin: "You are correct, Representative Preston.

 Explain what the Bill does and then what the Amendment does."
- Ewing: "The Bill deals with deferred compensation and... just a moment. Oh, yes, Madam Speaker, it allowed them to use certain time in the lump sum payment for, I think, sick leave and this type of thing in figuring deferred

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

compensation. Representative Preston, did you hear that? And the Amendment in the Senate added a part where certain state employees, department heads and all could not be covered by the pension system and it just changed. Under the Civil Administrative Code, that was taken out and they added with the advice and consent of the Senate. So, certain employees who are confirmed by the Senate would have that option. It really is a nothing Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1966? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the ... and none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1966. and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll now ... Representative Oblinger, what reason do you rise?"
- Oblinger: "Madam... Madam Speaker, there's another one on Pensions, House Bill 510 of Representative Dunn's."
- Speaker Breslin: "That didn't make it on the list, but we'll get
 to it eventually. We're on page 4, it's on page 5. The
 first... We'll go back to our regular order of call on the
 Order of Concurrences. At the top of page 4 appears House
 Bill 301, Representative Madigan Bowman. Representative
 Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move... This is the flagship Bill in the Alzheimer's disease package. The underlying Bill establishes a system... a regional system of diagnosis and treatment. The Bill in its original form had at the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

pinnacle of the hierarchy of these regional centers teaching hospitals that were associated with the state universities. Well, the Senate felt that was a little bit too restrictive. They, in Senate Amendment #2, deleted that requirement that locked into state teaching hospitals and this would permit other major teaching hospitals in the state to... to fill this role. I believe it is appropriate. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 301. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 301? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #2 to House Bill 301, and this Bill, received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 312, Representative Soliz."
- Soliz: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 312.

 Amendment #1 would transfer responsibility to test and certify court interpreters from the Office of Illinois Courts to the Department of Registration and Education.

 Amendment #2 would raise the maximum salary for court reporters from... from \$35,000 to \$37,000. The minimum salary remains the same at \$6,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "Tell us what the original Bill does, Representative"
- Soliz: "The original Bill is a Bill to establish the certification for court interpreters in judicial proceedings in the State of Illinois."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 312. On that question,
is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Churchill: "I notice that Senate Amendment #2 places all the functions of this Act with the Department of Registration and Education. Have you had contact with the Department and have they approved of this?"

Soliz: "Yes, I have had contact with the Department οf Registration and Education. Now, there are... They have certain questions; however, they are willing to work with and try to resolve them. I suspect that one of them is that they are concerned that they don't have the capacity to be able to test these individuals and they wanted to be able to contract the service out. And it's m v understanding that they would be able to do that. They have no problem with the Bill. They are willing with me to find some suitable way in which they can comply with the statute. The other concern is, of course, that they don't have the money at this time. However, I hope we deal with that in October. At any rate, they are willing to work with me on this and they are not opposed to the Bill."

Churchill: "Who pays... Who pays these salaries at the present time?"

Soliz: "The counties do."

Churchill: "So, in other words, we are taking that cost that the counties now pick up and we are going to absorb that through the state?"

Soliz: "No, the counties will continue to pay for the interpreters in judicial proceedings. In juvenile

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

proceedings, the counties could technically apply under the statute for reimbursement. The only change is with the judicial proceedings... the juvenile proceedings, I'm sorry. The counties would still continue to pay for the interpreters. The only function that the Department of Registration and Education would do is to test the interpreters to assure that they are competent."

Churchill: "No further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, Amendment #2 is a pay raise for court
reporters, is that correct?"

Soliz: "That's correct. Effective 1987, I believe, or 198..."

Hawkinson: "Now... Aren't they... Didn't they presently just receive a pay raise that, in fact, doesn't go into effect until next Monday?"

- Soliz: "I'm not... I'm not familiar with that at all. This is an Amendment that was attached in the Senate."
- Hawkinson: "Do you know what... I believe this Bill was... had been introduced earlier in the House and did not... did not pass the House. Do you recall the Bill number of that Bill?"
- Soliz: "I sure don't. I'm not familiar at all with this particular Bill because it was a Bill that was... or it was an Amendment that was attached in the Senate. It does provide for some increase in... in the court reporters salaries only in the maximum that they are... they can earn. Now, as far as I know..."
- Hawkinson: "Alright, thank... thank you, Representative To the ... To the Motion. I would stand in opposition to the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Motion. I have supported the underlying Bill, but now we are coming back from the Senate with a Bill that did not pass out of the House, as I recall, which would increase court reporters salaries in '86 and '87 when, in fact, they have just received an increase that doesn't even go into effect until next Monday and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

- Piel: "Representative Soliz, I would like to go back to one thing that you said before. Representative Churchill, I believe it was, asked you a question on the state picking this up. When it deals with court reporters, the way I read the Bill, the way I'm reading the Amendments is that the state will have to pick up... will reimburse the counties for the cost of court reporter services. Now, am I right or am I wrong? That's exactly what I'm reading here."
- Soliz: "At the present time, court reporters are paid by the state. It wouldn't change anything. Official court reporters are paid by the state."
- Piel: "What is the... Alright, the salary range on present court reporters?"
- Soliz: "At the present time, the salary, I believe, is \$35,250."
- Piel: "Okay, now the question I have is all court reporters in the State of Illinois are presently paid by the State of Illinois?"
- Soliz: "All official full time court reporters are paid by the state, yes."
- Piel: "Okay, now what about part-time court reporters?"
- Soliz: "Part time are paid on an hourly basis by the state as well."
- Piel: "Then the question I would have is why it was put into the

64th Legislative Day

Bill, I mean, that they would have to be paid by the

state?"

- Soliz: "No, the only thing that is placed on the Bill through
 Amendment #2 is that it raises the maximum salary that they
 can receive from \$35,250 to \$37."
- Piel: "Okay, I see. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I understand what you are saying now. But the question was asked to you also about the interpreters and you said that interpreters would be paid by the county?"
- Soliz: "Interpreters are presently paid by the county and they would continue to be paid by the county, right."
- Piel: "Okay, in your Amendment #3, it was you and Representative the area that you are changing, it says, however... this is dealing with interpreter services, it savs. 'However. from funds appropriated to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts by the General Assembly for the purpose, the Office shall reimburse for associated with these court counties the cost interpreter services. This Amendment basically puts the cost of these interpreters on the state."
- Soliz: "Are you reading from Amendment #..."
- Piel: "I'm reading from House Amendment #3. The Bill basically states, even though there were changes made in the Senate, basically it stays the same. But the interpreters... the interpreters that the court is doing now and House Amendment #3, not Senate Amendment, Larry, is stating that the interpreters services will be paid by the state. Whether I'm for that or against it, what I'm trying to do is figure out what is the cost to the state going to be for these interpreters because it's being paid right now by... the way the Bill states is that the state has to pick up the cost."
- Soliz: "For juvenile... That's the Bill that we passed out of the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House which essentially provides that interpreters would be certified by the state. The cost of certification would be borne by the state, however, the interpreters, the actual salaries for the interpreters would be paid by the county in judicial proceedings. In juvenile proceedings, the counties can... can apply to the state for reimbursement. That is the state... that is the state of the Bill as it left the House. Nothing has been changed with regard to that except that now instead of the certification procedures going through the Office of the Courts, they are qoing to be going through the Office of Registration and Education."

Piel: "But that is not what you told Representative Churchill.

Representative Churchill's question to you was are these reporters going to be picked up by the state. Your answer was no, the state... the counties are paying for the interpreters, not the state. Amendment #3, as it went out of the House, and it's basically the same now, that states that the state will have to pick up the salaries for the interpreters. The Bill states right now, and we are voting on final passage of this Bill, that the state will pick up the cost. My question to you is what is the cost to the State of Illinois?"

Soliz: "I'm not sure what the cost will be for reimbursing for juvenile proceedings. Nothing has been changed as the Bill passed the House with regard to that issue."

Piel: "I know. I agree. I agree. All I'm asking..."

Soliz: "The actual cost, I'm not... I'm not aware of the amount."

Piel: "No further questions, Madam Speaker."

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

Brookins: "Move the previous question."

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the main question is put. Representative Soliz, to close."

- Soliz: "I would just simply ask for a favorable vote on this Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 312. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Bullock, one minute to explain your vote."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think some misinformation was given out bν opposite side of the aisle. I don't know if it was intentional, but it certainly appeared to be somewhat significant. The fact of the matter is on Amendment #1 to this Bill, the responsibility for testing and certifying the court interpreters is being transferred the Department of Registration and Education. That not entail the responsibility of cost for those individuals be transferred to the State Department of Registration Education, but merely the testing of these individuals and the certifying of it and that is a legitimate function the Department of Registration and Education. The Senate Amendment was put on by Senator D'Arco. Both were put on by Senator D'Arco. Mr. Hawkinson raised the question regarding a salary increase for court reporters. That increase was in fact done in 1983 and Representative Soliz's Amendment, in effect, would make the increase in 1987. So, you would see that in a period of four years, there were two modest increases for court reporters and certainly I think Representative Soliz should be allowed to receive 60 votes and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Member of the House, Senor Soliz, (Speaker speaks Spanish)."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Soliz, that was a question."
- Soliz: "Would you please repeat the question? I didn't understand. In English, please."
- Hallock: "That was an answer. (Speaker speaks Spanish)."
- Soliz: "Would you please repeat the question in English, please?"
- Hallock: "The... It wasn't a question, is was a statement. Of support for 1 and opposition to 2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Soliz, to explain your vote."
- Soliz: "Madam Speaker... Can I, at this point, move to concur on
 Amendment #1 and not concur in Amendment #2? How would I
 have to do..."
- Speaker Breslin: "You can after we take this Roll Call.

 Representative Homer, would you change Representative

 Breslin's vote to 'present'? And on this question there...

 the Clerk will take the record. There are 37 voting 'aye',

 64 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's

 Motion fails. Representative Soliz, for another Motion."
- Soliz: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to move to concur on Amendment #1 and not concur in Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "We'll have to take separate votes on this. The first Motion is, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 312. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry. Wasn't the record or the Motion previously to concur in both and that failed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Correct, but he can make the same Motion as many times as he wishes."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

McCracken: "Okay."

- Speaker Breslin: "As long as it's not dilatory, okay, and it's a different Motion, so that... the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1. The only cost to the state is the cost that was mentioned in the original Bill and that is the pickup of interpreters for... in juvenile proceedings. That existed in the original Bill and I have no objection to the change contained and I would support the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 312. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Representative Soliz, for another Motion."
- Soliz: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to move to nonconcur on Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Amendment... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 312. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. 'Shall this House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 312? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 312. House Bill 314, Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Madam, would you describe for us what the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill does and what the Amendments do?"

Woicik: "Yes, what the... The Bill permits the local liquor control commissioner in any home rule municipality to levy fines for liquor license violations. What Amendment it removes restrictions to home rule municipalities does. and makes applicable to all municipalities. Amendment #2 exempts certain hotels, motels and restaurants from the prohibition against distillers and winemakers having an interest in retail establishments. Amendment #3 provides that alcoholic liquors may be provided in long term facilities owned or operated by a county to residents of facility who have had their consumption the alcoholic liquors approved in writing by a licensed physician. Ιt also requires approval by the operator and that such consumption of liquors not be conflict with the regulations of the Illinois Department of Public Health."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 314. On the question, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Lady yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Matijevich: "Representative Wojcik, this Amendment #3 would allow the nursing homes to permit alcoholic liquors owned or operated by a county. Now, does that mean, for example, if a... oh, a granny or a granddaddy about 85 years old presents one of these silver cards and it's between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., do they get two drinks for one during that happy hour or two or are they limited to one drink?" Wojcik: "Representative, the reason, as was explained to me, for this Amendment is because currently in nursing homes or for the county nursing homes, they cannot have like brunches or teas or anything, they can't serve alcoholic beverages.

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- So, the reason for this Amendment is to allow such a practice to go on. $\ensuremath{^{\text{m}}}$
- Matijevich: "You didn't answer me. I...don't they get... don't they get two drinks..."
- Wojcik: "You referring... Are you referring to happy hour?"
- Matijevich: "Yeah, don't they get two drinks for one during happy hour?"
- Wojcik: "I can't answer that."
- Matijevich: "We do that, you know, State House Inn, all these bars around here, they've got a happy hour. You mean that we are not going to have a happy hour in a nursing home where they get two drinks for one."
- Wojcik: "I'll buy that."
- Matijevich: "I mean, aren't you going to treat grandmothers and grandfathers the same as you treat anybody else? They ought to get two drinks for one. Now, one other question."
- Wojcik: "Why not, Representative?"
- Matijevich: "I noticed that they've got to have a approval before they can get a drink. In other words, this 95 year-old grandmother has got to come to the bar with a signed signature from her doctor. She can't get a drink otherwise, is that it?"
- Wojcik: "Representative, I think you are assuming that we are going to have a bar in these nursing homes. I'm under the understanding that this is just to provide alcoholic beverages and punches and wines and beer and what have you.

 I am not under the impression that they have bars in nursing homes. No retail sales."
- Matijevich: "Well, okay. You know, I have read... many times I have read where somebody gets to be a hundred years old and they say, 'What do you attribute your longevity to?' And very often that person has said, 'Well, I have had a nip every day." And believe me, I'm not going to stop anybody

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- from having that nip every day so they may live to a hundred years old and I support all three of your Amendments."
- Wojcik: "Thank you, Representative. I had a granddaddy that used to say a schnapps a day kept the doctor away."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris, on the question."
- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question."
- Speaker Breslin: "I think so."
- Harris: "Think so. The underlying Bill, I think, is certainly...
 we passed it out of here. I think it's probably a good
 Bill and what happened in the Senate... I just have..."
- Wojcik: "Representative, I can't hear you. Would you come..."
- Harris: "I just have a question on Senate Amendment #2 which
 deals, I gather with... with..."
- Wojcik: "I'm having a difficult time hearing him."
- Harris: "... the involvement of distillers with hotels, motels As I understand it in the ... in the and restaurants. alcoholic beverage industry, you have the distiller or winemaker. the distributor and the... the restauranteur. There have been historic reasons for those separate and now I under ... I see where this sort of breaks down those walls a little bit. Can you explain what Amendment #2 does?"
- Wojcik: "Yes, the explanation that I received was that there is a company coming in from Tokyo and that they were finding difficulties in having alcoholic beverages served. And so this has come from the Governor's Office requesting this Amendment."
- Harris: "I see. There's not... you don't know of any Senator who owns a restaurant and some distiller wants to buy into that restaurant?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Wojcik: "Not to my knowledge. This Amendment does come from the Governor's Office."

Harris: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 314?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 314. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 320, Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you... Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the
 House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to Senate
 Bill... to House Bill 320."
- Speaker Breslin: "Explain the Bill and the Amendment."
- Braun: "I'm about to. Essentially, the Amendment... you want the Bill as well... the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Bill... No, the Bill first, then the Amendment."
- Braun: "Alright. The Bill, itself, had to do with before and after school programs. It was some authorization in the School Code for such programs as a school district may decide to put in place. It was simply to clarify the authority of the State Board in that regard and passed the House with an overwhelming vote. The Amendment increases the amount of... the amount of noncompetitive bids for the Chicago Board of Education from \$5000 to \$25,000. I encourage your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 320. Is there any discussion?
 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 320? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93... 84 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 320, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 334, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 334, in its original form increased the number of enterprise zones from 8 to 12 during the next Calendar year... excuse me, fiscal year, and that Bill, the Governor signed in another form, in the Senate form yesterday and announced those 12 zones around the state. Senate Amendment #1 increases or... two more zones which would be used at the discretion of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for extreme economical circumstances. And I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 334."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate #1 to House Bill 334. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate... The Lady from Marshal, Representative Koehler." Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen I would just rise in support of this Motion." House. Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 334? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to Bill 334, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 335, Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing."

- Ewing: "Madam Speaker, I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 335. House Bill 335 provided for cities and villages to charge for accident reports because under the new Preedom of Information Act, there was some question whether they could do this. This just makes it clear they can. The Senate Amendment added the words... instead of 'law', they deleted the word 'law' and put 'other state law enforcement agencies or law'. I'd move for concurrence."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 335. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 335?* All those in favor all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. there 113 are voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 335, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. House Bill 337. Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I would move to concur with both Amendments I and 2 to House Bill 337. 337 is a Bill dealing with the Ag Areas Conservation and Protection Act. In the Senate they added an Amendment which exempted mineral extractions from the operation of the Act and the second Amendment in the Senate reduced the minimum acreage required to set up a conservation Act from 500 to 350. I would move to concur in both Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 337. Is there any
 discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall this

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House concur in... excuse me. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Klemm... McHenry, rather."

Klamm: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

- Klemm: "A question I have only on... and I just don't have the Amendment here. I think it's #1, exempts the persons or the parties from extraction of minerals. Would that be for land mining, for gravel and sand and that type of operation?"
- Ewing: "It would be my interpretation that it would. Now, what it does, it exempts the restrictions of the Ag Areas Protection Act from that operation. What you are saying is that is an accepted operation in an ag areas... under the ag areas law."
- Klemm: "Would this exempt then from any county ordinances concerning operations and creations of land mines, gravel mining, which obviously can take hundreds of acres as long as it's zoned agricultural? Is that..."
- Ewing: "No, it would not change. It would not override or circumvent any local rules in regard to the regulation of mining operations."
- Klamm: "Alright, so therefore then the Act that was adopted about two Sessions ago that I was Sponsor on of allowing local zoning requirements on mining gravel would still be applicable?"
- Ewing: "I would... I would... yes. In my opinion, yes."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Hawkinson: "Representative, this would remove strip mining, for example, from the restrictions in the Ag Areas Act?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Ewing: "That's my understanding."

Hawkinson: "As I understand it, the Parm Bureau supported the original Bill. Do you know what their position is on the Bill as amended?"

Ewing: "They accepted the Amendment."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 337?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 337, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 340, Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340. Senate Amendment #1 authorizes the sale on Sunday of self-contained motor homes, mini-motor homes, van campers and recreational trailers when offered for sale by a dealer at a place of business where only such vehicles are displayed or offered for sale."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 340. On that question, the Lady
from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Stern: "I cannot understand why it is alright to sell motor homes on Sunday when it's not alright to sell Chevys and Pontiacs."

Barnes: "Representative Stern, that is not the intent of my

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

legislation. The intent of my legislation is strictly focused on motor homes and the vehicles that I mentioned."

Stern: "You do see a clear difference, apparently."

Barnes: "I think anybody could, Representative."

Stern: "Very well. Thank you, Ma'am."

Barnes: "You are welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Bwing: "I just wondered if possibly you thought it would be practical to put this in Conference Committee and add the repealer for the Sunday blue law on autos?"

Barnes: "Representative Ewing, I'd yield to you at any time, but not on that subject."

Ewing: "You don't want to do that then?"

Barnes: "I don't want to do that."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 354, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Not read the Bill? Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 354. House Bill 354 is a Bill that passed this House on the Consent

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Calendar and simply all that it does is amends the definition of stun gun in the Criminal Code to reflect the new technologies with those devices. In the Senate, the Department of Law Enforcement had indicated that they felt that they had a better definition of the technology and the Senate amended the definition to provide for that. That's all that it does. There is no opposition and I would move to concur."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves to concur on Senate Amendment #1

to House Bill 357. On the question, Representative Tate.

354, sorry."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

"Terry, how are you changing the definition of stun Steczo: "Representative Tate, simply... let me... the current definition of stun qun does not reflect the new technology. the hand held device, so we are just simply saying that it's a device which is powered by electrical charging units such as batteries and which upon contact with a human or clothing worn by a human can send out a current to disrupt person. It's a... It's a definition that was given to us by the Department of Law Enforcement and change in the... in the current law aside from putting that language in the statute."

Tate: "So the... the Department of Law Enforcement suggested this language?"

Steczo: "That is correct."

Tate: "So, in essence, you... this Amendment would prohibit the use of the stun qun, is that correct?"

Steczo: "Representative Tate, no, that is not correct. Simply,
what House Bill 354 does, and it does no more than when it
passed this House on the Consent Calendar is simply amend
the current definition of stun guns to reflect the new

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

technology. So, any prohibited uses for the old stun guns would be prohibited for the new ones as well. That's simply all that the Bill does."

Tate: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "On the question, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "Just to make it clear, this Bill was amended in the House to delete the original Section which made the possession of these illegal per se. Does the Senate Amendment make them illegal per se?"

Steczo: "Representative McCracken, no, it does not. The Bill is in exactly the same form as it passed this House except for a change in the definition of stungunitself that was offered by the Department of Law Enforcement. They felt that they had a better definition than was in the original Bill as it passed."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "When the... When the Bill passed this House originally,

I think Representative McCracken is correct. It made them

illegal to possess and use except for law enforcement

people and so forth, right?"

Steczo: "Representative Johnson, no. House Amendment #1 deleted all of that... all of that..."

Johnson: "Oh, you're... you're saying as it emerged from the House rather than as it emerged from Committee or it was introduced?"

Steczo: "Right, as it was introduced, it was a prohibition.

Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, took all that
language out and simply changed the present law to reflect
the new technology and as a result of that, all opposition
was dropped and the Bill was placed on the Consent

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Calendar. And in its present form, there is no change in that."

Johnson: "You really... You really acknowledged by Amendment...

the House that these devices, and I think we had some discussion, had national use by, for example, some women's organizations who have supported their use as a means of deterrents of sex crimes and that sort of thing. So, you are really just changing the definition and you are keeping them available for use under appropriate circumstances?"

Steczo: "That is correct."

Johnson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the intent of the
Bill is clear. There is no opposition to it and I would
move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to... that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 354. This is action. All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and question, 2 voting 'present'. The House does concur to #1 to House Bill 354, and this Bill, having Amendment received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 374. Representative McGann Capparelli. Out of the record. Oπ tho Order of page 4 Concurrence, of the Calendar, appears House Bill 408, Representative Hicks, 408. Representative Hicks, House Bill 409."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If
we could correct the number, it's 408. I would move to
concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 408."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 408. On the question? Hearing none. does the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 409? The voting is open. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. 408, House Bill 408. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hicks. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 408, and Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 409, Virginia Fredericks."

Prederick: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur on Senate Amendment #1 of House The Bill provided that the State Board of Education distribute money appropriated by the state for the temporary relocation expense incurred by a school district as the result of fire, earthquake or tornado. Also, Bill provides for an annual five cent tax levy with a three year limitation in the school district to partially repay the funds received from the state. Senate Amendment extends the tax levy for as many years as is necessary to repay the state. I move concurrence with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves to concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 409. On that question, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Cullerton: "Representative, with respect to a referendum, doesn't
the Senate Amendment change the Bill so that instead of
having a tax increase with a backdoor referendum, you are

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- allowing for a tax increase without a referendum?"
- Frederick: "It is my understanding that Amendment included the backdoor referendum also."
- Cullerton: "Would you please take it out of the record and double check that?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

 Going back to page 3 of the Calendar appears House Bill

 204, Representative Cullerton. 204."
- Cullerton: "Oh, yes. Yes, I... Yes, I understand that the... 11, the Bill dealt with no interest rate, no First of interest being computed or charged on residential estate loams for a period after which the whole debt was paid off. And the... I amended the Bill in the House was pointed out to me that the Banking Act already has such a prohibition. The Senate, Senator Keats, was unaware of that and put an Amendment in dealing... trying to bring the banks into the law and after I... I just word that he now understands that there is no need for his Amendment so that he is going to recede from So, I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 for the purpose of allowing the Bill back to the Senate so that Senator Keats could recede."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 204. On that question,
 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I agree on that understanding that the Amendment will be dropped and the Bill will be returned to its original House form."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 204. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 204. On the Order of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Concurrence, on page 4 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 467, Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill House Bill 467, as it passed this House, was a Bill that provided prompt pay for local units of government and posed a two percent penalty per month effective July 1st of for Bills not paid within 60 days after their 186 submission. Amendment #1 in the Senate represents agreement by all parties that moves the language back to the form in which the original Bill was... as it introduced to require bills paid within 30 days after the And it also reduces the interest penalty date of approval. from one percent of the unpaid balance effective 1987. It was the feeling by all individuals that with a two year lead time, there would be no problem in terms adapting to the language of the Bill. Amendment #2 was offered by Senator Sangmeister. It provides that i n municipalities of 5,000 or over, currently the law says 25,000 or over, the electors of that ... of that... of those municipalities upon submission of a petition to respective boards could have a referendum to determine whether or not they would like to be... have their... trustees elected in districts rather than village their wide. I would move to concur in those two Amendments."

Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 467. On that question...

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', one voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 469... or 467. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 474, Representative Laurino. Out of the record. House Bill 481, Representative Nash. Representative Nash on House Bill 481."

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

 I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 481.

 House Amendment 1 reduces the number of signature requirements on nominating petitions for the office of ward committeeman from 10 percent to 5 percent of the primary electors of his or her party in the ward. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur to Senate
 Amendment #1 on House Bill 481. On the question,
 Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "We just ask it be taken out of the record for just a few minutes with the agreement that we can come back to the Bill with... as soon as we clear up a technical problem."
- Nash: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Johnson, you seeking recognition?

 On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 483,

 Representative Nash on 483."
- Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 483 adds declaration of intent language to the Article relating to municipal boards, boards of election commissioners, as well as county clerks. It makes no substantive change. It's a technical Amendment. I move for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 483. On that question... hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House 483. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page five of the Calendar on Concurrence, appears House Bill 489. Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson, on House Bill 489."

Johnson: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
489 which basically limits the number of offenses that
we're repealing by maintaining in the Criminal Code certain
Acts that we repealed, namely treason, criminal usury,
looting, and certain provisions on search and seizure. I
think the Bill as we originally introduced it made sense.
but if the Senate wants to do it, I'm not going to fool
around in here. So, I move to concur with Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate
Amendment 1 on House Bill 489. And on that question,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Johnson, the Bill that we passed out of the House was basically a cleanup Bill, correct?"

Johnson: "Right."

Cullerton: "And the Senate felt that they should restore certain crimes back into the Code that we felt should have been repealed, is that right?"

Johnson: "Yes, that's correct."

Cullerton: "Well, I'm just curious why... did anyone from the Senate explain to you why they..."

Johnson: "No, they really... they really didn't, and I would be real happy if we nonconcurred and we passed the original

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill. But at this stage of the Session, you know, what can you say?"

Cullerton: "You mean..."

- Johnson: "I have no idea. I don't think there's ever been a case in the history of the state ever prosecuted on any one of the four crimes that they want to retain. But as you know, Representative Cullerton, we've created... we create about 20 new crimes a Session and to repeal them is a major effort even if they never have been and never will be prosecuted and are probably unconstitutional in any event."
- Cullerton: "So, what you're saying is if we... if we nonconcur you're afraid that we'd never get around to passing the good part of the Bill..."
- Johnson: "Yeah, and I'm also afraid that we... they might use this as a vehicle to create a new crime like spitting on the cracks of the sidewalk."
- Cullerton: "Well..., I think we... I think that's already against the law."
- Johnson: "Well, I'm sure it is, but it's not a Class X Felony
 yet, and I'm sure there are people who'd like to do that."
 Cullerton: "Okay. I agree then."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur to Amendment #1 to House Bill 489. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 89 (sic - House Bill 489). And Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 510. Representative Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 513, Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 513."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask the House to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which exempted toll ways from the Bill on House Bill 513."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur to Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 513. And on that question,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative, this was a good Bill that we passed out of here dealing with signs on the interstate. Why does your Senator want to exempt the toll way?"

Hicks: "I don't believe it was my Senator's Amendment to the Bill, but it was my understanding that the toll ways — some of them are already done this way and that it was not needed on the toll ways. That's why I was willing to accept that."

Cullerton: "Well, I think that to... under the Bill, didn't we give DOT the power to, you know, have rules and regs with regard to these signs?"

Hicks: "Yes, we do."

Cullerton: "Okay."

Hicks: "John, I... if you know of another reason why, I would be happy to hear it. I don't know of any, if there is."

Cullerton: "I think... I think it's because DOT and the toll way don't want to..."

Hicks: "They don't want to get into that toll way authority. Is that what it is?"

Cullerton: "Right."

Hicks: "Oh, I see. Well, I would be happy to next year come back..."

Cullerton: "I think we should concur and pass... It's a good Bill. And then come back next year and make it apply to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the toll ways."

Hicks: "I... I have no problem with sponsoring that next year if you want me to do so."

Speaker Giglio: "On that question, Representative Hallock."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Hallock: "Since the toll ways are exclusively in northern Illinois, and that's an unfortunate fact but that's the way it is, what is your interest in excluding the toll way from this Bill?"

Hicks: "Representative, it was not my interest to exclude the toll ways from the Bill. If we want to give them the authority, I think it would be a good idea. And I would be happy to work with you to... to see to it we give that authority to them. It's not my interest to exclude it. It was at the interest of some of the people in the Senate. I would be happy to put it back in, but I'd like to do that next year after we see how it works this year on this one."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 513. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 513. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a distinguished former Member of the Illinois House right here to my right in front, former Representative and now the sheriff of the greatest county of the State of Illinois, Representative Dick Elrod. Representative Pullen."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Pullen: "We also have a former distinguished Member of the House,
 the Senate Minority Leader, Pate Phillip, down front."
- Speaker Giglio: "Go, Pate Phillip. Let's give our Senate Minority Leader a great hand. Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know that Sheriff
 Elrod was sheriff of Sangamon County. That must have
 happened over night. Best county in the state, right?"
- Speaker Giglio: "That's the best county in the state other than Cook. Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Right down to the left is Dave Phelps from southern Illinois.

 Dave, raise your hand. Dave Phelps. Dave, there you go.

 Dave Phelps."
- Speaker Giglio: "On the Order of Concurrence on page 5 of the Calendar, appears, House Bill 514, Representative Hicks.

 House Bill 514."
- Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
 would ask the House to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1.

 There are technical flaws in Senate Amendment #1. And I
 would ask to nonconcur with it so we can correct those and
 ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to House Bill 514. Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye'... 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 514. On the Calendar, appears House Bill 521, Representative McCracken.

 Representative McCracken on House Bill 521."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 521. Senate Amendment #1 more correctly, I think, states the scope of immunity which will be granted for antitrust violations only alleged to have been committed by

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

units of local government. Currently, the state is immunized, as a matter of law, from any trust liability. The Supreme Court has recently held that authorized acts of municipalities are state action and hence immunized There is a prior decision, however, Boulder versus Colorado is till good law to the extent it is not overruled by the recent 'Halley' case to which I referred. The Amendment merely makes clear that we do not immunize acts committed by local units of government in excess of their substantive authority. The immunization is limited to acts within their authority, and immunizes those. I move the... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur to Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 521. On that question,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Okay, now the Bill that you drafted and passed out of the House was in response to the Boulder case right? Was in response to the Boulder case."

McCracken: "Right."

Cullerton: "And it basically dealt with the issue of cable TV and..."

McCracken: "Right."

Cullerton: "And it strengthened the city's power to regulate cable television. Now, this Senate Amendment offered by the first declared candidate for Attorney General appears to modify it in some fashion, and I'm just wondering, in your concurrence, could you give me the background behind..."

McCracken: "Yes, be happy to."

Cullerton: "Was there a court decision that occurred after we passed this Bill just recently."

64th Legislative Day

June 29, 1985

McCracken: "No. No. No."

Cullerton: "Did we make a mistake when we first drafted it?"

- McCracken: "No. No. No. This is a controversy which arose over the meaning of ultravires that was in the first Bill. The question is, was ultravires meant to be a procedural irregularity which should be immunized, or was it a substantive excessive authority? I... It was my personal opinion that ultravires referred only to procedural irregularities such as an act taken which is authorized. by law but was taken... undertaken irregularly. The Amendment seeks to make it clear that we're only trying to immunize those within the substantive grant of authority."
- Cullerton: "Alright, so it sounds like that Senator Barkhausen has a very good Amendment. It clarifies the purpose of the Bill, and it appears that he is a pretty bright lawyer."
- McCracken: "It wasn't his idea. Alright. No, I'm... I'm being facetious. It was... It was the product of more than one mind."
- Cullerton: "I hope all not within Senator Barkhausen's head. I agree with this Motion to concur, Mr. Speaker. I think it's... it's a product of some fine minds."

McCracken: "Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton, any more? No questions. Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Just for purposes of intent. When you are referring to exceeding the powers, the intent of this legislation is to liberally construe the powers inherent in both a home rule and a non-home rule municipality in this... in Illinois."
- McCracken: "That's right. In the... in the first part of the Bill, we distinguish between home rule grants of authority and non-home rule grants of authority. Essentially, we adopt the 'Dillion' Rule for the non-home rule units. We

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

adopt the constitutional grant of authority for the home rule units. And then when we talk about this Amendment, we also distinguish between those two and make it clear that in either case only where the substantive grant of authority is exceeded does an antitrust action or cause of action lie."

- O'Connell: "And for non-home rule municipalities it includes
 those powers by implication as opposed to specification."
 McCracken: "That's correct. Under the 'Dillion' Rule, it's both
 expressed powers and those necessarily implied."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, and I would acknowledge the Speaker that
 he recalls the 'Dillion' Rule very well since he tried to
 eliminate the 'Dillion' Rule a couple of years ago."

McCracken: "And was unsuccessful."

- Speaker Giglio: "Your remarks are well taken, Representative O'Connell. On the question, the Gentleman moves to... that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill On that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have a11 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4... 521. this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence. 574. appears House Bill Representative Huff, do you... seeking recognition? Representative Huff."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to inform whoever ordered a milk in a styrene cup, it's on my desk.

 Obviously it was put here by mistake by one of the Pages."

 Speaker Giglio: "Thank you, Representative Huff. Representative Preston, on House Bill 574."

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 574 has been the often - and some may say too often - debated public financing of gubernatorial There were Amendments added in the Senate elections Bill. to this Bill. In its original form, the Bill provided checkoff for people to donate a dollar ... a checkoff on their income tax returns for a public financing for Gubernatorial Elections Fund that would provide matching funds for candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor. This Bill had previously gone to the Governor's desk, and he had vetoed the Bill, indicating some complaints. Those complaints were adopted in Senate Amendments to this Bill. And what the Amendments do is to make the effective date of this Bill 1990 so that it does not affect the qubernatorial election, number one, and number two, it creates this Gubernatorial Election Fund so that any monies that fund qubernatorial elections must come under this... must come out of this Fund. And the General Revenue Fund would be in no way affected. So, there would be opportunity, no possibility where General Revenue dollars could be used to finance gubernatorial elections. that's what the Amendment does, and I'd ask for your 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 574. And on that question, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
 Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."
- Churchill: "Representative Preston, this is still the Gubernatorial Election Fund Bill that we've been considering for the past couple of years."
- Preston: "That's right. And this is without that Amendment that
 you wanted to include a Mayoral Election Fund on this..
 This is just for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Illinois."

Churchill: "It's too bad that we couldn't have been debating this
Bill yesterday when Harold Washington was here. He might
have had some influence over my former Amendment on it.
This Bill still does have limitations in it as to the
amount of funds that can be raised and donated to
contribution campaigns?"

Preston: "That's correct. It has limitations on the amount of money that an individual can donate to a gubernatorial campaign, the total amount of expenditures that that gubernatorial campaign can make, and of course, it is voluntary with the candidate because it only applies if that candidate opts to accept matching funds from the State of Illinois."

Churchill: "And this Bill still has a tax checkoff in it."

Preston: "That is correct."

Churchill: "And that's a dollar from a person's tax refund or a dollar added onto a person's tax liability should they so chose to use this."

Preston: "Well, I'm not... I don't believe that's accurate,
Representative. If you can hold on for just one second.
Representative, it is a... it's a checkoff on the tax
liability, not the refund, but the tax liability. One
dollar of your tax goes to the Gubernatorial Campaign Fund,
the same way that the presidential campaign fund works at
the federal level."

Churchill: "Alright. So, then if the... if all of the citizens who file tax returns elected to check the tax checkoff box, then there would be a dollar per individual on those returns that would not come into the General Revenue Fund, but would instead go into this separate Election Fund."

Preston: "That is correct."

Churchill: "Okay, and how many tax returns are filed in the State

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

of Illinois each year?"

Preston: "Over ten."

Churchill: "Would it be over a hundred?"

Preston: "I believe it would be, yes. I don't have an answer for that. I don't have an accurate answer for that but..."

Churchill: "But potentially... potentially we could be talking millions of dollars come in for GRF and going into the special Election Fund."

Preston: "That's right. That's right."

Churchill: "Okay. And you have now, if I heard you correctly, removed that terribly onerous provision of the Bill that required that if the funds were not available in the Election Fund that you could go into the General Revenue funds to take dollars out of that."

Preston: "That's correct. That's been deleted in this
Amendment."

Churchill: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'm happy to see that that one last provision has been taken out of the Bill. It's something I've been arguing about for the last three or four years on it. It makes the Bill a little bit better, but it's still a bad Bill. And I rise to... to oppose this Bill, and I hope that all of the Members consider the effect of this and consider the loss to the state to provide tax dollars to go into a campaign fund for gubernatorial candidates."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Churchill, are you finished?

Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It would not be a June when Representative Preston and I wouldn't have an opportunity to visit about this issue. So, I will not reiterate what has been discussed ad nauseum for a number of years. I see no merit in the Amendments to the actual import of the Bill as... as come

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

to us on a number of occasions. Representative Churchill has said it well. We would encourage everyone to take a very hard look at what we are suggesting here. At a time with just a few days to the end of this Session when we have not resolved the issue of education funding, when we're considering a number of alternatives to a number of proposals, I think this is not the message that we should be sending to the electors of the State of Illinois. That we're going to use yet another ploy to divert monies that might be used better into a program to fund candidates' races. I would move defeat of this Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "On that question, Representative Countryman." Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Countryman: "Representative Preston, you indicated this is like the federal law, is that correct?"

Preston: "It's similar, yes."

Countryman: "Will decisions have to be made upon what our proper expenditure is under this law?"

Preston: "Well, decisions are already made in Illinois law without this on what are proper campaign expenditures in terms of whether or not somebody is diverting campaign funds for their own personal use, which would give them an income tax liability, of course."

Countryman: "Who rendered those decisions?"

Preston: "Oh, we've heard that and... there have been allegations about wrong use of... wrongful use of campaign funds probably in every presidential campaign that I can recall at one point or another."

Countryman: "Are you aware of the Pederal Election Commission?"

Preston: "I am, yes."

Countryman: "You're aware that they render decisions almost weekly on the proper expenditures under the Pederal Act."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Preston: "Well, I didn't know that they rendered weekly decisions, but I know they render decisions."

countryman: "Well, I mean they render an awful lot of them, don't
they?"

Preston: "I'm sorry, I can't see you. Could you stand up, please? Oh, alright."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "That was a low blow. Would it be... under this Bill, would the State Board of Elections be the body who would interpret whether or not the expenditures were properly made like the Federal Election Commission does?"

Preston: "Representative, on page 14 of the Bill at paragraph one it says, 'The board determines that any amount of any public matching funds received by the eligible candidates under Section 13 was used for any purpose other than', and it lists the... the board will... I guess the answer is the board will make the determination that the public matching funds have to be used for the categories of use indicated; otherwise, they will make a determination that there's an improper use of those funds."

Countryman: "And then they can order the funds to be repaid, if they were spent improperly, is that right?"

Preston: "That is presumably correct."

Countryman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

countryman: "I think that there's been a lot to improve this Bill in these Amendments, but I think that to go out to 1990 obviously to get by a couple of elections that are forthcoming and to bring in the Federal Act where the Federal Election Commission has just really gotten themselves bogged down into the nuiances of how money is spent, and I think we've all seen that, is probably not a good move. And with all due respect to the Sponsor, who

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

doesn't feel I'm standing up, I think this Bill in its present form is not sufficient enough. Let's defeat it, and let's come back again next year, and I will work with the Sponsor to improve the Bill. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston, to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before my closing remarks Bill, I just want to make it very clear that I certainly meant no disrespect to Representative Countryman, who's one of the most distinguished Members of this but to the Bill. This Bill is in no way intended to cast any aspersions or doubts on the integrity of any Member Illinois Government and certainly not on the Governor of this state, who has acted with great integrity in service to the State of Illinois. But the public has a perception in its mind that large contributions bring you large influence, perhaps greater influence than citizens, on decision making process in the highest halls of government in the State of Illinois. And I don't mean to imply through this Bill nor do any of the proponents imply that that is per se the case. But there is the perception of undue influence that large contributions might bring you undue influence. And it's that perception in the mind of the public that this Bill is aimed to rid its... to get rid This Bill simply says that if a candidate for highest office in Illinois is going to benefit by accepting public matching funds, at the same time that person has to agree to have limits on individual, and corporate, and union contributions, and limits on expenditures to give the public the perception that we've cleaned up the electoral act in this state. And that's important also for another The cost of election campaigns has grown to outrageous proportions. It has almost gone to where the cost of running for Governor of Illinois has doubled from

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the previous time candidates have run for that same office. And the rate of increase is increasing as well. So, that the next time there's an election for Governor of Illinois, the cost may be not 8 million dollars but 12 million dollars, and on and on and on to where the cost is so outrageous that only the wealthy and those backed by the wealthy can seek the Office of Governor. This Bill will reduce the need for an individual candidate to go and seek outrageous sums of money and, yet, still be able to put on a decent, active, viable campaign. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 574. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Olson, are you seeking recognition? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 574. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 578, Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 598, Representative Saltsman. House Bill
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 598."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur to Senate
 Amendment #1 to 598. On that question, Representative
 Ropp. Representative Ropp."
- Bopp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Saltsman, could you just explain what that Amendment does?"
- Saltsman: "Yes. What that Amendment does, it gives the private

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

universities a chance to negotiate with their local law enforcement and municipal enforcement agencies for jurisdictional rights on what areas they can patrol, and it's not just limited directly to the campus."

Ropp: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the House concurring to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 598 will vote 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all feter. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, who wish? there are 100 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to 598. House Bill And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On concurrence, appears House Bill 605. Representative Ropp on 605. Representative Ropp."

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

Bill 605 initially dealt with requiring the State Board of

Education to inform all school boards and superintendents

about the possibility of setting up and creating..."

Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Ropp. Representative Cullerton, for what purpose do you rise?"

Cullerton: "Yes, we have just reached an agreement with regards
to this Bill that you would... were going to nonconcur with
Senate Amendment #2. Representative Parcells and I just
spoke and Representative Sutker. Representative Parcells,
is that correct?"

Ropp: "Are they the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Cullerton: "No, you are. So everybody is going to vote against your Motion to concur."

Ropp: "And I haven't made an agreement with you already?"

Cullerton: "Everyone will vote against your Motion to concurumless you move to nonconcur."

64th Legislative Day June 28, 1985

Ropp: "Not everyone, because I'll probably vote with me."

Cullerton: "Okay. Maybe you can break Zeke's record on the off-track betting Bill."

Ropp: "Really. That's a possibility."

Cullerton: "Representative..."

Ropp: "Okay. With... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Ropp: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which I did not get a chance to even explain. But... which provides for procedures for implementing the House Bill 605 which we passed out of here, and we want to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate
Amendment #1. On that question... Representative Sutker,
are you seeking recognition?"

Sutker: "I have no objection to Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, we have no objection to concurring with Senate
Amendment #1, but Representative Parcells better make sure
that... that Representative... Senator Keats doesn't recede
from Senate Amendment #2, or she won't have a Conference
Committee to do what she wants to do."

Ropp: "I don't know what she wants to do."

Cullerton: "Well, you should talk. You should communicate.
You're in the same Party. She is right there. She is a
nice lady."

Ropp: "Well, I know she is and an outstanding tennis player too, but..."

Cullerton: "We'll... I'll... I'll go along with your concurrence."

Bopp: "I thought this is what you told me our agreement was."

Cullerton: "Yes, and we just a few minutes ago changed it."

Ropp: "Well, I thought you..."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Cullerton: "Things happen quickly down here this time of year."

Ropp: "I thought you... thought you were going to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2."

Cullerton: "Bight. But it's going to go to a Conference
Committee anyway. So, it doesn't make any difference
whether we concur with 1 or not."

Ropp: "Well, now I've seen you do the same thing for six years.

Concur with one Amendment and nonconcur with another one."

Cullerton: "That's right, because there's a possibility that they might recede from Senate Amendment #2. But if they do that, Representative Parcells is going to be very upset."

Ropp: "Well, I thought a one time, long time Speaker said that we don't deal with the devil until you actually face him. So, we... do you want me to... to nonconcur with the whole thing?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Ropp: "Even with the good Amendment #1?"

Cullerton: "Yes, it will come back on in the Conference
Committee."

Ropp: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I guess we don't want to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Speaker moves to nonconcur..."

Ropp: "Non... nonconcur."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraws his Motion to now nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 605."

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "All in those favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. The Motion was to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 605. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 621, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino, on House Bill 621."

64th Legislative Day

June 29, 1985

Hautino: "Thank you... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move Senate Amendments on House Bill 621, all to concur with Senate Amendments. 621, in its original form set up Illinois Loan Brokers Act, brought to our attention because some misadventures of some loan brokers as it pertains to agricultural loans in southern Illinois. This sets the licensure provisions. The Amendment that was placed on the Senate did a few technical changes. It provided some elimination for those individuals who are currently the licensure provisions of other statutes in the under This sets out specifically that the activities or expressly approved by the regulatory... officer is in control under regulation and licensure of this provision. Senate Amendment #2 excluded from the definition of loans, loans made for real property used residential commercial and industrial development, and it in no way, shape or form, as it pertains to commercial involves anything but farmland. Amendment #3 excludes real estate agents and brokers because they are covered under other areas of licensure. And I move for concurrence on the Senate Amendments to House Bill 621."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur to Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 621. all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', that question those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 'yes', none voting 'no', are 114 voting none voting 'present'. The House does concur to Senate Amendments #1. 2, and 3 to House Bill 621. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn on House Bill

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

627. "

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6... or House Bill 627. The Amendment provides that... adds the language without the knowledge and consent the minor's custodial parent or quardian. And the Bill the main is legislation to provide for criminal penalties for those who illegally harbor runaways. And the Senate Amendment is a clarification Amendment. I would ask for concurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 627. And on that hearing none, all those in favor signify by question. voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the... On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does to Senate Amendment #1. Representative Mautino votes 'aye'. The House does concur to Senate Amendment to House Bill 627. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order o f Concurrence, appears House Bill 650. Representative Tate. Representative Tate, on House Bill 650."

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

House Bill 650 creates the Illinois Real Estate Time Share

Act which requires a public offering... statement to

provide at each... I move to concur with Senate Amendment

#1 which is exactly like House Amendment #1 to the Senate

version of House Bill 650, which this chamber adapted on a

unanimous vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 650. And on that question, hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? take the record. On this question, there are 112 Clerk. voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 650. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cullerton. on page 7 House Bill 694. It was taken out of the record. Now are you ready for it? 694."

- Cullerton: "I thought that I already... I didn't? Okay. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 and concur in Senate Amendment #1 on..."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 694, and on that question,
 Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Let me once again explain what the Bill does. This deals with the state's attorneys appellate... it deals with the State's Attorney of Cook County, providing for them to be reimbursed, as all other counties, for their appellate section. Pursuant to a commitment that I made to Representative Hawkinson I... the Senate amended the Bill so as to limit that reimbursement to two-thirds of the cost, just as it is for all other counties. So, with respect to Senate Amendment #1, it's a fulfillment of a commitment to Representative Hawkinson and others. And that's why I wish to concur with it."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to

 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 694, and on that
 question, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman indicates he will."

- 64th Legislative Day June 29, 1995
- Pullen: "What is it you don't like about Senate Amendment 2?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I haven't gotten to that one yet."
- Pullen: "But I thought you had a double Motion there. You said that you..."
- Cullerton: "Well, but right now we're just on the first Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Pullen: "Okay. You're taking them one at a time. Okay, I'll wait. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ropp. Representative Ropp.

 Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question of the Sponsor?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He will... He will yield."
- Ropp: "Are you about to tell us that there are two Senate
 Amendments here..."
- Cullerton: "Right."
- Ropp: "And you want to concur with one and not the other?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, and I'll tell you why."
- Ropp: "Why don't you just... just put them both and just nonconcur with the whole Bill and send it all back."
- Cullerton: "I'll explain that to you. Do you... I want everybody to pay very close attention."
- Ropp: "Well, what's good for the gander is also being ready to be goosed."
- Cullerton: "Well, I think this will be very helpful. This will be very informative. This will be very informative for... especially for the freshmen that don't... like yourself, that don't seem to understand the process that well."
- Ropp: "Is the word 'knowingly' in this Bill?"
- Cullerton: "No. Representative Ropp, on your Bill there was a desire on a Member on your side of the aisle to have the Bill go to a Conference Committee. Okay? So, accepting one of the Amendments and not accepting the other was a

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

meaningless exercise. because it was going to go to a Conference Committee. With this Bill. 46 understanding with Senator Barkhausen and the Sponsor in the Senate to recede from Senate Amendment #2. So. were not to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and have me break my pledge that I made to Representative Hawkinson. the Bill would go to the Governor without having the limit of the two-thirds reimbursement to the County of Cook. So, we must keep Senate Amendment #1 on to fulfill commitment. However, Senate Amendment #2 is... there's an agreement in the Senate that they will attempt to recede from that Amendment: and, as a result, it will not go to Conference Committee. That's the difference between your Bill and my Bill."

Ropp: "Well, that may sound good, but I don't think it's..."
Cullerton: "Am I going to fast? Am I going to fast for you?"

Ropp: "Yes, you went a little bit fast because I wanted to keep the same Amendment on, the first Amendment, and the second one might have still gone in the Conference Committee anyway."

Cullerton: "In your case, if the second Amendment was receded from, it would've been fine with me, it would've been fine with Representative Sutker, but Representative Parcells would've been very upset. That's what I told you about. So, in an effort to protect the rights of the Minority Party I..."

Ropp: "Is she a double minority?"

Cullerton: "She is a double minority. That's right."

Ropp: "Double minority, and being short too that would probably
make her a triple minority."

Cullerton: "Like us."

Ropp: "You and me. Right-o."

Cullerton: "So, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 694, and on that question, Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Klemm: "Just out of curiousity, Representative Cullerton, you've got this limiting to... Amendment #1 to counties of three million or more to pay two-thirds of the cost of appeals for the state's attorneys. Is this common practice for other counties? And why was there a difference between..."

Cullerton: "Yes, you may recall, the reason for the Bill is that 101 counties get reimbursed for their appellate section. Two-thirds of the cost is reimbursed by the state. Cook County does not have such a reimbursement. The Bill as originally drafted provided for reimbursement, but contained no language limiting it to two-thirds. I agreed, during the debate with Representative Hawkinson, when it was on Third Reading, to add this limitation in the Senate, and that's why I'm trying to concur with that limitation."

Klemm: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Cullerton, I'm trying to make certain that I understand what we're doing here. Under current law the... all counties other than the County of Cook are eligible to... have their appeals handled on behalf of the state by the Appellate Service Commission. They can chose to enter one of the commissions and if they do so, then they... those counties pay one-third and the state pays two-thirds of the cost of running that State's Attorneys Appellate Service Commission, correct?"

Cullerton: "That's right."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Homer: "Alright, and then the Commission handles all appeals on behalf of the state in criminal cases. When that was set up as I understand it, Cook County has its own in-house appellate division in the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. They, in fact... this division handles all the appeals of cases from Cook County, is that right?"

Cullerton: "That's right."

Homer: "Alright. Now what you're... what you've tried to do with the Bill is say that it's not fair that... that the state does not pay or subsidize the appeals in Cook County like it's doing or making available to all the other counties.

So far, so good?"

Cullerton: "Right."

Homer: "Alright. So, how are..."

Cullerton: "Is this..."

Homer: "What? You have a question for the questioner?"

Cullerton: "I want to know who the questioner really is."

Homer: "Who's... who's the real questioner is the question. No, actually I'm the questioner, but what..."

Cullerton: "You're the spokesman."

Homer: "No. No. No. No. No. No. But in the case of the Commission, it's relatively simple to determine... Appellate Service Commissions what the expense is because they have their own separate offices usually right there with the Appellate Court. So, we can determine what two-thirds, one-third is. How are we going to determine for purposes of Cook County where it's an integral part of the office how much of the expense of that office is attributable to the appellate division?"

Cullerton: "And I have a very good answer for you. If you look on the Calendar, House Bill 693 is an appropriation for this amount. The way we determine it is we, down here in Springfield, determine how much money we're going to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

appropriate."

to kill the Bill."

Homer: "How do we determine that? How is it determined?"

Cullerton: "By the appropriation process. We have determined ... have determined... I'm not sure what this Amendment 693 is. My recommendation will be three million dollars because that's two-thirds of their cost last year, but maybe it's one million dollars, maybe it's two million I don't know. What this Bill says... what this dollars. Senate Amendment says is that we are capping it at two-thirds of the total cost. So that they spend four million... four and a half million dollars in Cook County for their State's Attorneys Office, we can, by law, not appropriate more than three million. And I would remind you, Representative Homer, that we already passed this Bill. If we nonconcur with these Amendments, back to the Senate where they can recede from them, and it will go right to the Governor's desk. So, this is too late

Homer: "No, I... and I'm not trying to kill the Bill. I'm just trying to understand the Bill. It seems to me it might be more difficult to determine what are the real actual costs of handling appeals in Cook County, because it's a integral part of... of the office. I mean do we pay... are we going to appropriate to pay for equivalent rent on the... on the office space as well as the staff attorneys and the equipment?"

Cullerton: "No. that's all determined by the appropriation process down here. What I would suggest to you there are line items for each individual salary and employee of the Appellate Section of the Cook Attorney Office. It is... and that's why I'm Amendment #2 which opposed t.o would eliminate There's a line item for each employee, and that's why it's

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

easily ascertainable how much money is spent. Last year it was approximately... I don't know the exact figure, but there is an exact figure of approximately four and a half million dollars. This Amendment would cap that at two-thirds of whatever that cost is."

- Homer: "Well, finally then, as I read the Amendment analysis here, the reimbursement to Cook County will come out of the budget of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, and that really has me baffled. What... why is the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, DCCA, funding criminal appeals?"
- Tullerton: "There was... the Bill originally had the money appropriated to the State's Attorney Appellate Service Commission. They asked that it not go to them. Then we sent it over to the Comptroller, or the Comptroller, whichever way you pronounce it. They asked... it was indicated to me by Representative Leverenz that it was preferrable to have it in DCCA because they have line item appropriations. And I acceded to that request."
- Homer: "DCCA is in the business of doing criminal appeals now?"

 Cullerton: "No, they're in the business of appropriating money

 out to these individual counties, and that was the more

 appropriate place to have it. Representative Leverenz may

 be able to fill you in more."
- Homer: "Alright well, Representative Leverenz is raising his hand. If I may, Mr. Speaker..."
- Cullerton: "It has nothing to do with this Amendment."
- Homer: "Alright. If I may yield to Representative Leverenz perhaps he could clarify that."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer."
- Homer: "May I yield to Representative Leverenz for the purpose of clarification as to why we're talking about having DCCA,

 Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, fund the Cook

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

County State's Attorneys Appellate Service, okay?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "They do other reimbursements to counties for other purposes. This is simply a pass through as if we could've appropriated it to the Comptroller, but there was a desire to the Comptroller's Bill clean of Amendments. And that right now there are other reimbursements to counties that go through DCCA. So, this now for the first time will treat the repayment of costs incurred through appellate defender services for Cook County as we do for the balance of the state. The other 101 counties go through the Appellate Service Commission."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Representative Leverenz. But it just seems to me an illogical place to put that appropriation. I don't understand why it's not in the Appellate Service Commission budget. And I think this Amendment really needs some additional work on it. I realize what Representative Cullerton is saying is if we nonconcur it goes back, and they recede then we're stuck with the original Bill where the state pays 100 percent. But that's no reason for us to sit here today and to approve an Amendment that... that has problems with it and is illogical. So, I'm going to stand in opposition to the Motion for concurrence on Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz are you seeking recognition?"

Leverenz: "Just to add to Representative Homer for explanation.

We now fund the salaries for state's attorneys and
assistant state's attorneys through DCCA's budget. It is
nothing new."

Speaker Giglio: "On this question, Representative Hawkinson."
Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, do you oppose Amendment #2?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I do."

Hawkinson: "Thank you. To the Motion. I still stand in opposition to the Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 694. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 59 voting 'yes', and 56 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1.

I'm going to ask the Senator to recede from it, and Cook

County will get more money."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman now moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to... 1 and 2 to House... nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 694. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed Hr. Clerk. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. *The House nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1 question is, and 2 to House Bill 694?! Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', and 41 voting 'no', voting 'present'. And the House does not concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 694. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 703. Representative Breslin. Out of the record. On the Calendar, appears House Bill 714, Representative Wojcik. Do you wish to have 714?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which simply exempts Cook County from the provisions of this Bill. Home rule."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 714, and on that question, Representative Dunn, from Macon."

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

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "Do I read the Senate Amendment correctly that any kind of door-to-door salesmen would have to register in each township to..."

Wojcik: "That's not the Senate Amendment."

Dunn: "Alright. What's the Senate Amendment do?"

Wojcik: "Let me find it."

Dunn: "Is that in the Bill to begin with? I quess it is."

Wojcik: "It authorizes... Okay. What the Bill does it authorizes township officials to adopt ordinances regulating various types of solicitation."

Dunn: "Yes, I'm looking at Senate Amendment #1. It says..."

Wojcik: "It exempts Cook County, because Cook County is a home rule county."

Dunn: "But in every county with a population less than three million, any door-to-door salesperson or itinerant merchant must register in each township. Isn't that what it says?"

Wojcik: "I... to tell you the truth, all I see is limits the provisions of the Bill to counties under three million. I don't have the Senate Amendment in front of me. So, if you want to take it out of the record, we can discuss it. And then we can talk intelligently."

Dunn: "Well, maybe you can. I doubt if I can."

Wojcik: "I'll try."

Speaker Giglio: "Do you want to take it out of the record?"

Wojcik: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Dunn: "I don't care."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. Take the Bill out of the record.

Alright, we'll go back to House Bill 704. Representative

Mautino. I inadvertently passed over that."

Mautino: "It's on nonconcurrence. I move to... I didn't know I had to. I thought it was just the Motion that I could adopt. I move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendments... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 704. Controversy has arrived on that subject matter. We have an agreement to sit down and work on some Amendments between Representative Johnson, Cullerton, Dunn, Greiman, etcetera. And we're trying to resolve that. And I ask nonconcurrence on Senate Amendment #1 and a Conference Committee be established."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 704. And on that question all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 704. On page 8 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 743, Representative Leverenz, 743. Representative Leverenz, on House Bill 743. Are you ready?"

Leverenz: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we would move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 743."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton"

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "My analysis indicates that this is a Bill... this

Amendment is a Bill supported by the Department of Law

Enforcement, and it provides that the Department of Law

Enforcement can furnish upon request all records of

convictions to units of local government, and school

districts, and local liquor commissioners. And one of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the... one of the changes that the Senate made was to allow for records of what's called 710 probation, which is a first time offender for possession of a small amount of marijuana. And so I just... my question was, why should we allow the Department of Law Enforcement to send out to various units of local government a record of a... of a 710 probation, which if successfully completed is a not guilty for possession of a small amount of marijuana?"

Levernz: "Which is that in, 1 or 2?"

Cullerton: "That's in #1."

Leverenz: "Speaker, would you take this out for just a moment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Take it out of the record?"

Leverenz: "Please."

Speaker Giglio: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On the Order of Concurrence on page 8 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 777, Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich, on House Bill 777."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, House Bill 777 created the Probation and Community Justice Act, which was supported very overwhelmingly in the Senate Amendment #1 to that Bill makes some House. technical corrections and also delays funding for implementation of the operation of individualized programs by one year from the original Bill. with agreement with the courts, and the Governor's Office. and the proponents of the Bill. Also Senate Amendment #1 changes the statement of purpose of the individualized service and programs, makes a declaration of legislative policy to encourage sentencing alternatives to prison. And among the stated purposes are to provide for increased recoveries, and to increase sentencing alternatives to reserve prison space for serious violent offenders. I move the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 777."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 777, and on that
question, Representative Johnson. I'm sorry, Hawkinson."
Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a

question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, do the provisions in the Senate

Amendment change any of the substantive provisions in the

Bill regarding the individualized services program?"

Matijevich: "No, and I know your concern regarding the community corrections. It was because of other concerns like yours that that is not included in the Bill at all."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 777. And on question all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to 777. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence on page 8 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 805, Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes, on House Bill 805.

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2. Senate Amendment #1 further defines the Comptroller's responsibility with regard to the withholding of all warrants or payments, not just tax refunds for the satisfaction of past due child support owed to the Department of Public Aid. Codifies the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Comptroller's current practice. Senate Amendment #2 classifies Sections of the Bill which explains the priority of DPA's past due child support claim against payments being made bу the Comptroller. Changes the 'deduction' to 'garnishment' in order to clarify that DPA's claim would not have priority over deductions, that is federal tax, state tax, etcetera, from gross income. And I think the Members will recall we're trying to conform with federal guidelines."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 805. And on that question, hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This... and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 905. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, passed. On the Order of Concurrence, hereby declared appears House Bill 807. Representative Representative Levin, on House Bill 807."

Levin: "Yes, I would move to nonconcur in House... in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 807. Staff has discovered some technical problems with the Bill, and there is agreement on the part of both the Department of Law Enforcement, the State's Attorney's Office of Cook County, and the women's groups that were involved in the initial negotiations on this Amendment to take it to a Conference Committee simply to clean up the three or four technical concerns that staff has raised. So, at this point I would move to nonconcur for that purpose."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that we non... that the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 807, and on that question, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, could you just briefly acquaint me with what some of these technical problems are?"

Levin: "Yes, the..., we create... the Amendment creates in Section 1016 the offense of aiding and abetting child abduction, and the penalties are a Class A misdemeanor, which is less than the Class 4 Felony for aiding and abetting. There is also another problem with the aiding and abetting provision which the suggestion is to just remove that new Section from... from the statute... from the Amendment. That's the major change and there are a couple of minor ones as well, but that's the major change."

Vinson: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yes, just move..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do nonconcur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 807. And on that question all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur to Senate #1 on House Bill 807. On the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 831. Representative Leverenz. 831. Representative Leverenz. Out of the record. Rep... I a sorry, Representative Leverenz, on House Bill 831."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 on House Bill 831."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to

Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 831.

Representative Leverenz."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Leverenz: "I would move we would not concur with Senate Amendment

 1 and to concur with Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 831. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 831. Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 831, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 which
 is changing a technical... making a technical correction in
 the enactment date."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 831. Oπ question... Alright. On this question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. Senate Amendment... the question is, 'the House do concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 831? Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. . Clerk. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', *no*, voting none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 831. the Order αf Concurrence, appears Bill House 933, Representative Hastert. Representative Hastert, on House Bill 833."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

 Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 30... 833."
- Hastert: "I'll explain the Bill. The Bill was some technical changes from the Department of Revenue. What the Amendments do is, basically, Amendment #1 changes the threshold for monthly average sales tax liability. It

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

increases it to reduce the number of filings. It also has other technical... some other technical changes. And it also allows prepaid accelerated sales taxpayers with a payment option of 110 percent."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. And on that question, Representative

John Dunn, from Macon."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor explain this in a little more detail?

The analysis of Senate Amendment #1 in my file is four single spaced pages, and it looks pretty complicated to me.

What all does... what happens here with this Amendment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "It raises the dollar threshold for quarterly sales tax liabilities from 20 dollars to 50 dollars per month. Okay. So it..."

Dunn: "And that means that it reduces... if it's under 50 you don't have to file."

Hastert: "That's correct. It's a small business thing."

Dunn: "Alright."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Klemm."

Dunn: "Well, wait. What else does it do?"

Speaker Giglio: "Sorry. Representative Dunn."

Hastert: "I'm trying to answer..."

Dunn: "I thought ... "

Hastert: "It also, on the yearly basis, goes from 100 dollars to 200 dollars sales. Alright. In another provision it replaces the sales tax claim for credit or refund system with an authorized sales tax deduction. That's an enter... affects enterprise zones, businesses with building material purchases. It also allows prepaid accelerated sales taxpayers with a payment option of 110 percent at the previous year liability or 90 percent of the current year which is consistent with regular accelerated taxpayers. Now, it makes some technical provisions in Chapter 73,

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

paragraphs 1065, line 80 through 13. Many of the proposals either reduce the burden on the taxpayers and the department or a cleanup change in respect to last year's STEP... stack... Step Tax Evasion Program. Both those are the major changes. Most of them are cleanup."

Dunn: "I see in my analysis there is a provision for a 100 percent tax penalty payable by the responsible officer of a corporation with regard to sales tax. Is that correct? Is that new and is that correct?"

Hastert: "That's consistent with the income tax."

Dunn: "Alright. Thank you."

Hastert: "You're welcome."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Klemm: "Thank you. Representative Hastert, my analysis, synopsis indicates that this Act relating to licensing and regulations of various professions and occupations that anyone who fails to file a tax return pay a tax, or penalty or interest on a tax as required may, in fact, lose their license or certification, or in fact, if they have already had one issued, maybe... it may be suspended. question to you, I guess more for a legislative intent, is, let me give you an example. I have a licensed professional my district who, with the Department of Revenue, has been accused of failing to pay 15 cents, that's 15 pennies, on a disputed tax return. Penalties and interest DOW are hundred and some dollars on this 15 cent dispute. over a My concern is that this individual under this Act perhaps even now be... have his license to conduct business in Illinois suspended, or rejected, or taken away while this case. I d he's arquing like clarification legislatively if, in fact, the Department would be able to

64th Legislative Day

June 29, 1985

do this."

- Hastert: "It... it does not allow the Department to do it. What this does is permit the licensing agency to, at their option, to look at the evidence and then to refuse to issue or to suspend a professional. It doesn't give them a power to revoke, and... and the Department doesn't do it. The licensing agency does do it."
- Klemm: "So even while an individual with a separate department, basically the Department of Revenue, is arguing an issue over validity of a claim or a dispute another agency who is removed from it can maybe get a printout and say, 'Hey, you've got a complaint here. We're going to pull it until you clarify it.' I mean, how would the two know it together?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Would you repeat your question, please? I was interrupted."
- Klemm: "Alright. While... I'll repeat the question. While the Department of Revenue is arguing with a constituent of ours, a taxpayer, about the merits or demerits of... of this claim, another totally independent agency who has licensing authority or power could unilaterally be taking some action on this person not knowing what's going on with the Department. Is that what you're saying?"
- Hastert: "Representative, what this does is allow the Department of Revenue to forward this information to the licensing agency. The licensing agency uses this information at their discretion."
- Klemm: "Well, okay. I don't want to belabor it. I am concerned about the protection of a constituent on a legitimate complaint with the Department, and some other department, irrespective of it, has permissive language that they may or may not, which certainly leaves, it seems to me, a lot

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

of constituents hanging there while they're arguing a legitimate complaint that they didn't pay their penalty on interest, in my case, of 15 cents. It's ridiculous."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 933. And on question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Johnson, 'aye', 'ave'. Representative Wait, 'aye'. this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House does concur on Senate voting 'present'. Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 833. And this received the Constitutional Majority, having On the Order of Nonconcurrence declared passed. on page eight οf the Calendar, appears Bill House 852. Representative Homer. Representative Homer, on House Bi 11 852."

Homer: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 952 deals with a situation where there has been guardian appointed for a minor, where that guardian has been given the power to consent to the adoption of And the Bill addresses the situation where the foster parents, who have had foster custody of that child for one continuous year or more, is given preference to apply for the adoption of that child. And the Bill sets forth certain considerations that the quardian and the court should take into account in determining whether or approve the application filed by the foster parent not adoption. The Amendment that was added, Amendment #1 in the House, took out some language that was in the Bill that said that the foster parent not only have continuous custody for more than one year, but also under

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the original Bill had to have current custody for the Bill... current custody of the child. The Senate Amendment takes out that requirement of current custody, so as to open this eligibility up to any foster parent who year continuous custody of the child. And it also makes another minor change with regard to the authority under which the quardian was originally appointed, initially in the Bill was limited to the Juvenile Court that language has now been removed. I would ask for the concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 to House 852. "

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 852. hnA ОD question, all those in favor signify by voting 'ave', those 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'none'... 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 852. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 864. Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. move that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 964. The original Bill was a land transfer between Doe TOOT the Fox Valley Park District of 3.6 acres. Various reversions... reverter clauses were included in the Bill in the event that a dam in the Fox River should be constructed. Amendment... Senate Amendment 1 is a quick claim deed transfer for a... an IDOT building to the City of Markham. And I move that the House... I ask for the House concurrence on the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House do concur in

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 864. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. And voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 864. This having received the Constitutional Majority, Bill. is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, on page eight of the Calendar, appears House Bill Representative McGann. Representative McGann in the Out of the record. House Ri 11 882, Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 883, Representative Peterson. Representative Peterson, on House Bill 883."

- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 983. The Bill as it was passed by the House has to do with the Board Trustees... Township Board of Trustees and their paying of accounts. The effect of the Senate Amendment would amend the Township Open Space Act to provide townships from hereafter acquiring and holding real property within a municipality or within an area which is subject municipal annexation proceeding without first obtaining permission from the affected municipality. T move for concurrence to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 883."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883., And on that question, Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to that
 concurrence Motion. This Amendment is just another version
 of a House Bill that was presented in our Committee in

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

and Townships which took about 45 minutes or an hour of our Committee's time and which was summarily dismissed by the Committee. And this Amendment is just another attempt to put it into law. And we. in the I understand Committee... as it. it has ŧο do with prohibiting townships from acquiring open space land without the permission of the city or village government. And we, in the Committee, thought that was a usurpation of the townships' right to exist and we summarily dismissed this Bill, as I said, in Committee and I would ask for a 'no' vote on concurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "On this question, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, rise in opposition to this Amendment. This may seem like a small whether or not a township should be permitted to acquire open space, but the filing of ... what was Senate Bill 1044 and now this Amendment to 883, is in violation of the Township Open Space Act passed by this Body in 1975 and would usurp an... a referendum that would be on the ballot this November. I, urge you to vote 'no' on concurrence. Permit the people of Libertyville Township only township in the State of Illinois interested in acquiring open space - permit them this self determination for themselves whether or not they wish to decide acquire it. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883. On that question, hearing no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are !1 voting 'yes', and 97

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. Mr... Representative Peterson."

- Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 893. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883. On the Order of Concurrences, we'll go back one, House Bill 880. Representative McGann, on House Bill 880."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 880. The House Bill originally requires the real estate index number for indexing in the counties, and the Amendment actually excludes Cook County from the forestry management plan. It takes Cook County out of an existing program in regards to the farmland assessment which is considered and requested by the Cook County Assessor. And I'd move for its concurrence."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman... Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 880. that question, all those in favor signify by voting those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes'. none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 880. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 888, Representative Bowman. House Bill 999. "

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House. First, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1
which was sensibly a cleanup Amendment, but they... they
didn't do it right the first time. They put on Senate
Amendment #2 and then forgot to table Amendment #1. So,
I'm going to move to nonconcur and then they will recede in
that Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks that the House do not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 998. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 988.

Representative Bowman, on Amendment #2."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #2 makes a number of changes to Environmental Barriers Act which replaces the Facilities for the Handicapped Act now in our law books. Amendment #2 adds some definitions. It make clarifications regarding the scope of the law; for example, that building include exterior decoration. alterations dо not T+ requires the Capital Development Board to establish standards for areas of public buildings restricted to It extends to 1990 compliance by government employees. leased facilities, specifies that the owner rather than the contractor is liable for the business offense if there is a penalty relating to construction or alterations in violation of the Act and specifies that an architect and engineer may be subject to professional disciplinary action for negligent statements. So, it's a sort of miscellaneous Amendment that makes clarifying changes intent of the law. And I move for ... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 888. And on that

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

question..."

Bowman: "No, 2. 2. 2."

Speaker Giglio: "Senate Amendment #2. And on that question, appear... Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, I'm just wondering, Representative Bowman, I understand that there were two Senate Amendments, and #2 is a correction of Senate Amendment #1. Do you have an understanding in the Senate that they are going to recede from Senate Amendment #1?"

Bowman: "Yes, I do. And we just nonconcurred in that Amendment."
Cullerton: "Okay. Fine, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, the Gentleman moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 888. And on that question, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question or two."

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he'll... he will."

Pullen: "Does this Bill apply to privately owned buildings that have public access?"

Bowman: "Yes, it does, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Does it require the installation of elevators?"

Bowman: "It requires buildings to be accessible in their public areas and adaptable in the private dwelling units. Let me add, Representative Pullen, that the Realtors' Association is neutral on the Bill. We did sit down and work out problems with the private owners and I think we have accomplished that."

Pullen: "Would it effectively require the installation of elevators?"

Bowman: "I'm not sure I can answer that question adequately. In multi-story buildings, it probably would, but there may be exceptions and I would not want to say that in absolute 100%."

64th Legislative Day June 29, 1985

Pullen: "Does this affect buildings owned by local government?"

Bowman: "Yes, it does."

Pullen: "Is it subject to the Mandates Act?"

Bowman: "I don't believe... No, it isn't. We did explore that question when 888 was in the House on Third Reading, and the interpretation of the... the law at that time was that this is replacing an Act that is already on the books and, as a consequence, does not fall under the purview of the Mandates Act."

Pullen: "Are its provisions more stringent than the Act that is currently on the books?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Yes. thank you. In my concluding remarks, let me just say in elaboration on my answers to Representative Pullen's question, I've consulted with the staff and I believe that with respect to the elevators, that's true of new construction, but not necessarily in the case of It would only be in the case where the alterations. alteration... the area effected would require elevators, not in all cases on alterations. So, I now move the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 838."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 888. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'ves'. voting 'nay', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 888. 0n the Order οf Concurrence appears House Bill 889.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Representative Bowman. 889. Representative Bowman, on House Bill 889."

- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, which provides that public or not-for-profit private organizations which provide such services prior to the effective date of this amendatory Act are eligible to receive grants. The underlying Bill provides for grants for... to schools... the school districts that provide services to handicapped children up to the age of three years old and this broadens it to include private...excuse me, public or not-for-profit private organizations as well.

 And I move the House concur."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 889. On that all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there 116 are voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 891, Representative Madigan...

 Madigan Daniels Levin. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 891. This is the last of the Bills on this Order that are part of the Speaker and Minority Leader's handicap package. And this Bill, when it left the House, dealt with the due process appeals procedure for special education and in... Since it left

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

letter received by the State Board of was Education from the United States Department of Education indicating that our state was out of the compliance with respect to federal requirements for due process appeals and stood to lose funding unless we acted to make changes. Amendments 1 and 2 make those changes. And what they do is provide, first of all, that, in terms of the hearing officers, no more than two of the five hearing officers at local level can be private providers of special education services; and secondly, and more significantly, the appeal at the second level is changed from an appeal to State Board of Education to instead an appeal by an arbitrator who would not be connected with the State Board Education but would have to be a member of the... of a nationally-recognized arbitrator group. There would be the opportunity for both the school and the parents to start with a panel of five and decide who they don't want, and you would end up with the fifth one being the one that hear the appeal at the state level. This would put us into compliance with federal law and remove the problems stated by the United States Department of Education. urge that we do concur for these reasons in Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 891. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bi11 891?* those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed A11 Voting is open. This is final action. vote *no*. voted who wish? Representative Cullerton wishes to vote 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. Ωn this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 891. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 903, Representative Bullock. Tell us what the Bill does and what the Amendment does."

- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill... House Bill 903 as amended with the House. Senate Amendment #1 deletes the content of the Bill. lieu thereof an Act authorizing conveyance of The Amendment would allow the certain state property. state which owns the property to give it to a college for \$1 as a quick claim deed. More importantly, this Amendment followed by Amendment #2 has a reverter clause in effect that the property is not used for strictly educational purposes, it would revert back to the Department of Central Management Services is neutral on the Bill. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 903. On the question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "Representative, would you tell me the number of acres that are involved in this conveyance?"

Bullock: "Well, it's not an acre. It's an old mansion in Chicago at 4545 South Drexell in my district. I doubt if it's an acre. It's been utilized for the last six years by the Community College of Law and they're presently operating in the facility. I don't think it's an acre."

Ropp: "Okay. Another ... "

Bullock: "Probably about 75 by 100 feet... 50 feet deep, which is the way we describe them in Chicago rather than by acreage."

Ropp: "Can you tell me or tell us what the lease cost is that the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

state has been receiving from this?"

Bullock: "What did you say, Representative Ropp?"

Ropp: "What is the state going to lose in terms of lease charges as a result of this?"

Bullock: "Nothing. Right now, the state's collecting no revenue.

Unfortunately, I represent a district that is somewhat desolate and is often described as a ghetto. By allowing these individuals to utilize this facility and to bring it to current standards and to become full occupants, we will remove a blight in our urban area and hopefully enhance economic development when they can produce the kinds of citizens that will be taxpaying, law abiding residents of our state."

Ropp: "Well, that's all well and good and I support that intent.

I guess another question. My analysis says the state is
leasing it and you say they're leasing it for no money.

That's not a very big lease."

Bullock: "I agree."

Ropp: "The other thing - the normal policy that I think we have here, at least in the House chamber, is that we receive an appraised value of property that the state is in the process of selling or buying. Can you tell me what the appraisal of this property is?"

Bullock: "No, I can't, Representative Ropp, and we passed several land conveyance Bills two nights before. I think Representative Pullen had one. I think someone back in the back had one for a college and a hospital. We didn't request an appraised value on that, and I don't have one on this."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you!"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Who are the owners of this college to whom the land is

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

- going to be conveyed?"
- Bullock: "Representative Johnson, you're fairly familiar with the owners. They were in Committee. They came before you.

 They're a private non-for-profit groups, the National Conference of Black Lawyers Community College of Law."
- Johnson: "Well, I... I mean, who owns it? Did they... Some individuals own it or..."
- Bullock: "No, the state owns it, Representative. Obviously, no one owns it. We're asking the state to sell it for a dollar."
- Johnson: "I don't mean that. I mean, who owns... who is going to own the land when this transfer takes place?"
- Bullock: "Well, I just stated the National Conference of Black
 Lawyers Community College of Law."
- Johnson: "Well, they have trustees set up to be the title holders or..."
- Bullock: "Yes."
- Johnson: "And why is it that we're making this transfer?"
- Bullock: "I'm requesting it."
- Johnson: "Why are you requesting it? Why do we... what's the state's interest in making the transfer?"
- Bullock: "I'm requesting it. I would like to have it done. I
 think it serves a useful public purpose. I think the
 individuals who are presently occupying it will improve the
 property. And certainly, if it is not contingent for
 educational purposes in a non-profit manner, it reverts
 back to the state."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... Are you finished,

 Representative Johnson? Okay. The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Brookins."
- Brookins: "Thank you, Mrs. Chairman (sic Madam Speaker). I call... raise the previous question."
- Speaker Breslin: "That's not necessary. Representative Bullock,

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

to close."

Bullock: "Madam Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote. I think the Bill has been well explained. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House... question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 903?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all wish? The Clerk will take the record. question there are 71 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 'present'. And this House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 903, and this having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen. in about the Chair is prepared to g o to the Order of Nonconcurrences which begin on page 16 on your Calendar. We would like to take only those Bills that Members wish to refuse to recede on, so that we can get Conference Committees going on those Bills. So, we are notifying that you can look over those Bills, come to the well if you have one of them that you are going to refuse to recede Let us know what the Bill is and bе prepared to your Motion. With leave of the Assembly, I'd like to go back now to Representative Wojcik's Bill that taken out of the record a moment ago. House Bill 714, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Member's of the House, what House
Bill 714 does is it allows solicitation within the
unincorporated areas with the exception of Cook County. In
my district in Medina, Illinois, they are having problems
with people coming to their doors late at night and trying
to sell their wares to them. So, what this does is it
allows the merchant to go to the township, ask for a

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

license. The township then tells them what hours they can solicit the homes, and it is regulated that way. must explain to the Members of the Assembly that when I introduced this Bill, Representative Cullerton and I worked extensively. I put three Amendments on it in I gave my word that when it got to the Senate, it would be clearly defined and understood. That was done. The Senate Amendment did clear up the concerns. It passed the Senate with a vote of 57-1. Passed the House 96-2, and it did eliminate Cook County. Now, there has been a lot of work put into the Bill and Representative Dunn has now questioned the word 'itinerate merchant'. I feel that we probably should have clarified that when it was in the House, and I would like to move its favorable passage."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 714. On that question, the
 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Ι rise to congratulate Representative Wojcik with regards to this Bill. You may recall that when we debated this Bill, Representative Wojcik said one of the three great promises, I'll amend it in the Senate. And I asked her who her Senator was and she said, Pate Philip. And then she made sure that the Sponsor in the Senate was..."
- Wojcik: "Senator Savickas, so that Cook County would be protected."
- Cullerton: "... Someone who... someone who she could trust."
 Wojcik: "That is right."
- Cullerton: "And Senator Savickas, indeed, put on the Amendment that we asked. So, this is a situation where Representative Wojcik really did amend it in the Senate.

 And now, she comes back here and I think that the Bill has

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

been improved from my point of view, because it doesn't apply to where I live. If anybody lives outside of Cook County, you may want to vote against it like the two people who voted against it the first time we passed it. But I want rise to thank Representative Wojcik for making the Bill not apply to my city."

Wojick: "You're welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn." Dunn: "Thank you. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Unfortunately, for the other ... Unfortunately, for the other 101 counties, we are not exempt from the proposals contained in this legislation. The way this legislation is written and all of you downstaters should pay attention because this legislation is written in that any traveling salesman who comes through your county can be required to register separately with township within your county. That, for example, might mean right here in Springfield, that a shirt salesman or a shoe salesman or a tie salesman could go out here on East (sic -South) Grand to the Penny's store and come in and sell but whatever township White Oaks Mall is in, he might be regulated and prohibited by that township from It is crazy to ask traveling coming to that store. salespeople to try to find the location of the town in each township, in each county in 101 counties across this state to seek permission to peddle his wares. lots and lots of discussion in this chamber about protecting the small business person, traveling people or independent business people, manufacturers' reps, traveling salesman, merchants, as they are called in this Amendment. And this Amendment clearly says, clearly says, that every township in every county can regulate the terms conditions upon which merchants shall be allowed to sell

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

and offer for sale their merchandise within that township. The township boards don't want this burden. If you're going to do this, it should be either with the county or with the largest municipality in the county and the county for the rest of the area outlying the municipalities. Township-by-township regulation of traveling salesmen is just crazy. Vote 'no' on this Bill. Send it to Conference Committee and we can do something about it."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

McNamara: "If I read this correctly, it's my understanding that the regulation does not apply within the limits of municipality. So. therefore, what this legislation is doing is it's allowing townships to legislate for unincorporated areas that have no way of legislating right now or controlling door-to-door salesman, so to speak. Is that... Am I correct? Is that the intent of this legislation?"

Wojcik: "Yes, Representative. In fact, I was going to reiterate that it is only for unincorporated areas. Municipalities would still have the right to take care of the people are residing in their districts; and, if anyone would want to go or solicit, they must go to their municipality to get such a license. This Bill only pertains to unincorporated areas. It has nothing to do with cities or with the counties. Actually, the Bill is permissive. It's to the county statute and the municipal statute. So, there really is no..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik, you're responding to a question. Representative McNamara, continue."

McNamara: "Thank you. That was my question. And, unlike the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

previous speaker, I do believe it's a good Bill because it fills a void in the law which does right now in some townships create a problem where any solicitation could go on unrestricted. And this... since this applies only to the unincorporated areas of that township, I think it's a good one and I'd urge the 'aye' vote."

Wojcik: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik, to close. Briefly."

- Wojcik: "Yes, I would like to say that it is also my intention that House Bill 714 will not affect any group of individuals presently licensed by the State of Illinois. I would also like to point out again that this is permissive. It is for the unincorporated areas and I do move for its passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 714? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 714, and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 743, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Speaker, rather. And I
 would now move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to
 House Bill 743."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 743. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 743?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action.

64th Legislative Day

Giorgi:

June 28, 1985

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The will take the record. On this question there are 116... Representative Dunn has voted 'aye'. There are 117 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 House Bill 743, and this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going now to the top of page nine on Concurrences appears House Bill 922, Representative Giorgi."

"Madam Speaker, I move that the House concur to Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 922. The Bill is the Bill that provides for the County Executive Act. It provides that county can... at referendum elect... to elect your chief executive at large and at the same referendum elect not home rule county. The Amendment from the... the Senate Amendment only provides that the chief executive officer can vote to break a tie. And under the authority of the county board, he can be allowed a legal officer, and that legal officer must be comparable to a state's attorney. And I urge the adoption of Senate Amendment #1." Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Speaker Amendment #1 to House Bill 922. Is there any discussion? none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 922? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 922. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 932, House Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino. Just proceed, Representative. The

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Bill does not need to be read."
- Laurino: \$"I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 332."
- Speaker Breslin: "Tell us what the Bill does and what the Amendment does."
- Laurino: "It's a Dietetic Practice Act, and it includes a medical differential diagnosis, and is meant to prevent the dieticians from medical diagnosis."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 332. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 932? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. will take the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'ave'. 12 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 932. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 950, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 950 is the Illinois
 Milk Promotion Act that is comparable to our corn, soybean
 and other checkoff promotional programs. Senate Amendment
 1 allowed for those funds also to be used to promote
 outside the State of Illinois. And it stated that the
 Champaign County Milk Producers and the Swiss Valley Milk
 Producers could have only one member on the State Board of
 Directors. And the reason is that is because they are very
 small in total membership. I urge your support of Senate
 Amendment #1 and concur..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 950. Is there any discussion?
 The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 950? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. wish? On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 950. House Ri11 This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 964, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Honse Bill 964 as it left the House, required advertisements for bids to approximate the number of days between the time of contract or a vendor would submit his bid and the state The Senate Amendment #1 added a provision pay it. that stated the Director of the Department αf Rehabilitation Services and two additional public representatives from private businesses would be appointed by the Governor to the Department of Central Management Services on the State Youth Board. And that that primarily, has the responsibility for assisting handicapped people to secure either products or services. I urge concurrence of Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur to Senate #1 to House Bill 964. Is there any discussion? Amendment Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 364?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 964. And this Bill, having received the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 968, Representative Nash. Explain the Bill and the Amendment. Representative Nash."

Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 provides that the pharmacists' license fee will go to the special fund and be used for pharmacy matters only. This is already done for doctors, dentists and realtors."

Speaker Breslin: "Tell us what the original Bill does."

Nash: "The original Bill amends the Pharmacy Practice Act.

Changes 'pharmacy apprentice' to 'pharmacy technician'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 968. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. *Shall concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 968? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye'. Representative Johnson votes There are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 969, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 975, Representative Brunsvold. "

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 975 in its original form addressed sawed-off shotguns. sawed-off rifles and defined, as in federal language, one pull of the trigger with one round fired, addressing the definition of machine quns. The Amendment, Senate Amendment. simply the state or federal contracts with + ha manufacture, transportation of weapons under contracts to Illinois firms for the manufacture of weapons in this state, and this is under the Exemption Section of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

39. I would ask for the concurrence on House Bill 375."

Speaker Breslin: "Would you turn off Representative Nash? The
Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 975. On the question, the
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, this is the... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Okay. I just want to be very careful on this one.

Were you down here when we had the machine gun

controversy?"

Brunsvold: "I was not here, but I know..."

Cullerton: "You heard about it."

Brunsvold: "...Representative Polk, yes."

Cullerton: "Yeah, Representative Polk. We passed a Bill that was construed in the media in Chicago as allowing for people to walk around carrying machine guns."

Brunsvold: "I remeber that."

Cullerton: "Some people thought that was a good idea, but others didn't. Now, could you tell me the origin of this... Now, first of all, it's sponsored by Senator Philip and Lemke.

That's the first thing... first note of caution we might observe."

Brunsvold: "The Amendment, the Amendment... There are some facilities in the state that manufacture weapons for the Pederal Government. And under Section... under item 5 of the exemptions, it wasn't clear to them that those facilities would be exempt because they're in their... in their districts. And so, this ... this Amendment simply says that if you're under federal contract, which I think item 5 or Section 5 under this, says already."

Cullerton: "Well, we came back in a Veto Session and corrected whatever we thought we did wrong the first time. And that's why I don't know why we need more..."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Brunsvold: "Yeah, the original... The Amendment really doesn't do anything except say that if you're under a federal contract to manufacture barrel... weapons with shorter barrels or special ammunition, that you're exempt. Well, Section 5 under there also says that... also indicates that."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now... So, let me ask you one question, then.

 While transporting the weapon, they must be in a

 nonfunctioning state or not immediately accessible. Does

 that mean that they would be in a box or in a truck?"
- Brunsvold: "They would be in a box and that would be broken down, barrel in one section and the receiver, probably, in another section as it would be in a transportation to one armory or another."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So, you think we're safe in concurring with this?"
- Brunsvold: "Well, the Amendment... the Amendment really is not controversial. In fact, I think the Amendment's already addressed in present language. The Bill itself, if you're concerned about the Bill, that is word for word with federal language."
- Cullerton: "No, I'm not concerned about the Bill, just the
- Brunswold: "No, I think... I think the Amendment really is... is
 extra language that probably we don't need, but if the
 Senators feel that they need to define that exemption, why
 then, you know, that's fine."

Cullerton: "Okay. Fine."

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

Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Representative, are you a sportsman?"

Brunsvold: "Yes, I am."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

Vinson: "Okay, now, I'm not looking at the language of the Bill.

I'm looking at an analysis and perhaps you can direct me to
the language in the Bill that will satisfy my guestion. It
would seem to me that from my analysis the offense that is
created in the Bill that passed the House... The Bill that
passed the House is still in here, right?"

Brunsvold: "Correct."

Vinson: "Okay. It seems from my analysis that the... that
offense would exist, that you'd be violating the law if you
fired a double-barrel shotgun and fired both barrels at the
same time. Is that correct? Or if you possessed a
double-barrel shotgun which could be fired in that
fashion?"

Brunswold: "What kind of double-barrel are you talking about, single trigger or double trigger?"

Vinson: "Double trigger."

Brunsvold: "You can fire... That's one pull of the trigger, each trigger, and one firing of the weapon in each barrel. So, you've, in effect, pulled the trigger once for each barrel and fired each barrel. So, it's, I think, within the law."

Vinson: "Well, does the Bill say that if the weapon can shoot multiple shots by a single function of the trigger, that then you're violating the law?"

Brunswold: "Right. Single function of the trigger, one pull of the trigger - one projectile being fired. Now, double-barrel with double triggers would have, of course, one barrel for each trigger. So, it's a single function."

Vinson: "So, that wouldn't be a mulitiple function?"

Brunsvold: "No, that would not."

Vinson: "No, wait a minute... wait a minute. It's the single function that's outlawed, right?"

Brunswold: "The language says that you can't fire more than one projectile with one pull of the trigger. If you fire more

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

than one, then you got a machine gun."

Vinson: "Okay..."

Brunsvold: "That's federal language."

Vinson: "...With a double trigger, double barrel shotgun..."

Brunsvold: "Right."

Vinson: "...Because you got to pull both triggers, even though you can fire them simultaneously..."

Brunsvold: "Right."

Vinson: "...You would not be violating the law."

Brunsvold: "That's the way I interpret it, yes, Representative."

Vinson: "Alright, that's my only concern on the Bill."

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

McNamara: "Yes, the Gentleman will yield for a question?"

Brunsvold: "Yes."

McNamara: "I guess I'm a little confused on the Senate Amendment analysis. In the first sentence it says the Amendment supplies an exemption to certain persons from the effect of the unlawful use of weapon statute prohibition against possession of machine guns, sawed-off shotguns and 'maltov' cocktails. I guess what my problem comes in is it's with the exemption against the 'maltov' cocktails, et cetera."

Bransvold: "Are you looking at the Bill, Representative?"

McNamara: "I'm looking at the Senate Amendment analysis."

Brunsvold: "I'm looking at the Amendment itself, yes. What line are you referring to?"

McNamara: "I believe he has the analysis next to you, if you could read that."

Brunsvold: "I don't see that in the actual Amendment itself,

Representative. I don't see that 'maltov' cocktail being

in the Amendment."

McNamara: "So, it's your contention, then, that the Senate

Amendment analysis is probably faulty?"

Brunsvold: "I would say so, because I don't see that term being

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

used in the Amendment itself, here."

McNamara: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cole, Mr. Weaver.

Representative Greiman in the Chair."

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

Brunsvold: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, a question that was kind of brought up by Representative Vinson. There are a number of shotguns predominantly European make that do fire both barrels with a single trigger."

Brunswold: "Correct."

Weaver: "Would this... would this prohibit those?"

Brunsvold: "No, no. The way a double-barrel shotgun is set up with a single trigger, is usually that the impact of the first round trigger sets up this shear again for the next firing of the second barrel. So, you can only fire one barrel at a time. However, on some exceptions, you will get a double firing of the barrel. And that happens very, very seldom."

Weaver: "But both barrels would be fired with a single pull on the trigger and no matter..."

Brunsvold: "That's not the way it's designed. It's not meant to be that way, but it's a mechanical device and on very, very rare occasions, you will get a double firing of a double barrel, simply because of malfunction. It's happened to me, Representative."

Weaver: "Me, as well. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brunsvold, to close."

Brunswold: "Thank you. I would ask for your support on the concurrence with this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 975. And on that, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

This is 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 99 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 975. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby On page 16 of the Calendar, on the Order declared passed. of Nonconcurrence, will be Bills for which the Member wishes to not recede from the Senate Amendment the Bill into a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 114. Mr. Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I choose not to recede and will request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Young moves to refuse to recede from Senate... House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 114. On that. there being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate... from House Amendment #271 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have And the House refuses to recede from Senate Amendment #2 and a Conference Committee will be organized. the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 165. Mr. Capparelli moves... Mr. Capparelli, Capparelli. the Order of Nonconcurrence. Want me to take that out of the record for a minute? Mr. Levin will handle that, I guess. Mr. Levin, Senate Bill 165."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, we wanted to recede. So, we have to hold it, if that's what we want to do."

Speaker Greiman: "That's right. Exactly."

Levin: "We can come back to it at the appropriate time."

Speaker Greiman: "You can, indeed. On the Order of
Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 212, Mr. Hannig."

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

would move that the House not recede from House Amendment
#1 to Senate Bill 212 and that a Conference Committee be
formed."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment Senate Bill 212 and that a Conference Committee be organized. And on that, there being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment... from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 212?* Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 212 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 320, Mr. Ronan. Ronan or Mr. Homer. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, Mr. Homer. Mr. Vinson, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Vinson: "Well, are we on a Motion to nonconcur in Senate Bill 320?"

Speaker Greiman: "We... We're on Motions to refuse to recede."

Vinson: "Which one are we going to refuse to recede from?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, at this point, I have asked Mr. Homer or Mr. Ronan if they wish to proceed, and Mr. Homer was examining his files. And Mr. Ronan has now arrived. Mr. Ronan."

Vinson: "Why don't we just move to refuse to recede..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Excuse me."

Vinson: "... from all of the House Amendments? We worked on this

Bill pretty hard. I move that the House..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, I have not recognized you for that purpose. You made an inquiry of the Chair."

Vinson: "Well, can't I be recognized for any purpose?"

Speaker Greiman: "You made an inquiry of the Chair, and you are

- 64th Legislative Day

 June 29, 1985

 not recognized for that. Mr. Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am happy I just walked on the floor to listen to Representative Vinson's diatribe. We're now on Senate Bill 320 and the Amendment I refuse to recede from. I just don't know what the number is. It was a misguided Amendment that was put on by Representative Tuerk. I remember the issue. It's Amendment #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Roman moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate ... from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 320.

 And on that, is there any discussion? The Gent... Are you rising on a point of order, Mr. Vinson?"
- Vinson: "No, I'm rising for a substitute Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, this is the appropriate... this is the appropriate Motion that the Chair will recognize. And on the Motion, Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer, on the Motion. Mr. Vin... Excuse me, Mr. Homer. Are you rising on a point of order, Mr. Vinson?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, when somebody puts a Motion before this chamber, another Member has the right to make a substitute Motion. That's been going on for the past two or three days around here. Now, why are you refusing me my right to make a substitute Motion?"
- Speaker Greiman: "The Parliamentarian advises me that's our procedure in Committee but not on the floor of the House."
- Vinson: "Well, we did it all day yesterday and all day the day before."
- Speaker Greiman: "Not while I was in the Chair. Are you rising on a point of order, Mr. Tate? For what purpose do..."
- Tate: "Yes, Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Tate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've had my light on for the last five minutes. And on that point of order, it's been a practice of this chamber to explain Amendments that we are asked to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

vote on, and the Gentleman has a Motion to nonconcur. He's given virtually no explanation of what the Members are to be ..."

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, let me say this. On that point, the Gent... Mr. Ronan is in order. The Chair, nor the... neither the Chair, nor the Body, can exorcise him to make a thorough..."
- Tate: "Well, then ... then I would ... "
- Speaker Greiman: "However, Mr... Excuse me, Mr. Tate, if I may.

 However, I have a sense that everybody in the floor will

 know what this Amendment is about before we get through.

 Mr. Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Ronan's Motion, as I understand it, is he moves to recede.

 He's asking that the House recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 320 so that there could be no mistake as to what we're dealing with here. And the Bill itself..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me."

- Homer: "No. Well, I'd like him to clarify that because I'm confident his Motion is to..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer, excuse me. Mr. Ronan, we are now taking Motions to not recede so that we may get ourselves in an appropriate position with respect to Conference Committees. If your Motion is to recede, I would appreciate your taking it out of the record. And Mr. Ronan takes it out of the record. Mr. Tuerk, for what purpose do you seek recognition? For no purpose. Alright. Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Was that exercise...

 I mean, did the Speaker send you out to get in that Chair and go through that exercise for the purpose of getting us ready for the heavy hand? Are you going to be the person who does it the hard way when it's got to be done in these

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- last two days? Is that what this is all about and we're supposed to get prepared for it?"
- Speaker Greiman: "You know how to hurt a fellow. On the Order of
 Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 416, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 416, I move that we non-recede... not recede from House Amendment to Senate Amendment... what is it, House Amendment... House Amendment..."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves that the House do not recede from Senate Amendment... from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 416 and that a Conference... and that a Conference Committee be appointed. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is... Yes. Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "I just wanted to tell Representative Vinson and you that
 the rest of us are speaking the English language. You two
 guys speak the American language and that's why you are up
 there."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson... Mr. Tate, did you want to speak
 on this Bill... to this Motion? Mr. Tate, on this Motion?"
 Tate: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a Parliamentary Inquiry."
 Giorgi: "Tate, are you fussing with my Bill?"
- Speaker Greiman: "What's the question?"
- Tate: "The question is, just for the benefit of the Membership here, we would like to have it stated for the record, what would be... when would substitute Motions be in order on Motions to concur and non-concur because I know that there are many Members in this chamber that have different ideas and we are going to be dealing with that subject matter the rest of the day. And we would like to have it clear to the entire Membership what the practice of this Chair is going to be, whether it's going to be arbitrary or are we going to take this on a case by case basis?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Well... Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, I made a point of order. Representative

Tate has asked for direction of the Chair and it is not the
function of the Chair to make direction to a Member of the
Body. If he has made a valid point of the order, then it
is the function of the Chair to respond to that point of
order and he hasn't done so, so I say that he should be
ruled out of order."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I think... yes, Mr. Giorgi, as to... let me just respond. I think Representative Matijevich has made certainly a valid point. We do not usually give opinions as to what we are going to do in the future. However, you know, our vines have tender grapes and we have to be sensitive to the needs of the Nembership. to the questions that have been put is essentially that firstly a Bill is still in the control of the Sponsor at this level, at the level of concurrence and to recede and whatnot. So that a Member who makes a Motion on his own Bill which fails, another Member can thereafter, if we are on that Order of Business, make a Motion dealing with Bill. That would be appropriate. Substitute Motions are inappropriate and will not be recognized. Mr. Vinson, do you have a... Yes, Mr. Giorgi, I'm sorry."

Giorgi: "Nr. Speaker, you haven't disposed of my Notion to refuse to recede to ..."

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair is desperately trying to remember where we are right now."

Giorgi: "Well, I'll refresh your memory."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, I know. Further discussion on Mr. Giorgi's Motion? Mr. Vinson, do you wish to discuss this?"

Giorgi: "I don't want him infringing on my Bill."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that you ruled that

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- substitute Motions are not in order?"
- Speaker Greiman: "That's what I ruled."
- Vinson: "Now, does that just apply when Bills are on the Order of
 Concurrence? What happens about Conference Committee
 Reports?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, well, regarding Conference Committee
 Reports, substitute Notions are still not appropriate, but
 any Member may make a Motion with regard to those
 Conference Committee Reports."
- Vinson: "Okay, now will those two rules apply to Democrats as well as Republicans?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giorgi, to close."
- Giorgi: "Never, Sam. Anyway, I renew my Motion to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giorgi moves that the House do not recede from House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 416 and that a Conference Committee be organized. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries that the House does not recede from House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 416 and a Conference Committee is requested. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 651. Ms. Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe we wanted to...

 Where is Mr. McCracken? Representative McCracken here?

 Just one minute. Mr. Speaker, we wanted to recede from Amendment #2. I'm not sure that's the Order we're on here."
- Speaker Greiman: "No, we're on the Order... we're putting Bills in Conference Committees right now. If you wish to not to recede, make a Motion."
- Parcells: "I wish... no, I do not wish to not recede."
- Speaker Greiman: "Then, let's take your Bill out of the record.

 On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 653, Mr.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bullock. Bullock. Mr. Bullock moves that the House Mr. not recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 653. any discussion? There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 653? All in favor say 'ave'. those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair. House refuses to recede from House 'aves' have, and the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 653 and a Conference Committee requested. 0 n the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 796. Mr. Slater. Mr. Slater. Out of On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 913, Ms. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, I move to not recede from House
Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 813."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon moves that the refuse to recede from Senate Amendment... House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 913. Is there any discussion? being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2. . . from Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 813?! Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, have it. and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 913 and requests Conference Committee. Mr. Slater. Mr. Slater moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 Senate Bill 796. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 796. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 796 and a Conference Committee is requested. On the Order Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 830, Mr. Tate."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Tate: "I'd like to take this out of the record."
- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 856. The Lady from Lake, Ms. Frederick. Wirginia Frederick."
- Prederick: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move... "
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Please give the Lady your... your attention. Ms. Frederick?"
- Frederick: "I move that the House refuse to recede from House

 Amendments 1 and 2 and request that a Conference Committee

 be appointed on Senate Bill 856."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Frederick, moves that House refuse to recede from Senate... Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 856. There being no discussion, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 t o Senate Bill 856 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order of Senate Bills Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 859, Ms. Frederick."
- Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Frederick, moves that the House refuse to recede from HA #1 to Senate Bill 859.

 And on that, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "No. No."

Speaker Greiman: "No? Oh, there being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate... from HA #1 to Senate Bill 859? Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from HA #1 to Senate Bill 859, and a Conference

- 64th Legislative Day

 Committee is requested. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr.

 Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a Motion with regard to
 House Bill 627. We have a technical error in a Bill, and I
 have to move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 627
 passed, so at this time, I so move. We'll have to send it
 to Conference Committee to take this error out of the
 Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon moves that the House reconsider the vote by which it concurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 627. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House reconsider the vote by... Yes, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I think it was 1 and 2, wasn't it, or not? There were two Amendments on it. Right, John?"
- Dunn: "I think only one, but let me double check the Calendar, here."
- Matijevich: "Well, the Calendar's... No, no. I'm sorry. I'm in error. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House reconsider the vote by which it concurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 627? And on that, all favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does hereby vote to reconsider the vote by which it concurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 627. And now, on the Order of Concurrence on House Bill 627, Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 627."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, moves to ...

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

that the House do nonconcur in Amendment.... Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 627. All in favor... Yes, Mr.
Vinson?"

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, this is now the second one of your Bills that Enrolling and Engrossing has done awful things to.

Isn't that right? Is there somebody up there that just doesn't like you, or what? What's the story?"

Dunn: "I'm just an active Legislator, and I give them such a large volume of business that they apparently can't handle it, and I regret that I have inconvenienced them. I'll try to condense my legislative package next term."

Vinson: "Well, I just resent the fact when they can't sit there and simply transcribe those Amendments."

Dunn: "And I appreciate your leaping to my defense. I hope we can nonconcur and get this to Conference Committee and take care of it. Thank you."

Vinson: "I'll be glad to help you any time I can."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton entering the fray. Mr. Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I'm sorry. We... after having passed the Bill,
we sent the file upstairs. Could you tell me what the Bill
does?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Dunn?"

Dunn: "The... The Bill is a Bill which creates a Class A misdemeanor for harboring runaway children, and somewhere in the drafting process between here and the Senate, a provision relating to a critical sentence in the Bill relating to a 48 hour period was left out of the Bill, so we need to take it to conference and put this back in and clean it up. It's all technical."

Cullerton: "Alright. Fine. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment. #1?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 627. Message from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills #537, 560, 623, 879, 892, 984, 1091, 1189, 1267, 1287, 1289, 1294, 1303, 1345, 1388, 1437, 17, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 200, 207, 254, 521, 263, 497, 1095, 1111, 1129, 1132, 1152 and 1165, action taken by the Senate June 28, 1985. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now go back to the Order of Concurrence. On page nine on your Calendar, the next Bill to be called is House Bill 986, Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Well, Madam Speaker, I've decided that it's better to be safe than sorry, and I'm just wondering if you would affirm whether you're going to make the same ruling in regard to substitute Motions that Representative Greiman made when the subject came up when he was in the Chair. Would you rule the same way, that substitute Motions will not be permitted on concurrences?"
- Speaker Breslin: "If they are substitute Motions on another Member's Bill on concurrences. That is correct. The Motions made on concurrences must be made by the Sponsor the House Sponsor."
- Vinson: "Okay, now. On Conference Committee Reports, however,

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

it's fair game. Is that right?"

Speaker Breslin: "It has always been, Sir."

Vinson: "Anybody can make a substitute Motion or any Motion, for that matter, on a Conference Committee Report. Is that right?"

Speaker Breslin: "Not a substitute Motion, necessarily."

Vinson: "You can't make a substitute Motion on a Conference

Committee Report? I thought we... I thought that that's

what Mr. Greiman ruled."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Member can make a Motion on a Conference

Committee Report. I don't ever recall substitute Motions,

Sir."

Vinson: "Well, can you make a substitute Motion on a Conference

Committee Report?"

Speaker Breslin: "We'll address that issue when we come it."

Vinson: "Ah, the 'ripeness is rottenness' doctrine."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahev."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. T move that we... we accept Amendment 1... we concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 986. The Bill as originally drafted indicated that the ... It authorizes the Secretary of State to issue handicapped license places or decals to corporations. school districts, special education cooperatives, which is fine, but it said. which will primarily and frequently transport handicapped persons. It removes the requirement that an organization quote, 'primarily and frequently transport handicapped persons. It's a little open-ended, and I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 986."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 986. On the question, the
Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Representative

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

yield for a question?"

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

- Hawkinson: "Representative, by deleting this language, is there any qualifying language at all, or would they be able to get a handicapped sticker by merely so transporting one time?"
- Mulcahey: "They will. This is all under the authorization of the Secretary of State in the existing language of the statutes regarding handicapped persons and handicapped parking, handicapped license and decals and so on."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment House Bill 986? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 986. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 997, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1000, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1000. Senate Amendment s #1 and 2 now are the Bill. Amendment Senate #1 reenacts those portions of the Workers' Right to Know Law to conform with a Appellate Court decision. Last year, the Federal OSHA adopted a hazard communications rule that required businesses to prepare material safety data sheets on toxic substances that are used in the work place and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

storage containers indicating toxic chemicals in them. Two weeks ago. the Court ruled that state workers' right to know laws are preempted under the OSHA rule on the agency has the authority to regulate the only that area of workers' rights issues. The language allowing an employee to refuse to work if ... if a material safety data sheet has not been prepared, the labeling requirements similar sections are removed. The new Act retains the requirements that manufacturing businesses prepare the data sheets and that they be filed with the Department of Labor and data sheets prepared in conformance with the Federal OSHA rule is presumed to satisfy the requirements of The requirements that businesses communicate with local fire departments on possible hazardous... hazards is also retained. Senate Amendment will allow £ 2 the Illinois EPA to reduce the number of samples required for community water supply systems serving 25,000 persons. In so doing, the agency may comply with the provisions of Federal Safe Water Drinking Act rules that allow states to reduce such sampling frequency to a minimum of four times a year if no contamination is found. I renew my Motion to concur with those two Amendments... "

Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1000. Correct the board. It's one and two that we are concurring with. there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the is, 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1000?' All those in favor vote 'ave'. a11 those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Voting is open. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate
Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1000. And this Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. House Bill 1016, Representative Van
Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To explain the Bill, it... it's in the Human Care of Animals Act, and it makes it punishable by law to cruelly treat or abandon an animal. Originally, the Bill provided for up to one year fail sentence and a fine of up to \$1,000 dollars, and the Senate Amendment does that in three stages. The first offense is a Class C misdemeanor. It gives you a maximum of 30 and \$500 fine, and the second conviction would be a Class B misdemeanor, which would give you a maximum of six months term or \$500 fine, and the third offense would be a Class A misdemeanor, one year term or \$1,000 fine So that's the only change, and I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1016. Representative Vinson,
on the question."

Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Is the language about 'no person may beat an animal' still in there?"

Van Duyne: "Representative Vinson, if it was in it originally, I presume it's in there. I'm just looking at the Bill synopsis."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you."

Van Duyne: "I said, if it was in the Bill originally, then I imagine it is still in there, because I'm just looking at the synopsis, and it makes the changes that I enumerated."

Vinson: "Wouldn't this make a criminal offense out of a jockey

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- using his whip on a thoroughbred race horse?"
- Van Duyne: "No, I don't believe so. That's a common practice."
 Vinson: "What?"
- Van Duyne: "I... I do not believe so. That is a common practice, especially in the stretch."
- Vinson: "I agree that it's common practice, but the Bill appears
 to outlaw that. It says, 'No person or owner may beat any
 animal.'"
- Van Duyne: "I don't think that urging a horse onto greater effort in the stretch is beating, under the... under the strict terminology of that Act. Of course, all of these things would be up to the determination of a Judge if somebody was going to file some kind of a suit against him."
- Vinson: "Now, what about a person who is being attacked by a dog?

 Would they be able to beat the dog to keep it from biting
 them?"
- Van Duyne: "Yes, I think your... I think in every law in this state and others, you are allowed to defend yourself.

 Even... You can even hit a human being in a case like that."
- Vinson: "Well, it's just... I'm just concerned that we may be in a situation where we're raising animals above the status of human beings, here."
- Van Duyne: "No, if I can possibly put legislative intent into this along with Representative Klemm as my hyphenated Cosponsor, that is not our intent at all."
- Vinson: "Okay, now, do you think that that kind of legislative intent would be a meaningful defense in a criminal court?"
- Van Duyne: "Well, yes, I do, because it's already been stated on the... on this legislative floor. Secondly, I might point out to you, as you well know, that someone would have to file charges against this person, and of course, it's his duty to prove those."

64th Legislative Day

June 29, 1985

Vinson: "Well, some of us are a little bit concerned at just trusting in the good discretion of grand juries and state's attorneys."

Van Duyne: "Well, I agree, but I want to point out to you that they won't go to the gallows or anything for this. The maximum fine upon conviction of a third offense is one year and up to \$1,000."

Vinson: "Alright."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Van Duyne's Motion to concur. The Bill as it went out of the House referred to people convicted of cruelly treating or abandoning animals. The Amendment that it offered seems to be reasonable, and I would urge its support."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm to close."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of the concurrence Motion. Certainly, the existing statutes do have the terms in there of cruelly treating an animal. I think it's quite clear. I don't think we need to debate the issue any longer about judges and lawyers. This is a straightforward attempt to stiffen the penalties on those who cruelly treat animals, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1016? A11 in those favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 7 voting and 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1016. And this having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

declared passed. House Bill 1034, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker... Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1034. It's a revision of the scholarship program. It would now grant the scholarship to a student who attended either a public or private institution or higher learning. It would change the cut of the high school graduating class eligible for the scholarship from one-third... the upper one-third of the class as the House had proposed it, to the upper one-fourth of the class, as the Senate Amendment calls for, and I would be happy to try to address any questions or otherwise move for concurrence with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Is that correct?"

Satterthwaite: "2. Just 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1034. On that question, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"
Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Countryman: "Does... What was the rationale for changing this to the upper 25 percent as the upper third, initially?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, I believe that was Senator Etheredge who felt that we were not guaranteeing the highest quality student and thought that if we took them from the upper quarter of the class, that that would be better than receiving them from the upper third. I think that we would be wise to try it at this level. If we find that that's not practical, we might, at some later date, want to come back and change it to the upper third, but I'm willing to go with that upper quarter figure."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Countryman: "Was the number of scholarships reduced from 1,000 to 500 in the Senate?"
- Satterthwaite: "No, that reduction was made in the House."
- Countryman: "And, did the House Bill say that they could, in essence, these scholarships are forgiven if they teach for four years?"
- Satterthwaite: "Right."
- Countryman: "Did the House Bill say in public or private schools?"
- Satterthwaite: "No. The provision as it left the House was totally in the public domain, both in terms of where the scholarships would be available for the teacher education and in terms of the payback provision."
- Countryman: "Is... Is there some way of determining accreditation of the private schools that they're... that they're to teach in, or is it just any private school?"
- Satterthwaite: "Well, I believe that the State Board could set some rules and regulations in that regard."
- Countryman: "So they would have to... to issue some... what schools... what private schools qualified?"
- Satterthwaite: "I presume if they had questions about who would qualify in terms of where they would teach and whether that would be allowable, that they could establish those standards."
- Countryman: "And the Senate Amendment added a lawful permanent resident alien was qualified? Is that correct?"
- Satterthwaite: "Yes, I think that would simply clarify the language that we had originally put in as to citizens and legal residents."
- Countryman: "Well, as I read it, it says 'a citizen or a lawful permanent resident alien'." ... The Senate amended it. Is that...So, either one. Is that right?"
- Satterthwaite: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

Countryman: "No further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from... The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Didrickson: "Representative Satterthwaite, I, too, would like to pursue a little bit further the ratonale for the inclusion of a resident alien."

Satterthwaite: "Well, again, Representative Didrickson, I did not have input to why the Senate felt that that was a necessary change, but I would feel that we may endanger the possibility of having the program at all if we don't concur in this Amendment, and I would rather see the program become functional than to lose the scholarship program. I think this is one of the few real incentives that will be available to people to go into the teaching realm after we put our reform package into effect, and so, I would like to have that incentive available to encourage the students in the upper portions of our high school graduating classes to go into the teaching field."

Didrickson: "Is there any language existing in any other Bills or, to your knowledge, in the omnibus education Bill that we will have with regards to such an incentive to encourage our young people into the teaching profession?"

Satterthwaite: "There will be language, as I understand, in the education package that speaks to areas of shortage, but it does not do anything to suggest that those students have to come from the higher portion of the graduating class."

Didrickson: "Thank you."

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

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- "The Gentleman has moved the previous Speaker Breslin: question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' A11 those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Satterthwaite to close." Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge your support in concurrence with this Amendment. The Amendment was not of my making. I would have preferred the Bill in the form in which it left the House, but I also feel that this program would be... is a much needed should have in place as an incentive to encourage higher quality students graduating from our going into the teaching profession. And for that reason, I am willing to concede to the Senate's desire make these changes so that we can have a functional program and encourage the good students in our high schools today to go into education, and for that reason, I ask for a
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1034?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver, one minute to explain your vote."

'yes' vote on concurrence."

- Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think we established a dangerous precedent, here, because of the shortage of funds for Illinois state scholars, citizens of Illinois to attend college, and here, we're offering scholarship monies to non-citizens of Illinois who may end up leaving the state, leaving the country, leaving us with no recourse to recover. I urge a 'no' vote on this concurrence."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me say that in regards to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

what one of the previous speakers mentioned, the way to encourage teachers going into the profession of education is to encourage them by providing additional salary increases that are comparable to business out in the field, and certainly, providing a small incentive in the way of a scholarship is not helping the whole educational arena. I urge you to reconsider your green vote and vote red, and let's really place the emphasis on teacher education, rather than to allow a mere tuition increase or grant to them. Salaries needed to be increasing, and that's what will cause good people to go into the teaching profession, not this particular incentive."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1034.

 And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1035, Representative Soliz."
- Soliz: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to move to concur with Amendment #! to 1030... House Bill 1035. The Bill deletes the requirement the corporate name of a not-for-profit corporation be in the English language. The Amendment stipulates that a corporate name must consist of letters of the English alphabet, Arabic or Roman numerals or symbols capable of reproduction by the Office of the Secretary of State. So I move concurrence with this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1035. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1035?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

This is final action. This is final action. Have open. all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1035, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional... Representative Leflore votes 'aye'. There are, therefore, 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'... Representative LeFlore votes 'aye'. 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1039, Representative Mulcahey."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. 1 move that we nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1039. Ιt did. indeed. make some technical. corrections. However. we feel that we should have this back over in the Senate in order to use it for a potential vehicle regarding the education reform package."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1039. Is there discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #12* A11 those in say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair... Excuse me. The Gentleman... A11 those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill House Bill 1059, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059, which is an omnibus JCAR Bill which was designed to codify what had been previously done by agency

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

rule making. Senate Amendment \$1, sponsored by Senators Welch and Bloom, created the Space Heating Safety Act to regulate the sale and use of portable kerosene fuel heaters and to repeal the existing statutory provisions. This Amendment is supported by the association, and as well as it is acceptable to the Office of the State Fire Marshall, I would move for the adoption of this Motion."

- Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Speaker Amendment #1 to House Bill 1959. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059? Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say the opinion of the Chair... All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1059. having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 1072, Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, this is the foreign language academy. The... I've moved to concur in Senate Amendments I and 2. Senate Amendment #2 just makes the effective date. Amendment #1 does what we've discussed in Committee. It creates two locations, one in the City of Chicago and one downstate. I would ask for your concurrence."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1072. On that question,
 the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

- Cullerton: "Representative Oblinger, you said this is the language academy Bill. Now, when it started out, it was the Illinois Language and International Studies Academy."

 Oblinger: "Right."
- Cullerton: "And there was going to be a institution located in the central part of the state."
- Oblinger: "That's been amended out to be two sites: one in Chicago and one downstate with no definite location. The reason for that is we're going to put out proposals for...

 I mean, requests for proposals ... fees for the schools to provide language instructors, space and so forth. This time, we put in the appropriation, only money for a planning session for this time. If they determine that it is better to have residential schools or teachers within the regular classroom, that will be determined in the study this year, and we will change the thrust of the Bill."
- Cullerton: "Well, isn't there also a... another academy that we have been concerned with this year? That was an academy...
- Oblinger: "I imagine you're referring to the one on mathematics and science..."

Cullerton: "Yes."

- Oblinger: "... Which includes building buildings and all the rest of it. This does not include anything of this kind. We're asking for proposals from any colleges or universities that are interested, to provide space, teaching facilities, and if they determine in the study that it would be a residential one, that they would provide those. This is just now for the study."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, I... I think I have some bad news for you. Could you... Could you just take this out of the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

record just for a minute so we can get something straight?"

Oblinger: "Surely, I'd be glad to."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 1079, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to move to concur with #1 on House Bill 1079. Last year, a Senate Amendment Public Act was passed that permitted municipalities and property owners to enter into pre-annexation agreements for 20 years, rather than 10 years, as it did exist. What we did is, we failed to amend a related provision which would allow existing pre-annexation agreements to be extended also. House Bill 1079 does that. What we found, though, in the drafting of 1079 reached the Senate, that we, in fact, had omitted some dates and some wording that would actually cancel that out. So, what Senate Amendment does... Senate Amendment # 1 does is to allow that a pre-annexation agreement to be continued if approved by the municipality beyond the 10 years to 20 years to now make the statutes in uniformity."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1079?' Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Will this Senate Amendment grandfather in existing annexation agreements?"

Klemm: "They would have to approved by the city council. It would allow them to extend it from 10 to 20 years, if the city council felt it was appropriate. You see, we had a turn down in our economy, as you and everybody else knows, Representative Cullerton, and some of these agreements and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

pre-annexation agreements hadn't been completed. Unfortunately, we find some of the agreements, if they're running out, the monies that are being held in escrow for completion of, say, sewer projects and water projects, possibly could terminate, leaving that development half completed. So, this would allow those individual cases to be addressed by the municipal elected officials to extend that if necessary."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment House Bill 1079? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1079. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back Representative Ryder's Bill, House Bill 997. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with the Senate Amendment 1, which added a effective date."

Speaker Breslin: "Tell us what the Bill does."

Ryder: "The Bill is a revenue Bill dealing with propane, and it to correct an anomaly in the Act concerning sales tax repayment and refund."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 997?' And on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Oh, yes. Representative Ryder?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder will yield to a question." Cullerton: "Okay. Now, this Bill, we... when we first debated

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- it, I think we.. we engaged in a dialogue."
- Ryder: "I seem to recall that."
- Cullerton: "And I think that what we... What we determined was that the Department of Revenue supported the Bill, but clearly, those people who sell liquid propane gas not used as a motor fuel, really supported the Bill."
- Ryler: "I think they were slightly in favor of that, yes."
- Cullerton: "Because basically, what the Bill does is to say that they get to save money."
- Ryler: "They get to save money on the fact that they don't have to pay it in and then ask for it to be refunded. They were getting that same money back. It's just now they don't have to pay it in and wait for it to come back to them."
- Cullerton: "So that's called the use of money."
- Ryder: "Correct. That's what they get to use... save."
- Cullerton: "Correct. So the use of money is money."
- Ryder: "To bankers and various other astute people, that is also correct."
- Cullerton: "Right. It's right. If they don't put it in an interest bearing account, it's not any money."
- Ryder: "Correct."
- Cullerton: "And of course, then, the state doesn't have use of the money, and we do put it in interest bearing accounts."
- Ryder: "The state has always wisely used its money."
- Cullerton: "So the state loses a little money, and these guys that sell this stuff, gain it. But we passed the Bill."
- Ryder: "It was very nice of your help to get the deed accomplished."
- Cullerton: "Right. Now, Senator Etheredge has changed the Bill.

 The original Bill exempted liquid propane gas when not used as a motor fuel."
- Ryder: "Correct."
- Cullerton: "But what this Amendment does is to drop that

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

restriction so that liquid propane gas is exempted regardless of how it's used."

Ryder: "(inaudible)"

- Cullerton: "And my question is why we want to do something like that."
- Ryler: "Because the sales tax would only apply to motor fuel.

 Oh, excuse me. Prepaid sales tax. Prepaid tax only applies to motor fuel."
- Cullerton: "Oh, so this is just a clarification."
- Ryder: "I'm trying very hard, but I'm not sure I'm accomplishing that. Yes."
- Cullerton: "I see. So, you're giving us the opportunity to, second time, vote on a Bill that will benefit sellers of liquid propane gas at the expense of the state."
- Ryder: "I sincerely hope that it only takes a second time, and there's very little expense involved, and it's a fairness issue that I'm sure that everyone would appreciate, especially a fair person such as yourself."
- Cullerton: "So, you don't think it's... involves civil liberties or the right to a person's freedom of choice or anything like that? It's just basically a money Bill."
- Ryder: "Surprisingly enough, none of the people that represent groups that normally talk to me about those issues have contacted me, although I'm always anxious to meet with them on issues like this."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you for answering my questions."

Ryder: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further... Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "The question before us is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 997?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114... 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 997. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going back now to House Bill 1072, Representative Oblinger."

- Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I
 move now to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Ladv moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1072. Ts there discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?* All say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill Representative Friedrich is recognized for Motion."
- Priedrich: "Madam Speaker, I respectfully request a 30 minute recess for the purpose of a Republican Conference in Room 118 immediately."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Republicans had requested there will be immediately a Conference for all Republican Members in Room 118 for one-half hour. We will be back on the floor Session at 4:00. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House of 4:00 having arrived, the next Order of Business that the Chair would like to go to is Supplemental Calendar #1 on the Order of Nonconcurrences. We would like to go to those Bills where Members would like to refuse to recede. In your Bills other words. if you want to get into a Conference Committee, we want to get those Conference Committees going, so come up to the well and give the Clerk

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

your Bill number that appears on this Supplemental Calendar #1, and then we will go to that Order of Business as quickly as we can. Again, just those Bills that you want to refuse to recede on. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House
of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur
with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the
following Bills: Senate Bills #834, 882, 925, 1004, 1037
and 1077, action taken by the Senate June 28, 1985.
Kenneth Wright, Secretary.'"

Speaker Breslin: "Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 619, offered by Representative McNamara; 623, by Hallock and Giorgi; 624, by Curran; 625, Flowers; 626, Krska; 628, Nash et al. House Joint Resolutions 85, Kirkland; 86, Kirkland; 87, Deuchler et al."
- Senate Bill: "Representative Matijevich, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, House Resolution 619, McNamara, commends Ed Murphy. 623, Hallock - Giorgi, recognizes the Committee on Drugs and Alcohol. 624, Curran, salutes Ralph Nickell. 625, Mary Flowers, commends Renee Walker. congratulates the Sacred Heart of Jesus parish. 628, Nash - Madigan, requests the government agrees to check security. House Joint 85, Kirkland, congratulates Bill Chesbrough. House Joint 86, Kirkland, salutes the City of Elgin. House Joint 87, Deuchler, recognizes Commodore Emery of the United States Navy. Madam Speaker, I move the... the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the

64th Legislative Day
June 28, 1995
'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

General Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 622, offered by Representative
 Huff et al. Senate Joint Resolutions #47, by Braun.
 Senate Joint Resolution 48, by Ropp. Senate Joint
 Resolution 35, by Braun. Senate Joint Resolution 61, by
 Ropp. And Senate Joint Resolution 69, by Terzich."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignments. Death Resolution."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolutions 627, offered by Representative

 Nash, with respect to the memory of Chris H. Chamis."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash moves adoption of the Death A11 Resolution. those in favor say 'aye', all those In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' opposed say 'nay'. have it, and the Death Resolution is adopted. Representative Mautino in the chamber? Representative Mautino. Would you ask him to come to the well, Announcing again, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair would like to go to the Order of Nonconcurrence on Supplemental We would like to take all of those Bills in which Members intend to refuse to recede so we can Conference Committee... Conference Committees convened and going. So you... If you have a Bill on Supplemental #1 which you intend to refuse to recede, come to the well and give the number of that Bill to the Clerk. Mr. Clerk, read the Bills on Supplemental #1, and House Sponsors."
- Clerk O'Brien: "On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Bill 17, sponsored by Representative DeLeo. Senate Bill 91, House Sponsor is John Dunn. Senate Bill 92, sponsored by Representative Hastert. Senate Bill 95, by Representative Barger. Senate Bill 97, by Representative McCracken. Senate Bill 98, by Representative Currie. Senate Bill 200, by Representative Braun. Senate Bill 207. by Representative Ronan. Senate Bill 254, by Representative

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Bill 263, by Representative Richmond. Senate Bill 497, by Representative Richmond. Senate Bi11 by Representative Terzich. Senate Bill 537, by Representative O'Connell. Senate Bill 560, Representative Wojcik. 623, by ₩. Peterson. 879. by Representative Wojcik. 992, by Kubik. 984, by Anthony Senate Bill 1091, by Representative Panayotovich. Young. Senate Bill 1095, by Representative Hallock. 1111, by Senate Bill 1129, by Anthony Young. Mays. Senate Bill 1132, by Speaker Madigan and Representatives Giorgi and Senate Bill 1152, by Ewing. Senate Bill 1165, by Senate Bill 1189, by Kubik. Currie. 1267, by Hoffman. 1297, by Regan. 1289, by Parke. 1294, by Olson. 1303, by Slater, Senate Bill 1345, by Curran. Senate Bill 1388. by Wood vard. And Senate Bill 1437, by Terzich."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, would you read HR 614? Ladies and Gentlemen, would you give the Clerk your attention, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 614, offered by Representative Whereas, the Member of this chamber Mautino. especially honored and delighted to recognize and commend the outstanding achievements of one of our distinguished colleagues; and whereas, on June 8, 1985, during the commencement ceremonies, National College of Education, located in Evanston, awarded an Honorary Doctor of Public Service degree to the Honorable State Representative Richard T. Mulcahey; and whereas, Representative Mulcahey, of the 69th District, has served with honor and distinction the Illinois House of Representatives since chairing the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee for the past three years and serving on various other House Committees; and whereas, a former teacher, Representative Mulcahey is a member of the Illinois

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Education Association and a past Vice President of the Illinois Historical Society; and whereas, truly recognizing the importance of the education of our nation's prestigious source, our children, Dick Mulcahey has been justly honored through the years for his interest area, including as a recipient for the past 10 years of the Priend of Education Award from the Illinois Office of Education and the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents: and whereas, Representative Mulcahey's well-merited recognition by the National College of Education bestows great honor not only on himself but on his family, this chamber and our state, which he serves therefore. рé it resolved by the Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of the State Illinois that đо wе hereby congratulate our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Richard T. Mulcahey, on being honored with an honorary Doctor of Public Service degree from the National College of Education in Evanston, and be it further resolved that we sincerely join with colleague in commending Representative Mulcahey for his years of invaluable contributions and service to this cause of education in this state, and be it resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Representative Dick Mulcahey a formal token of our esteem."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey, now known as Dr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Take two aspirin and call my answering service in the morning. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate very much that Resolution. It was a tremendous honor on June 8, going down to Evanston at 'McGaul' Field House and receiving that degree in front of some 6,000 people. And it was a privilege and a very

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- distinct honor for me, and I shall always be grateful to the National College for it, and I'm grateful today for you for the Resolution. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I would ask leave of the House that all Members would be added as a Cosponsor to that Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "Does the Gentleman have leave? He has leave."

 Leverenz: "And then, we'll pass it."
- Speaker Breslin: "All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted unanimously. Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "We're making progress, here, Ladies and

 Gentlemen. Representative Hastert, you are recognized for
 a Motion on House Resolution 617."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. House Resolution 617 asks
 the Auditor General to make a audit on the Illinois
 Commerce Commission so we can implement the provisions of
 1021 and ask for its favorable passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "You first have to move for consideration, so the Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration of House Resolution 617. All those in say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman has leave. The Gentleman has... now has asked for passage of Resolution 617. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is. 'Shall House Resolution 617 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed... Excuse me. It takes Roll Call. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and voting 'present'. And the House Resolution 617 is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we would like to Supplemental Calendar #1, for all of those Motions in which Members which to refuse to recede in the Nonconcurrence Calendar on Supplemental #1. If you wish to refuse to recede on Supplement... on any Bill on Supplemental #1 and then get into a Conference Committee on any of those Bills listed there, please bring the number of your Bill the Clerk's well. We are compiling a list. While we are waiting for Members to come to the well to tell us what Bills they would like to have called when they wish to refuse to recede on those Bills on Supplemental #1. we will go back to the Regular Order of Concurrence on page 10 on your Calendar. At the top of the call appears House Bill 1083, Representative Panayotovich."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 House Bill 1083. House Bill 1083 was the... amending the Private Detectives' Act. It had no opponents was here in the House. The Department of R and E gave me a Amendments. Oh, I'm sorry, one Amendment to define a 'private detective', set up fees, training regulations from a 45 to 90 day period. Amendment #2 had some residency, requirements as far as fingerprints and background checks on employees and set up some elements for time search and training, and I concur. "

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur í n Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1083. Ιs there anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and... 1 and to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 1083?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments And this Bill, having #1 and 2 to House Bill 1083. received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Ladies and Gentlemen, for your information, passed. starting out today at 9:00, since that time, we have taken 89 Bills out... out of 257 just on the Concurrence Calendar. We need to get through all of these Bills today, so we are asking all Members to be prepared when you are called upon, explain the Bill Amendment as quickly as possible and then, only those who rise in opposition should be prepared to speak so that we move this along as quickly as possible. Remember, we have already... we have already discussed the original Bill at one time and passed it out of this House. The next Bill is House Bill 1086. Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"

Piel: "Madam Speaker, could I ask why all these have to be out today?"

Speaker Breslin: "I... I didn't say they all had to be out today.

We want to get through the entire Calendar today."

Piel: "Oh, okay, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, for what reason do you rise?"

Johnson: "Since... Since we're setting the mood of the Body, I don't disagree with the fact that we ought to consider legislation in due time, but the fact that we voted on these at one time doesn't mean that there can't be dramatic and 180 degree changes in the original legislation, and so,

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

I think it's equally important, if not more important now, to find out what the Senate did to out Bill and what kind of concept we had before us before we vote on final passage. So, I don't want to... I don't want to, at the price of expediency, move through these things to the neglect of the merits of the issues."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Chair certainly agrees with you, Sir.

 Okay. The next Bill is House Bill 1086, Representative
 Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1096. It simply puts July 1 as the effective date on the Bill, which was the request of the State Board of Education."
- Speaker Breslin: "What does the original Bill do?"
- Mulcahey: "The original Bill includes transportation, service, salaries and related building maintenance costs without limitation as allowable to direct costs for transportation reimbursement purposes to elementary school... high schools throughout the state. It passed out of the House and the Senate. It did not have an effective date, and they want an effective on there."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to... The Gentleman moves concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1086. there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. 'Shall this House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1086?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1086. And this Bill. having received the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1104, Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate... House Bill 10... 1104 dealt with the... the supervisor of assessments, said that the appointed supervisor of assessments had to have the same qualifications as an elected supervisor of assessments. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which is just some technical grammatical changes in the language."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1104. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1104? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This... And the House does concur in Senate Amendment ... Representative Mulcahey votes 'aye'. There are, therefore, 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate #1 to House Bill 1104. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 1111, Representative Roman or Bowman. Representative Bowman. Explain the Bill and the Amendment... both Amendments."
- Bowman: "Wait a minute. Madam Speaker, I think maybe we should take this out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 1117,

 Representative Keane. Explain the Bill and the Amendment.

 Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 1117 amends the School Code. It deals with the ability of the Chicago

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers' Union to enter into a three year contract up to a multi-year contract. That's the way it left here. All the Senate did was put on an effective immediate date, and I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 1117."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 1117. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all Voting is open. those opposed vote 'no'. This is final passage of House Bill 1117. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 112 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1117. And this Bill. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1142. Representative Brookins. Representative Brookins."
- Brookins: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in the Amendment of House Bill 1142. House Bill 1142 requires the Comptroller to conducts before revoking or refusing to issue a trustee funeral director's license. The Amendment only says that they do not have to disclose a full credit report."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1142. On the question, the
 Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Priedrich: "I'm trying to figure why the Comptroller should have anything to do with the licensing of funeral directors. I thought you were licensed by Registration and Education."

Brookins: "They license the Funeral and Burial Trust Act, which

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

is the money which a funeral director puts up when he makes pre-needs."

Friedrich: "Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1142? A11 favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1142. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1177. Representative Ronan OΓ Leverenz. Representative Ronan. Out of the record. House Bill 1202, Representative Klemm. Tell us about the Bill and the Amendment."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. 1202 is the solar energy credit Bill. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the amount of credit from 2,000 to a \$1,000 maximum, and I move its adoption and concur with Senate Amendment #1."

"The Gentleman moves to concur in Speaker Breslin: Amendment #1 to House Bill 1202. And on that question. the Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell, standing in opposition. No? He waives it. All those... The 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment question is. #1 to House Bill 1202?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final Representative DeJaegher? passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. there are 104 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 1202. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill 1204, Representative Ryder. Explain the Bill and the Amendment."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Bill transfers certain real estate from the mental health facility in Jacksonville to the City of Jacksonville for maintenance. The Amendment placed on in the Senate is with the Department of Transportation for certain changes and modifications in drainage, which is agreed to, and I would move to concur."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1204. And on that question, is
there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "This exempts a parcel of land that was originally planned to be transferred to the City of Jacksonville?"

Ryder: "That's correct, Representative The parcel that is exempted will be used by the Department of Transportation to make a road improvement to increase safety at an intersection. It is coming off the corner of the property to be conveyed, and it will not interfere with the intended uses."

Cullerton: "What about the original Bill that authorized transfer of property for a dollar?"

Ryder: "That remains in effect."

Cullerton: "And could you tell me why it's only a dollar?"

Ryder: "That was a nominal amount that was selected at the time that it was drafted."

Cullerton: "Alrighty. And this authorizes the Director of Mental
Health to give land to the City of Jacksonville, and it's
going to be used as a city park?"

Ryder: "In... That is correct, but in addition, part of the requirement is that it remain fully accessible to the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

residents at the developmental center so that they may continue to use it, since it is a park setting at this time."

Cullerton: "And what is the... So right now, the... the state owns it, and the state maintains it."

Ryder: "Correct. At the state's cost."

Cullerton: "Cuts the grass and everything."

Ryder: "Correct."

Cullerton: "And so, we're going to get a dollar, plus we're going to have..."

Ryder: "You're going to have full use of it, and no expense."

Cullerton: "And the city will have to do the... cut the grass."

Ryder: "Correct. And the city also cannot alter it within certain restrictions without the approval of the Director of the Department of Mental Health."

Cullerton: "So this is a good deal. This is a good deal for the... for the state."

Ryder: "Well, it's a good deal for the state and for the developmental center and obviously for the City of Jacksonville."

Cullerton: "Do you think... Do you think we could have gotten a little more than a dollar out of them?"

Ryder: "I didn't do that negotiation. I'm certain that the... "Cullerton: "You're passing the Bill for them."

Ryder: "That's... "

Cullerton: "You're a State Representative. You... "

Ryder: "That's the best that I could do, but in that city, that's not bad."

Cullerton: "Is that in your district?"

Ryder: "Last time I checked, it was still. Did you have a desire to change it?"

Cullerton: "Yeah, we want Representative Gross to be from that district."

64th Legislative Day June 28, 1985

Ryder: "Guess we'll have to wait another year and a half."

Cullerton: "Alright. Go ahead."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment House Bill 1204? All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ጥክል Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And this House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 1204. and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back on this same page, to Representative Ronan's Bill. House Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I
 move to concur with Senate Bill... Senate Amendments #1 and
 2 to House Bill !!!!. This is part of the infrastructure
 program we put together. Both of these Amendments were
 Amendments that we added to the... the House... the Senate
 Bills when they were over here, the requests from the
 Governor's Office of Planning, the Bureau of the Budget,
 and the Capital Development Board. I'll be glad to answer
 any questions concerning Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House
 Bill !!!!."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1111. And on that
 question, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Is this the Democratic response to Build Illinois,
 Representative?"
- Roman: "No, Representative McCracken. This is an opportunity for you to vote for some good government this Session. With your voting record, my advice is to jump on board."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

McCracken: "I must have misidentified it. Sorry."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1111? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final action. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1111. And this having received the Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. House Bill 1177, Representative Bonan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I
move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1111.

This is the nurse... Excuse me, House Bill 1177. This is
the Nurse Baccalaureate Assistance Program. This Amendment
is a request from the Department of Public Health dealing
with the repayment formula. It's a reasonable, rational
request by the Department of Public Health. I agree to it,
and I move for concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 1111 and final action."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1177. Does anyone stand in
opposition? Representative Preston."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Preston: "Representative Ronan, are the nurses in agreement with this Amendment?"

Ronan: "Yes, Representative Preston. This is a nurse

Amendment... nurse agreed to Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the... the answer is yes, Representative Preston. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill !177?'

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and none 'present', and the House does concur in... Representative Stern wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1177. And this Bill, received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 1208, Representative Pangle. Explain the Bill and then the Amendment."

Pangle: "... Madam Speaker. The Bill is one that allows nonprofit organizations to set up a coffee at rest stops and so forth. The... Amendment #1 makes it that it has to be a national recognized holiday and that the Department of Transportation approves for sufficient parking. I move for... "

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate #1 to House Bill 1208. Is there any discussion? Amendment Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Amendment #1 to House Bill 1208? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Representative Tate votes 'aye'. There are, therefore, 113 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received... And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1212, Representative Cullerton."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and... Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1212. House Bill 1212 is permissive legislation allowing the county board to pay a public defender up to 100 percent of the compensation that's paid by the State's Attorney and prohibits them from engaging in the private practice of law. if they do receive this extra money. The Amendment that the Senate put on is really kind of minor. right now, counties of less than 35,000, they can, by resolution, create an office of public defender. All the Amendment does is increase that to 50.000. So I would be happy to concur with Senator Donahue's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Amendment #1 50 House Bill 1212. Does anyone stand in opposition? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #12 (sic - #1) to House 1212?1 All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed Voting is open. This is final action. Have who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk voted will take the record. On this question, there 113 voting 'aye'. 2 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this... And the House does concur in Senate And this Bill, having received the House Bill 1212. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1258, Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill amends the Tax
Anticipation Note Act in relation to the amount of such
notes which may be issued interest rates in the manner of
refunding the notes. I would like to nonconcur in Senate
Amendment #1. As it's stated, it's... there are some
inconsistencies in the Bill, I would like to send it to a
Conference Committee."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1258. And on the question, the

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Is the... Is it the intention for this Bill to go to

a Conference Committee, or for Senator Weaver to recede?"

Kirkland: "Conference Committee."

Cullerton: "And what's going to be on the Bill?"

Kirkland: "Well, we are going... What happened was, there is language in the Bill regarding levying for the amount necessary for payment of interest costs and cost of issuance. The Bill was amended to take that out, but at least as I understand it at this point, it only came out of part of the Bill. We're now trying to determine among the parties who are interested in it whether they would like it totally in the Bill or totally out of the Bill."

Cullerton: "Which Amendment was it that made that change, a House
Amendment or a Senate Amendment?"

Kirkland: "Senate Amendment."

Cullerton: "So the Senate Amendment was not just technical?"

Kirkland: "Well, yeah. In effect, the Senate Amendment was technically incorrect in that it attempted to make a change but only made part of the change."

Cullerton: "I see."

Kirkland: "Okay."

Cullerton: "Alright. Thank you."

Kirkland: "Alright."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur...

Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

Bill 1258? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed

say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have

it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House Bill 1258. House Bill 1265. Out of the record. House Bill 1301, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 1301 is one of the normal JCAR Bills requiring various state departments and agencies to adopt rules pertaining to their functions. Senate Amendments were ones agreed to by the departments involved and by the JCAR staff. I would... Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate #1 and 2 to House Bill 1301. Amendment and on the question. the Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Representative, this Senate Amendment #2 seems to deal with the nurses' assistance program."

McMaster: "Yes. Would you like me to explain it further?"

Cullerton: "Did you mention that at all?"

McMaster: "No, I guess I didn't. I said that they were Amendments agreed to by the people involved and by the JCAR staff, John."

Cullerton: "Pine. That's good enough for me."

McMaster: "Is that good enough?"

Cullerton: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment s #1 and 2 to House Bill 1301?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1301. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

passed. Representative Greiman in the Chair."

- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1265. Ms. Breslin."
- Braslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1265 amends the Code of Civil Procedure and authorizes the Illinois Supreme Court to establish a mandatory court annex to arbitration system. Senate Amendment #1 specifies that these arbitration systems shall be adapted to each judicial circuit. The Amendment is put on at the request of the Chicago Bar Association and is agreed to by the Supreme Court. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from LaSalle moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1265. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will."
- Hawkinson: "Representative, a question about what the Amendment means. Does it mean that programs ought to be developed for each circuit, or only that if this program is to be instituted, that it somehow be adapted to the existing circuit?"
- Breslin: "It means if a program should be suggested for a particular circuit, that it be adapted to that particular circuit. It is not required."
- Hawkinson: "And at this time... "
- Breslin: "It is not required. At this time, it is anticipated that only Cook County would have such a mandatory arbitration system."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

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

Cullerton: "Is... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Cullerton: "Does... Does this, in effect, have the... say that counties have to opt into the program?"

Breslin: "No, it does not."

Cullerton: "Okay, so ... "

- Breslin: "The Supreme Court has complete authority by rule to decide whether or not the county will have... or the circuit will have a mandatory arbitration system, and this..."
- Cullerton: "Oh, so it's up... it's up to the Supreme Court to decide."
- Breslin: "Absolutely, it is. All this does is request or direct the Supreme Court to adapt to the needs of each judicial circuit. The real reason for it is that the individual bar associations would like to have input into the process. So, this is the language that the Supreme Court agreed to, to guarantee that they will have input into whatever system is developed."
- Cullerton: "Okay, so the Supreme... The Supreme Court's not going
 to impose mandatory arbitration unless and until the
 individual counties have agreed, in fact, to doing it."
- Breslin: "Well, it's not a matter of agreement, it's a matter of bringing them into the process as they are setting up the system. Remember, we don't want to infringe on the... the rights of the judiciary, here. So, the Supreme Court really has complete authority, here."
- Cullerton: "Right. Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "No further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1265?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this will be

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby... I'm sorry. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1265. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1317. Mr. Mr. Hartke."

- Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House
 Bill 1317 completely exempts the state sales tax from the
 farm machinery parts and pieces costing less than \$1,000.

 It also defines 'gasohol'. Senate Bill... Amendment... or
 Senate Amendment #1 changes the wording from 'domestic' to
 'cereal grain'. I move for concurrence with Senate
 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham moves that the House does... do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317?' All in favor 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? Mr. McCracken to explain his vote."
- McCracken: "Thank you. I'm sorry, I meant to get in on the debate. I'm told the Governor's Office opposes this, and frankly, I don't understand the issue entirely, but I thought I'd bring that to the attention of our side of the aisle."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted... Well. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1318, Mr. Giglio."

- Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House...

 House Bill 1318 was a Bill that the Towing Association of
 Illinois asked for as a little cleanup Bill with the
 Illinois Motor Carrier Act, and what Senate Amendment #1
 does was to explain what the emergency transportation of a
 wreck of accidently disabled vehicle is, and I move for the
 concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1318."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1318. And on that, there being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment House Bill 1318? All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in House Bill 13. . . does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1318. this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1335, Ms. Flowers."
- Plowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335. House Bill 1335 amends the Public Aid Code by, first, requiring notice to be posted in all public aid offices that describe the rights of clients in courteous treatment and to appeal denial of aid. The second

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

provision of House Bill 1335 extends public aid benefits to maximum extent possible extended followed by federal provide medical coverage law. It would for recipients who have left the welfare roll to take lower paying jobs that do not include health benefits. benefits would not be provided in the case of former recipients who have secure jobs that pay a sufficient amount. So. they may... so that they are beyond the so called earned income category. And I move for your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Flowers, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335.

 And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she'll yield for a question."
- McCracken: "What is the point at which the earned income amount is significantly greater so that the assistance is not provided? How much of a change between the initial level and the point at which you do not come under this disregard income formula?"
- Plowers: "It would depend on what you... what your family income if you were on aid and how many kids you would have. So, it would make a difference."
- McCracken: "Okay. Do you... Have you been advised relative to a potential fiscal impact on this?"
- Flowers: "This study has been done... It would be federally reimbursed, but the Department has not given a fiscal note as to the actually amount."
- McCracken: "Alright. My understanding... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that it's a federal matching program. I don't think it's a reimbursement program, and I'm advised that the cost is very substantial in the millions of dollars. I think our side, at least, should be

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

· aware of that and leave it at that. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Piel: "Mary, basically, what this is doing, correct me if I'm wrong, it stretches it out for an additional three months.

In other words, the people... the recipients presently have nine months and this would stretch this out to a year?"

Flowers: "It would stretch it to six extra months."

Piel: "Six extra months?"

Plowers: "Six extra months."

Piel: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I would, you know, reluctantly stand in opposition because of the additional cost. And you know, what the previous speaker mentioned in opposition, this is going to cost. And the figure that we've got, is that it is going to cost a minimum of three million dollars a year in extra funds. And it's not a situation where the people are not being taken care of, but it is a situation to where ... You know, I would feel that, you know, nine months seems at the present time to be long enough when we're sitting here trying to put money education one thing and another, and \$3,000,000 a year can. you know, do a lot for the education area. And so, I would ask for a 'no' vote on this."

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

Dunn: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of concurrence in this situation. The Amendment, which is Senate Amendment #1, is the Amendment which incorporates the provisions of a Bill which was approved by an 8 to 0 vote in the Human Services Committee of this chamber. It is a House Bill, House Bill 1865. House Bill 1865 was lost because it did not get

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the deadline for House Bills on May 24th. called before What this Bill does is to provide an opportunity for want to work to do so when if this Bill doesn't pass. they'll have to go on welfare. This Bill amends the Public Aid Code in relation to medical assistance eligibility requirements and permits the state to exercise its full Medicaid option to cover cases under the aid to dependent aid to aged, blind and disabled. children, These programs by disregarding the earned income up to the maximum allowed by federal law. What this means now is that we can That's what it really means, and we help the working poor. have more and more of them in this state. As we know, income levels are declining. We have more and more work and we have a large number of people who are struggling, struggling to pay their bills. to to be law abiding citizens, to be contributing, productive citizens. And Amendment #1 would allow them to medical assistance through the Department of Public Aid. I would ask for your concurrence with regard to legislation. This is not a cost. There was a speaker that talked about a cost. This is an investment. Anvone we can keep off the welfare rolls is someone saved productive taxpaying citizen. This is an investment future of taxpaying citizens, and I would respectfully request an 'aye' vote on this concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335."

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of this fine piece of legislation. The Federal Government will reimburse back to the State of Illinois those dollars that are expended. And I just think that in talking with staff, there is a good possibility that there may even be a savings for the state in regard to this piece

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

of legislation. So, I stand in support of it. And I think all of us should vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Flowers, to close."
- Plowers: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to concur on House Bill 1335. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question there are 76 voting 'aye', 31 record. voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1353, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins."
- Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1353 provides the General Assembly with the mechanics to which it may appropriate money to public museums of this state for capital improvement. The Amendment to 1353 is the law as presently provided are written money appropriation for the General Assembly to museums. This will be... make it possible to appropriate monies to some forty museums across the State of Illinois. And I ask for your concurrence in this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1353. And on that, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman would yield for a question." Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he'll yield for a question."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Vinson: "Now, what is it exactly that this does for public aid?"

Brookins: "This is a museum Bill, not a public aid Bill."

Vinson: "Okay, would you explain to me what it does?"

Brookins: "It allows the General Assembly to provide money to museums across the State of Illinois for capital

improvements."

Vinson: "For capital improvements of museums?"

Brookins: "To museums."

Vinson: "Statewide?"

Brookins: "Statewide."

Vinson: "Now, what's the Senate Amendment do?"

Brookins: "Repeat?"

Vinson: "What does the Senate Amendment do?"

Brookins: "The Senate Amendment added some of the forty museums to it. Such museums as museums in Springfield, Illinois, and Batavia, Nomence, Rockford, Glencoe, forty some museums

across the State of Illinois."

Vinson: "Okay, now..."

Brookins: "Clinton also. Kenny, also. DeKalb, Elmhurst,
Evanston..."

Vinson: "Keep running through the list."

Brookins: "Kankakee, Libertyville, Peoria."

Vinson: "How about Farmer City? How about Farmer City?"

Brookins: "Where?"

Vinson: "Farmer City?"

Brookins: "Farmer City. One second. Pekin, Brookfield, Elgin."

Vinson: "Farmer City. Farmer City, what about it?"

Brookins: "Joliet, Freeport."

Vinson: "What about Farmer City?"

Brookins: "Glen Ellyn, Libertyville."

Vinson: "Can you tell me about Farmer City?"

Brookins: "Addison, Bloomington. There are two in Decatur."

Vinson: "Can you tell me about Farmer City?"

64th Legislative Day June 28, 1985

Brookins: "I don't even know where Farmer City is."

Vinson: "What about... Is this the Bill that... Isn't there some new museum in Chicago that was just opened?"

Brookins: "No."

Vinson: "There's not."

Brookins: "No."

Vinson: "Well, I'd heard that there was. Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Howard, Amendment 1 just allows the state to contribute and
support capital projects in public museums. Is that
correct?"

Brookins: "That is correct."

Tate: "And how much money do you anticipate... Is there a companion appropriation Bill for this?"

Brookins: "Not at present."

Tate: "Do you have any idea... do you have any specific projects that were in mind that Senator Smith had in mind for this?"

Brookins: "I'm the originator of this Bill. In 'Build Illinois',
the Governor speaks of museums and improving our museums
and the capital improvement of our museums. And this is
what this Bill is about."

Tate: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I guess to the Concurrence Motion. What this Amendment does is put the state into a new business of supporting capital projects for museums throughout the state. It certainly doesn't indicate how much money and what financial commitment we have in this state. It's one of those issues that I think the Members should be aware of and be sure and know what they're voting on."

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

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

Representative..."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield."

McCracken: "Thank you. Representative, how does the Amendment change the House Bill? Is it as simple as it looks, the operations, programs, and capital development of public museums?"

Brookins: "It just expands it a little bit."

McCracken: "Pardon me?"

Brookins: "It expands it a little bit."

McCracken: "It just transferred it?"

Brookins: "It expands it. 'Expands'. Make it larger, stretch, bigger."

McCracken: "Under current law, does this same Department have this responsibility?"

Brookins: "They're just using it for operating now."

McCracken: "Okay. Now, this allows operations, programs and capital development. So, that's a new authority under this Bill?"

Brookins: "Yes."

McCracken: "But under the same Department?"

Brookins: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. Does this implicate or is there an appropriations Bill pending? Okay. How much? \$3,000,000?"

Brookins: "About \$20,000,000 I've been told."

McCracken: "\$2,000,000?"

Brookins: "\$20,000,000."

McCracken: "\$20,000,000? \$20,000,000 in this year's budget?

Pretty soon we'll be talking about real money. Okay, it's

20,000,000 bucks. \$20,000,000, thank you."

Brookins: "Mr. McCracken, the Chairman of Appropriations I

Committee will be checking that."

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

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker "The Gentleman from Effingham moves the previous... the main question be put. Those in favor sav 'ave', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question be put. Mr. to close."
- Brookins: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this
 vote, that we do concur in this Amendment. It will help
 museums across the whole State of Illinois."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1353?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Leverenz, to explain his vote, one minute."
- Leverenz: "I do believe I gave you a bad figure. It is not \$20,000,000. The number is coming down right now. It might be closer to the two that you've said at the outset. We have the list of all of the museums and the amounts. I believe it would be closer to what you're talking about. I was way out of line on that one. I encourage your green vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie, one minute to explain your Currie: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker and Members of the House. don't know why people are having trouble voting for good Bill. Яe presently have a program of direct state support for public museums. This Bill merely expands the authority of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources include some capital projects at those museums within its opportunity, Nothing will be spent under this don't choose to spend. The point is. the Department is already helping to support these public This Bill merely expands the kinds of things the Department may support at these very same public museums."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel, one minute to explain your vote."

Piel: "Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask him a question during debate, but... because our analysis says that the initial Bill, which I do not feel the Amendment changed it, asks for 2.5 million dollars for DuSable Museum in Chicago. And I believe that, you know, with the added Senate Amendment, he's asking for more money to be spent on other areas. And I would ask for a 'no' vote and if it should receive the 60 votes needed for passage, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Hr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. It is my understanding that the outlay of funds is not all totally at this time. This is a good piece of legislation. It allows them to, possibly, use approximately 2,000,000 in capital funds for their repairs on this museum. And I do believe its time has come and I would certainly appreciate a couple more green votes on behalf of this legislation...

DuSable Museum in Chicago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. We have an outstanding number of museums in the Chicago area which many of us and myself included always support the funding for it because they are statewide institutions, but we have to travel to the Chicago area to visit those facilities. This legislation has a little bit of something in it for everybody all over downstate Illinois and has... as has been indicated by previous speakers. What this legislation does is say that in addition to operating grants, there are to be some provisions for capital grants. Your people back home will like this. Everyone has some item of interest in their own home territory, something about which we are

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

We have a little museum. proud. We come to it in the summer or the fall. We take our children to it. We're proud of it. We're proud of our local heritage. This is it is displayed. where This Bill has a little bit of something in it for all of us all over the State of Illinois. Everyone should support this Bill. We need more green votes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'.

And Mr. Piel, do you persist in your request for a verification? Mr. Clerk. Yes, Mr. Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, just... let's wait until we get the
Roll Call out. Mr. Piel, Mr. Dunn requests leave to be
verified. Mr. Piel. Mr. Piel says you may be verified.
Mr. Clerk, verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Berrios. Braun. Breslin. Brookins. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Kirkland. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. Nash. Panayotovich. Pangle. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Turner. Van Duyne. Washington. White. Vitek. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Soliz, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Soliz asks leave to be verified, Mr. Piel. Mr. Soliz, you have leave. Mr. Piel, questions of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Piel."

Piel: "We are starting with what, Mr. Speaker, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Piel: "May I ask what we're starting with?"

Speaker Greiman: "64 votes."

Piel: "Thank you. Representative Berrios."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Berrios. Representative Berrios is in the middle aisle."

Piel: "Representative Brunsvold."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brunsvold is back near the back door."

Piel: "Representative Curran."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Curran. Mr. Curran is right there at the back door."

Piel: "Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeLeo is in his chair as always."

Piel: "Representative Flinn."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Well, remove Mr. Plinn, then."

Piel: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning, I asked Bepresentative Berrios. Was he here, I'm sorry?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Berrios is... was... is here and now you've already verified him. And he's still here."

Piel: "Thank you. Thank you. That's good."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Nr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, can I be recorded as 'aye' and verified?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. O'Connell goes from 'present' to 'aye' and asks leave to be verified. You have leave, Sir."

Piel: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio is right there at his chair."

Piel: "Representative Krska."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Krska. Mr. Krska in the chamber? Mr.

Krska. How is Mr. Krska recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Krska."

Piel: "Representative Laurino."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Laurino. Mr. Phelps, for what purpose do you rise?"

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I be recorded as voting 'aye', please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Phelps goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr.
McNamara asks leave to be verified. You have leave, Mr.
McNamara. Mr. Piel, proceed."

Piel: "Had we removed Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Greiman: "We have removed Representative Laurino."

Piel: "Thank you. Representative Hartke."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hartke is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Nash."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative who?"

Piel: "Nash."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Nash."

Piel: "Representative Panayotovich."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Panayotovich."

Piel: "Representative McGann."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann did you say?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Piel: "McGann. Bepresentative McGann."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann. Is Mr. McGann in the chamber?

He's right here at the well."

Piel: "I see him. Representative..."

Speaker Greiman: "He's embracing his fellow funeral director."

Piel: "Representative Pangle."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle is in his chair. Mr. Ronan asks
leave to be verified. Mr. Ronan, you have leave. Mr.
Hicks asks leave to be verified. Mr. Hicks, you have
leave. Mr. Kulas asks leave to be verified. Mr. Kulas,
you have leave. Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Representative Mautino."

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

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Mautino."

Piel: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey is in the rear of the chamber."

Piel: "Did Representative Phelps ask to be verified?"

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon? Who?"

Piel: "Did Representative Phelps ask to be verified?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Phelps?"

Piel: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Phelps just voted 'aye'."

Pial: "Well, I know he voted 'aye', but he has to be verified.

He's off the floor."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, he's still here. Would you like to verify him? He's..."

Piel: "No, I see him for a change."

Speaker Greiman: "He's at his desk."

Piel: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Rea is in his chair."

Piel: "Representative Roman."

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ronan was... had leave to be verified."

Piel: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Van Duyne is in his chair. The problem is that Mr. Regan still needs a picture to identify the Democrats after six months. Proceed."

Piel: "Well, we have those problems every once in a while.

Representative LeFlore."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. LeFlore is standing right at his desk."

Piel: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz. is coming in the back door. He has his hand up. His hand is up there. Proceed. Mr. Nash has returned to the chamber. Return Mr. Nash to the Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Piel. Mr. Kirkland goes from 'aye' to 'no'."

Piel: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Mautino has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Mautino to the Roll Call. Yes, I've already put Mr. Nash back on the Roll Call. On this question there are 61 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1353. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1356, Mr. Farley."

Parley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1356. What the Amendment does is just make a technical change to clarify the Bill's original intent.

And I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley, moves for the... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1356. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1356?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1356. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Pulton, Mr. Homer, on a Motion."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to make a Motion with respect to House Resolution 202, which was adopted earlier today. In fact, one of the first items of business this morning. Having voted on the prevailing side of that Motion... or that Resolution, I would now move to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 202 was adopted and I would further move to recommit House Resolution 202 to the House Labor and Commerce Committee on the Order of Interim Study."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Pulton, Nr. Homer, having voted on the prevailing side, moves that the House... vote to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 202 was adopted and that the Bill then... that the Resolution thereafter be commended to the Interim Study Committee of the Labor and Commerce Committee. And on that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Marshall, Ms. Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur in Representative Homer's Motion to recommit this to the Committee on Labor and Commerce. It was introduced in March early this year after we, in the central Illinois area, had just missed an opportunity to have a Chrysler mini van plant located in our area. There were successful Resolutions passed in both the Congress and it was supported by the President of Chrysler, Lee Iaccoca,

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

at the time. And while we were disappointed at losing that, there are other opportunities that are now being interested in our area. The Resolution has lost its timeliness and while I support your votes, I do support Representative Homer's Motion also. Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hawkinson, the Gentleman from Knox."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of this Motion. I think that the timing was ill-advised and it is wise to reconsider it."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the Motion to reconsider... Yes, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "What are we talking about?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Davis, at this... you'd ask that at this late of time."
- Davis: "What's the Resolution? What's the Resolution. What's the Resolution?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Davis asks leave to... for questioning.

 He'll yield for a question, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "The Japan Resolution. An anti-Japan Resolution? Is that what this is?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the Motion prevail?' 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 move to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 202 is adopted and the Bill is committed to the Interim Study Calendar of the Committee on Labor and Commerce. Now, on the Order of Concurrences, page 11 on the Calendar, appears House Bill 1362. Mr. Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1362 dealt with pawn shops and the original Bill dealt with the provisions stating that a police officer should inform a pawn broker that he cannot deal with a thief. And we change that thief to... from larceny to thief. And the Senate Amendment

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

simply made clarifying language which made the Bill better in my estimations. And I would move for concurrence on Senate Amendment 1 to 1362."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Rock Island moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1362. on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #12* All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Inot. Voting is now open and this is final action. vote Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'ave', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1362. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the οf Order Concurrences appears House Bill 1382, Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I move that the House concur with Amendment number... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1382. The original Bill increased the amount οf construction contracts that must be left to lowest... responsible bidder from 4,000 to 5,000. This is putting municipalities in the same position as many other units of government. Amendment made a slight change and it included in addition to construction contracts by 2/3 vote of the council, it included public improvement and maintenance contracts by a vote authorized by four of the five council members selected. I move for its... for concurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Jackson moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1382. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

All in favor signify by voting 'aye' #121 those opposed Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye'... 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 'present'. Bill, and this having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, the House having concurred in Senate Amendment #1. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1395, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395. This is an issue we debated yesterday and to reacquaint everybody with it, House Bill 1395 extends to park districts the authority previously granted to school districts and community college districts which provides a five cent levy for life safety. The Senate Amendment provided for a complete front door referendum. The Bill, in its original form as passed the House, provided for nickel levy and then from five to ten cents by front door referendum. I had mentioned yesterday that this Bill in scope and far more limited than that authority given to school districts and community college districts the nature of the operations of these particular local governments is far different than school districts and community college districts. It is a limited levy that provides for life safety where a board of a park district is required by law or regulation to alter or facilities or if the board determines that such alteration is required for health and safety, for things handicapped accessibility, for environmental protection, et And in terms of limitations, there has to be, number one, a subjective finding by this park district that

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

there is a lack of sufficient funds and there has to be certified estimate of an engineer architect that the expenditure will be \$25,000 or over. This is to prevent frivolous types of expenditures. This is a situation where are seeking to assist park districts in meeting unexpected costs that in most cases, we mandate upon them and that they have very little trouble with except by saying, please, give us the assistance to take care of these because park districts do not have bonding authority that school districts and community college districts have. This is an opportunity for them to levy for that particular purpose, for that particular project. They cannot issue bonds and have the levy be ongoing. I should also mention that when the project is completed, the levy for purpose, then, is abolished. I would now renew my Motion, Mr. Speaker, to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, moves that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Piel: I would just like to bring to the Body's attention this is the Bill that we soundly defeated yesterday. the Sponsor wants to do... the way the Bill is right it's a front door referendum. What he wants to do is take the front door referendum provision off. So, we're talking about a back door referendum. This Bill, presently, the move for the nonconcurrence is opposed by the know. Parm Bureau, the Taxpayers Federation, the Illinois Association of Realtors. They're all opposed to this man's Motion. and I would ask for a sounding 'no' vote on his Motion."

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

64th Legislative Day June 28, 1985

Olson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Olson: "I'm looking at an analysis, Terry, just for my own mind.

Has the Farm Bureau removed their opposition to this in

view of the front door referendum?"

Steczo: "Representative Olson, they have not. I have tried to explain that in terms of the other units of local government that have this authority, this is far поте limited in scope because of the... in particular, the situation where park districts cannot levy... issue bonds and have the levy for life safety be ongoing to pay off the They don't have that authority. limited in scope to a certain amount of money per year. I think. However. philosophically, the Farm Bureau's opposed. So, they have not removed their opposition."

Olson: "Thank you. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair... All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Goodness. Mr. Steczo, to explain your vote."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, to make the appropriate Motion after this Roll Call is over. I think I've seen the light."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, on this question there are 15 voting 'aye', 101 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the Motion to nonconcur fails. Yes, Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The newest member of the Century Club would now move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395. And on that, is there any discussion? Well, there being none, the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', 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 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. the Senate does... and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1395. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears Senate... House Bill 1411. The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. appears Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. House 1411 amends the Physical Fitness Services Act. The original Bill provided in part that a customer days after signing a contract in which to cancel and receive a refund. The Senate added Senate Amendment #1 in which I move to concur which reduce from seven to three, the number of days after signing a contract within which customer may cancel. The agreed Amendment has been agreed between the Representatives of the health clubs and service centers and the Attorney General's Office who oversees their activity and who is the original promoter of this I would ask for legislation. your joining in concurrence to Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1411. There being no dis... Mr. Cullerton, the Gentleman from Cook, on the concurrence Motion."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cullerton: "How does the Senate change the Bill with regard to the right to rescind your contract?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Homer: "Alright, the... the right to rescind the contract? Would you amplify on your question?"

Cullerton: "Yes. The Bill that... as we passed it, dealt with
the issue of the right to rescind a contract, the right of
a consumer to rescind a contract and as I understand it, he
had seven days to rescind his contract."

Homer: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Seven calendar days, right?"

Homer: "Correct."

Cullerton: "And this makes it three business days, right?"

Homer: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Now, is that viewed as a change designed to give more time to the consumer?"

Homer: "Well, it depends, I suppose, on what day he signed the contract. If he signed the contract in the early part of the week, it would reduce the number of days. If he signed it on a Friday or a long weekend, I suppose, it would be the same number of days."

Cullerton: "So, the rationale, then, behind that, what would you think it might be?"

Homer: "The rationale behind the ... "

Cullerton: "The change of Senator Zito?"

Homer: "The rationale behind that Amendment is very clear. It became an agreed Bill with that Amendment."

Cullerton: "Okay. How about the second part... the House Bill required that the customer had to use the center twice before he had the right to cancel. Is that right?"

Homer: "Well, yes. And the Senate Amendment, Representative Cullerton, deleted the requirement that a customer have used the center in order to cancel. So, it's no longer... the recision provision no longer has a condition precedent that the customer had used the center."

Cullerton: "Okay, now, would you characterize that change as one

- 64th Legislative Day

 June 28, 1985

 designed to make it easier to cancel? Is that a consumer

 protection..."
- Homer: "That... that... that could be construed, yes, as a consumer protection requirement... Well, because, otherwise, if... let's suppose that the customer wanted to rescind under the original Bill. Before he could do that, he, first of all, had to use the center. And so, by deleting that requirement..."
- Cullerton: "He had to use it twice. He had to go back even if he didn't like it the first time."
- Homer: "He had to make sure that he didn't like it before he could rescind. So by removing that, we're taking a pro consumer step in protecting that consumer further than the original Bill."
- Cullerton: "In fact, the House Bill that you sponsored was almost silly with regard to that provision, because it would have required before someone had the right to rescind for someone to go to the facility twice. Even after they didn't like it, they'd have to go back and get another rub down or whatever they got there."
- Homer: "No, I've never... I've never... I would never allow my name to be associated with a silly Bill."
- Cullerton: "But you're concurring with the Amendment that changed it, aren't you?"
- Homer: "Well, yes, I am. I think it makes it a very fine piece of legislation in... and even perfected what was already in the House a very excellent legislative effort."
- Cullerton: "Pine. Well, thank you for answering my questions."

 Speaker Greiman: "Being no further discussion, the question is,

 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

 Bill 1411?' All those in favor 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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill !4!1. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 14!3, the Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank Mr. Speaker. This... House Bill 1413 amends you, the Criminal Justice Information Act regarding membership the Criminal Justice Information Board of Commission. And the original Bill provided that with respect to the Attorney General's position on that Commission, that the Attorney General would have the right to designate another individual to serve in his or her stud. When the Bill went the Senate, it was further amended to remove from the Commission the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, a Justice of the Supreme Court and a Judge of an Illinois Circuit Court designated by the Chief Justice the Illinois Supreme Court. So, three Judges who have - it turned out that the Judiciary did not wish to participate on the Commission - requested this additional Amendment in the Senate, and I would move to concur then, with Amendment #4. #

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1413. And on that, there being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1413?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1413. And this Bill, having

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1436, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 1436 implements the recommendations of the Governor's Chemical Safety This is a bipartisan Bill, you may recall, we sent Porce. over to the Senate as a shell to incorporate the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force. And with Senate Amendment #1, sponsored in the Senate bу and Rigney, that objective is accomplished. Very briefly, what the Amendment provides is for the establishment of a chemical safety contingency plan to be implemented by July 1, 1986. The Bill specifies certain minimum requirements of what must be in the plan, including listing of the chemicals handled at the facility; the procedures to be followed in the case of an emergency; arrangements with local emergency response agencies and a list of emergency equipment at the facility. It spells out what businesses, what categories of industrial businesses are covered by this requirement. It provides that copies of these reports... these plans must be submitted to local fire, police and other emergency response agency. requires the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency to adopt rules and regs identifying local emergency response agencies and establish minimum requirements for coordinating emergency response procedures with local emergency agencies. It requires the affected companies to educate their employees on emergency response procedures which are consistent with their plans; establish plans, procedures for the Illinois EPA and ESDA to review chemical safety plans and spells out procedures as to what to do case there is a spill in terms of reviewing these plans for

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

their adequacy. It also deals with trade secrets, establishes what a violation is. As I said, this has roundly discussed by all the affected parties and enjoys everybody's support. I think this is a very significant I think, a very meaningful response to the Bill and is. concerns which have come out of disaster ... and other concerns that the industries of this state have meaningful emergency responses. I think this fills a significant loophole in the law. It is not community right-to-know, but it is nevertheless, a very significant Bill which was developed on a bipartisan basis. If there's question, I'll happy to answer, otherwise, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. "

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1436. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you. I rise and want to know if my Joint Sponsor could repeat that last statement. I didn't hear all of it.

 But seriously, to the Bill. One of the major components of the community right-to-know Bill, which we sponsored last night, it was, in fact, that it did have an emergency response plan. This Bill, of course, incorporates most of those provisions. It's been worked on by both parties. I strongly believe that Illinois, since we are one of the largest chemical producers in the nation, needs to have a plan like this in order and I ask for your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor 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 113

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1436, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1445. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1455, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with
Senate Amendment #1 which is really just clean up language.

The Bill provides that state revenue sharing distributed to
local governments may be deposited directly into an escrow
account established by that local government to repay
bonded... specific bonded indebtedness. This language...
We worked on this language with the Treasurer and the
Comptroller's Office, and it just makes technical changes
that were necessary to implement the original intent."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1455. There The guestion is, 'Shall the House being no discussion. concur in Senate Amendment #1?* All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having... and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1455, this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... Mulcahey 'aye'. 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared... is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 15... Yes, Mr. Nash. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Nash?"

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, my button's not working. Would you record me

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

'aye' on that last vote?"

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nash, the tapes will show that you were...
 are in favor of that Bill. Yes, Mr. Vitek. Alright, we
 will test your tape... your buttons to make sure that they
 do work. Alright. On the Order of Concurrence appears
 House Bill 1458, Mr. Hannig, the Gentleman from Macoupin.
 Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I
 would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to
 House Bill 1458. We passed this Bill last month with a 114
 votes in this chamber, and the Bill provides the methods
 whereby alternative schools can receive adequate amount of
 state financing. Now, in the Senate, the Bill was simply
 reworded to clarify the intent of the Bill as recommended
 by the State Board of Education. Basically, it was a
 technical Amendment made no change in substance to the
 Act. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macoupin moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1459. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #1? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1459. And this having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1474, Ms. Braun."
- Braun: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in Amendment 2 to House Bill 1474. Essentially, the Bill provided for an opportunity

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

for public aid recipients on work fare program to attend college, four year institution, for college and/or vocational training. The Senate Amendment limited the scope of the program to a three year demonstration project. And I move to concur."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1474. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Representative Braun told me not to oppose her Bills anymore, so I'm voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 95 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1474, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, on House Bill 1479."
- Leflore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1479. This Amendment requires the Illinois Department of Public Aid to implement a three year demonstration Medicare assistance project to provide legal services for the recipients who may be entitled to file medicaid benefits. I move to concur onto this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1479. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."
- Piel: "We're talking about I and 2 or just 2, Mr. Speaker?"

 LePlore: "Just one. It's only one Amendment I'm referring to."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Piel: "I'm sorry, Bob, I didn't hear you."

Leflore: "Amendment #1."

Piel: "Okay, what are we doing in reference to #2?"

LeFlore: "I wasn't aware there was a #2 on this Bill,
Representative Piel."

Piel: "Maybe I... ask the Chair. According to our records, there stwo Amendments on here, 1 and 2."

LePlore: "Okay, I just got some information. The other Amendment just knocks out the Amendment... my original Bill."

Piel: "Okay, would the Gentleman yield, please?"

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

Piel: "Okay, this basically... Correct me if I'm wrong.

Amendment #1 requires the Department of Public Aid to
implement a three year Medicare assistance demonstration
project which will give free legal service to these..."

LeFlore: "Exactly."

Piel: "And what... what is the potential cost of this? Do you have an idea?"

Leflore: "The appropriation has been already appropriated as \$250,000."

Piel: "What was the original Bill when it left here?"

LeFlore: "Well, we're hoping that we will be able to get more people off of the medicaid roll."

Piel: "By what process?"

Leflore: "By giving them legal assistance."

Piel: "I'm sorry..."

Leflore: "To go through their federal appeals process."

Piel: "Okay, but... Alright, let me back up just a second just so I understand. Alright, this Bill will give free legal assistance to people, but just in one area or... I mean, because the way the legal assistance is set up, they give legal assistance or legal advice for any, you know, legal purpose whatsoever... And so, you know, the figure of

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- \$250,000 seems to surprise me, especially, I mean if..."
- LePlore: "Well, this would only apply to the medicare applications."
- Piel: "How does it give them... You know, what legal problems would they have..."
- LeFlore: "Mr. Piel, I can't hear you too well."
- Piel: "I'm sorry. Can we have some order, Mr. Speaker? Hello,
 Mr. Speaker. Hello. Alan, could we get some order,
 please? See, it was so loud here, you couldn't even hear
 me. He can't hear me either."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel, I've developed some defensive mechanisms."
- Piel: "Wait, wait, wait. Keep it nice. Keep it nice."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel asks for order and I think we should certainly give him order. Mr. Piel, proceed."
- Piel: "No, I didn't need... you know, your Democrat colleague needed it. He couldn't hear me. Bob, alright, it's giving them legal assistance with making out their applications?"
- LePlore: "Yes, you will give assistance to... in the... the people with the application, the senior citizens and individuals who need necessary help. And it also would help them... If they're denied, they will receive legal assistance help with their case and their appeal. In other words what I'm saying, Representative Piel, is that many of people in my district are denied and many of them doesn't understand how to really fill their application Once they get to a point where they're not able to out. apply themselves with the application and then when denied, they need legal assistance. And they have to turn to someone to receive this type of services. m T has saying that legal... the legal aid is not able to give them this assistance, but a lot of time legal aid backlog of cases and they re not able to really deal with

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

these cases. So, therefore, they need to have some other agency to turn to in order to receive support."

Piel: "One final question, not a comment, but a question. What about... Isn't it... Excuse me. The current... Isn't it technically the Department's duty, I mean, not as far as legally... legal assistance, but to help them when they got problems with their applications, not when it's been rejected, but to help them with the application so they make it out correct?"

Leftbre: "Well, at present, they probably can't handle the case loads that they have available now. They have a backlog."

Piel: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

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

This Amendment is like a Bill of mine which didn't make the deadline crunch. And the Department of Public Aid Committee, Pam McDonald was in Committee and said her opposition was so mild and based only on the fact that there was not any appropriation. There is since now a \$250,000 appropriation in the Department of Public Aid And she even said this is a good program working in Connecticut. It isn't very often that the state can double its return. In other words, for every dollar spent, going to get two dollars back and the reason for that is when somebody is on medicaid, the state pays for all of it and then is reimbursed for half of it in federal funds. But there are some who are receiving medicaid who really should be a medicare which is fully federally funded, and because they don't... can't get involved in the complexity medicaid applications and so forth, they don't get οf the benefits do to them under medicare. And in Connecticut it was proven that for every dollar spent in this pilot project, the state had two dollars in return. So, Mr.

64th Legislative Day

- June 28. 1985
- Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on that basis alone, I feel that we ought to concur with this Amendment and I appreciate your full support."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
 Mr. Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."
- Bullock: "Representative LeFlore, is it not true that this Bill deals exclusively with the elderly and those disabled, thus qualifying for medicare?"
- LeFlore: "That's true, Representative."
- Bullock: "Is it not true, Representative LeFlore, that the medicare program is a 100% funded federally reimbursed program?"
- LePlore: "That's true, Representative."
- Bullock: "And is it also not true that Representative Matijevich represented that the appropriation for this is \$250,000 which is to subsidize or pay for a statewide hotline, Representative LePlore?"
- LeFlore: "That's true, Representative."
- Bullock: "And is it also not true that the Connecticut experience has shown a three to one ratio cost benefit in favor of the state when we implement these kinds of programs?"
- Leflore: "You're right."
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I respect Representative Piel's questioning. Unfortunately, he did not pursue the very heart of the matter and the substance of Amendment #1 which has been Representative bу Matijevich and which Representative LeFlore has responded to adequately. Certainly, this Bill should go out of here with a 118 green lights. Ιt is, in fact, a benefit to our

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

financially. But more importantly, it deals with those senior citizens, those who are disabled period — senior citizens and those who are disabled, who need legal assistance to prequalify them for medicare eligibility. And certainly, that is the intent of the Sponsor's request to concur with Senate Amendment #1. And I urge green votes."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

 Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Countryman: "Has there been another Bill that we passed that did essentially part of this?"
- LeFlore: "Not to my knowledge, Sir. It came out of Committee, but it wasn't heard on the floor. It wasn't called on the floor."
- Countryman: "My understanding is that on the Bill that was in Committee that it was like a contingent fee, that if they made a recovery, then they were able to get the fee and then... and that this differs and it's not that way. Can you tell me if that's the case?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, from what I can understand, that's a different Bill. That referred to SSI."
- Countryman: "Alright. Is there anyway that we can look down the road a year or two to see if we are getting more money back than we're spending on the legal fees here, so that we can make a judgment on this?"
- LePlore: "Well, this is a demonstration project. I'm...

 hopefully, that the state will recover some funds and
 really, the program might be one day self-sufficient."
- Countryman: "So, it would be your intent, hopefully, to come back next year showing us the revenues that come back in comparison to the amount we spent for the attorneys."
- Leflore: "I would say this is a demonstration project. At the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

end of three years, not next year."

Countryman: "Three years?"

Leflore: "Exactly."

Countryman: "Where are these attorneys going to come from, they private attorneys or...?"

LeFlore: "They could be private attorneys, but more likely, they'd be legal assistance attorneys."

Countryman: "But a private attorney could do it?"

LeFlore: "I would think so."

Countryman: "Thank you."

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

Brookins: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins, moves that the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question be put. Mr. LeFlore, to close."

LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, I just ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment # 1 and 2 to House Bill 1479?' All those in favor 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 71 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1479. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1491, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1491 deals with school consolidation. Amendment #1, Amendment #2 were technical changes made by the State Board of Election, and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

I move for its concurrence."

Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Bill 1491. There being no discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. this question there are 112 voting take the record. 0 n 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, declared passed. The House having concurred in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. On the Order of Concurrence appears 1500. Bill Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1510. Mr. Mautino, the Gentleman from Bureau. Mr. Preston... Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 1510. In its original form, 1510, provided all hearings involving liquor under public scrutiny and setting forth the state statute very similar, if not identical, to the Cook County provision so that the ... record can used instead of the individual going to two hearings, one at the local the state. Senate Bill... Excuse me. Amendment to House Bill 1510 by Senator Vadalabene. provided for a provision that was in a prior Bill as it pertains to any person who is licensed as a distiller or wine manufacturer to also be a wholesaler of beer products. The other Amendment was the administration's Amendment as it pertains to a tied house which is the authorization retail establishment to sell their own products in their own facility if it is within less than 10% of their overall I move for adoption of all Senate Amendments sales. and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

move to concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 1510.7

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, + h = House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1510. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1?" A11 in favor 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? Clerk, take the record. On this question there voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1510. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Oπ the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1523, Br. Hoffman. Hoffman. Well... well, we'll come back to him. going to change the Order of Business and move to... We are going... it is the intention of the Chair to consider Motions to refuse to recede that are on Supplemental Calendar #1 on the Order of Nonconcurrence. And on Order, appears Senate Bill 98, Ms. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move the House do not recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 98 and then ask for a Conference Committee to be appointed."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House not...
refuse to recede from Senate Amendment number... from House
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 98. And on that, the Gentleman
from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

McCracken: "Are there plans at this time for what this will look like when it comes out?"

64th Legislative Day

June 29, 1985

Currie: "I'm not absolutely certain, Representative McCracken.

The Amendment that is on the Bill is one that the

Department of Registration and Education was interested in

having. The Department, I know, would like to keep that

Amendment on the Bill. And my understanding is that the

Senate Sponsor whose Bill this is, was not interested in

concurrence when this Bill was last in that chamber."

McCracken: "So, the answer is you don't know."

Currie: "I don't know."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 98 and requests a Conference Committee. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan. Out of the record. Mr. Ronan. Alright. Mr. Ronan. Mr. the House refuse to recede from Senate Ronan moves that Amendment #1 to House Bill 207. And on that, is there discussion? There being... I'm sorry, Senate Bill 207. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall House refuse to recede?! Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have House does refuse to recede from House it, and the # 1 to Senate Bill 207 and requests a Conference Amendment Committee. Mr. Hoffman, for what purpose do you recognition? Mr. Hoffman. Alright. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert, on Senate Bill 92."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to refuse to recede from Senate... from the Senate... House Amendments | and 2 on Senate Bill 92."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

"The Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House Speaker Greiman: refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate And on that, is there any discussion? the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to being none. recede from Amendments 1 and 2? All in favor say In the opinion of the Chair, the those opposed 'no'. 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 92 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 254. The Chair recognizes Nr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan. The Chair recognizes Mr. on Senate Bill 263."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I move to refuse to recede from Amendment... Senate
Amendment #! to Senate Bill 263."

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair rec... The Gentleman from Jackson, Richmond, moves that the House refuse to recede from House (sic - Senate) Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 263. being discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House no refuse to recede?! All in favor say 'aye', those In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and House does refuse to recede from House (sic - Senate) Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 263 and requests a Conference Committee. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Ronan, on Senate Bill 254. Mr. Ronan. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bonan, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 254. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 254?* favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 254 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order... The Chair recognizes

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on Senate Bill 521.

No. No, I think... Out of the record. Mr. Terzich, I think you wanted it out of the record. Well, Mr. Terzich, I think... you did not want to refuse to recede, right?"

Terzich: "Yes, I want to recede."

Speaker Greiman: "You... Yes, we're going to refuse... We're taking Motions that refuse to recede."

Terzich: "Yes, just the opposite..."

Speaker Greiman: "So, you did not want to. Alright. We will get back to you. The Chair recognizes Mr. Peterson, W., on Senate Bill 623."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on Senate Bill 623 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peterson, moves that the House refuse to recede on House Amendments I and 2 to Senate Bill 623. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 623 and requests a Conference Committee."

Peterson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Ms. Wojcik. Ms. Wojcik. Go slow. Go slow. We're going to wait for you. Ms. Wojcik."

Wojcik: "I need to lose the weight anyway. Mr. Speaker and
Members of the House, I refuse to recede and I ask for a
Conference Committee on Senate Bill 979."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1..."

Wojcik: "And 2."

Speaker Greiman: "...And 2. Yes, from 1 and 2 to Senate Bill

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

979. There being no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede to House Amendments 1 and 2?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 979 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order... I'm sorry. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik, on Senate Bill 892."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House would refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 9... 892."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 892, and on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Cullerton: "What did the House Amendment do:

Kubik: "The House Amendment... the House Amendment basically authorized the IBPA to issue permits that are... that are the same as the federal permits."

Cullerton: "We have to have it?"

Kubik: "It had be re... it's an administration Bill. It was requested by the IBPA."

Cullerton: "Well, I mean if it's such an important Bill, why don't we recede? Send it to the Governor."

Kubik: "They have requested to go to a Conference Committee."

Cullerton: "Who's they?"

Kubik: "The IEPA."

Cullerton: "Do you trust them?"

Kubik: "I beg your pardon?"

Cullerton: "Do you trust them?"

Kubik: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Cullerton: "Okay."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 892? Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from Senate Amendment 1... House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 892, and requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich. Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Panavotovich. Gentleman from Cook. Out of the record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment... from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1132, and on that, is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #1... I'm sorry, from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1132. Mr. Hallock, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Hallock: "Well, not on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to call Senate Bill 1095, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "No one has pointed that out to us. We'll get back to you. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"
- Speaker Greiman: "I think he may have stepped off the floor. Mr. Wolf, though, may handle this."
- Vinson: "Yes, Representative, why is it that we are refusing to recede on House Amendment #1?"
- Wolf: "There is question, Mr. Vinson, on the... on the Amendment.

 The Senate had a question and refused to concur. We refuse
 to recede because we feel that the Amendment is
 self-explanatory in removing the hundred dollar a day
 penalty. There might be possible that we would add a few
 Bills on this as we go along."
- Vinson: "Okay, thank you. That makes a lot of sense."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1132?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Bill... refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to House Bill 1132 and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1095, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd move that the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095 and ask that a Conference Committee be established."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1 and 2?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #... sorry, from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1095 and requests a Conference Committee. Gentleman from DuPage, Mayor Barger."
- Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to recede from the House Amendment on Bill #95, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 98 (sic 95). Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' All in favor say... Yes, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Por a question, he indicates he will."

McCracken "Is this the Amendment that would no longer require

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

signatures in the presence of each other? And you are going to recede from that so that it..."

Barger: "No, I move to refuse to recede."

McCracken "Refuse, I'm sorry."

Barger: "Yeah, I promised my friend here that I would stand by..."

Speaker Greiman: "All those in favor signify... signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 95 and requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, are we on Senate Bill 95?"

Speaker Greiman: "No, we have done that. We have refused to recede, yes."

Cullerton: "We have? I had my light on. I wanted to ask a question. Whose Motion was it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Cullerton: "Whose Motion was it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Barger."

Cullerton: "And he refused to recede from his Amendments?"

Speaker Greiman: "I believe so."

Cullerton: "Well, Senator Fawell is right here and she says that your Amendments were bad and I tend to agree with her. So, why don't we just recede from them and let her fine Bill, the way she drafted it, go to the Governor? She's lobbying me over here and I think we... think we got an agreement."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Cullerton..."

Cullerton: "It too late?"

Speaker Greiman: "It is a bit late. If Mr. Barger wishes to reconsider the vote by which he agreed to refuse to recede,

I would entertain that Motion. And if Mrs. Fawell wants to go over and twist his arm, that's all right."

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Cullerton: "Well... Well, I think there's a... there an intra-DuPage County fight here between a Senator and a State Rep and I don't know what he has against her. She's a very nice lady. She is right here."
- Speaker Greiman: "It's terrible to see that kind of thing happening."
- Cullerton: "I don't know if we should even participate in this squabble."
- Speaker Greiman: "I don't want to mix in. Okay, where are we?

 The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr.

 Ewing, on Senate Bill 1152."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I want to refuse to recede and ask for the appointment of Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1152. There being no discussion... yes, Mr... Mayor Barger. Mr. Barger."
- Barger: "Excuse me, but I was not paying attention so I have no idea what you are talking about."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, does that indicate that you want to say something or just..."
- Barger: "No, I normally try to say something after I find out what you are talking about. In case I don't know what you are talking about, I prefer not to say anything."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well... The Chair really talks about anything substantive. If you wish to inquire as to the subject matter, you might appropriately ask Mr. Ewing if he would yield for a question. Indicates that he will."
- Ewing: "Okay, what's 1152 and why am I involved with it?"
- Kubik: "Yes, Mr... Mr. Speaker, apparently..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Kubik, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's highly possible that Mr.

64th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1985
- Barger's light remained on and that's why he's asking a question. He was the last speaker."
- Barger: "Oh, my... I'm sorry. I should have turned by button off when I left. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ewing, as you were saying."
- Ewing: "I really can't answer that. I'd just like to go ahead with the vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "So, question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1152?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from Amendment #1... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1152 and requests a Conference Committee. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, on Senate Bill 1165. Ms. Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1165 and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie, moves that House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1165. There being no discussion, the question *Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1? A11 in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion a f the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to receded from Senate Amendment... from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1165 and requests a Conference Committee. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik, on Senate Bill 1189."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House refuse to concur with House Amendment 1 and 2 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kubik, moves that the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2. . . I'm sorry, House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1189. There being no discussion, the question is. House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2? favor say 'ave', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion αf the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill and requests a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1267. Mr. Hoffman. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that the
 House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and call for
 a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, moves the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1267. There being no discussion. The question is. 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' **A 1 1** in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion ο£ the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from Amendment number... House Amendment Senate Bill 1267 and request a Conference Committee. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke."
- Parke: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On Senate Bill 1289, I ask that I refuse to recede and ask that this be put in a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr... from Cook, Mr.

 Parke, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment
 #1 to Senate Bill 1289. There being no discussion, the
 question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from
 Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the
 House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to
 Senate Bill 1289. Mr. Mays, for what purpose do you seek

64th Legislative Day recognition?"

June 28, 1985

- Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 on Senate Bill 1111 and request that a Conference Committee be reported."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Adams, Nr. Mays, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate All in... Is there any discussion? There being the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1 and 2? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have and the House has refused to recede Amendments | and 2 to Senate Bill 1111 and requests a Conference Committee. Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson, on Senate Bill 1294. 1294. "
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do not wish to recede on the Senate Amendment in the sense that we have reached agreement with people on both sides of the issue and we... we would like this to go to Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lee moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1294. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1294 and requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on Senate Bill 1437. Mr. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, I move that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 and 2 and ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Bill 1437. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House has refused to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1437 and requests a Conference Committee. Yes, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "1303?"

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. McCracken, we have some supplementaries. We'll add them. Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell, on Senate Bill 537.
 Mr. O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would make a Motion at this time to refuse to recede from Amendment #1 of Senate
 Bill 537 and request that it be placed in a Conference
 Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell, moves that
 the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to
 Senate Bill 537. There being no discussion, the question
 is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?'
 Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the
 opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does
 refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 537
 and requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from
 Cook, Mr. Young, on Senate Bill 984. Mr. Young."
- Young: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 984 and move for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young, moves that the House do recede from Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 984.

 Is... There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 984 and requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Slater... I'm sorry, McDonough. The Gentleman from McDonough, Mr. Slater."

Slater: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Mr. Slater, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303. There being no discussion. the question is. 'Shall the House refuse to recede?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303 and requests a Conference Committee. On Calendar #2, we will again those Bills dealing with a request to a... Motion to refuse to recede. Ms. Zwick, did you wish to refuse to recede on 834? The Lady from Kane, Ms. Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 834."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Kane moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 834. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 834 and requests a Conference Committee. Mr. Terzich, did you wish to go on 882? Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Are we all set there, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1880... or 982 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 882. There being no discussion, the question is 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 882 and request a Conference Committee. Mr. Curran, do you wish to refuse to recede? Mr. Curran, Gentleman from Sangamon."

Curran: "Wish to refuse to recede."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Sangamon moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 925. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede all in... from Amendment #1?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 925 and requests a Conference Committee. Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer on 1004. You wish to refuse to recede?"

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask leave to table Senate Bill 1004."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves to table Senate Bill 1004. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment... Senate Bill 1004 is tabled. Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, can you do that?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Yes. For example, Bills... Bills that are here on deadline day get tabled."

Cullerton: "Yes, but... I just... I think we should indicate in the record for Representative Homer's own well-being and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

safety that this agreement... this decision is concurred with the Senator who sponsored the Bill. Maybe we can have Senator Jeremiah Joyce from Chicago, maybe we can have... He's the Sponsor of the Bill and he may be very disappointed with Senator... with Representative Homer's decision so maybe we could have on... put on the record that it's... it's by agreement."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, if we don't see him in 24 hours, we'll get a writ of habeas corpus ready."

Cullerton: "And I don't think we can do it, I really don't."

Speaker Greiman: "Chair rules that we can do it, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Do we have control of the... of the substance of the Bill or just control of the Amendments?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We have control of the Bill in our House. When Bills, for example, reach a deadline, they are tabled in the House. Senate Bills not out of the House are tabled in the House. When we reached our deadline, Nr. Cullerton, and for the time for Senate Bills to be out of Committee, those Bills that were not out of Committee were tabled under our rules."
- Cullerton: "Well, I just... Well, let's put it this way, Mr.

 Speaker. If you are wrong, we can always come back and do

 it again. If it turns out that you are wrong, we can

 always... nobody will lose any face."
- Speaker Greiman: "I suppose. I'd like to go back to Supplemental

 Calendar #1. On that Order, the Gentleman from Jackson,

 Mr. Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede in Amendment... House Amendments #1 and 2 of Senate Bill 497."

 Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, moves

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 497. There being no discussion. the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 497 and a Conference Committee is requested. Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton, your attention. Mr. Homer, your attention. Well, fine kettle of fish you've gotten us into this time. A Bill can tabled... a Senate Bill may be tabled in the House when we are in possession of the Senate Bill. for example, when a Bill is on the Order of Third Reading, when a Bill is in our Committees and reaches the does not get out, that Bill is tabled. Although it is a Senate Bill, it is tabled as long as we have control of the Bill. But where a Bill, on the other hand, as this Bill that Mr. Homer tabled... requested to table is the Bill is not in the possession of the House. Only the Amendment is sent back and returned to the Accordingly, the Bill is in... is in the Senate and the Amendment is here for us to act upon either for us to recede or to refuse to recede. Accordingly, Mr. Homer, the Chair has to tell you that your Motion is out of order."

Cullarton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Cullerton, for correcting... for pointing that out to the Chair or for at least raising the issue to the Chair. Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you take the Bill from the record?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 1287, Representative McAuliffe.

Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Member of the House. I move to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

nonrecede on House Bill... Amendment 1... House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1287."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman refuses to recede in Senate Amendment #... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1287 and requests a Conference Committee. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House refuses to recede in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1287 and a Conference convened. Committee will be Senate Bill 1037. Representative Keane. Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1037 is the Bill
 we are trying to put on the previous year's BAV and for
 that reason I refuse to recede from Amendment #1, House
 Amendment #1 and would ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede to Senate Amendment #1 to Senate... to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1037. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1037?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1037. Senate Bill 1077, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I wish to recede."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to recede... to recede?"
Cullerton: "Yeah, I wish to recede."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to recede from House
 Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1077. Is there any
 discussion? Hearing none... the Gentleman from Knox,
 Representative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "My request would be that there would be an explanation of what those Amendments do."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Cullerton: "Yes. the Bill amends the Foreign Banking Office region in Chicago and I added Amendments #1 and 2 and the Senate didn't concur with those Amendments. Now, what I want to do is send this... the original Bill to Governor's desk. So the Amendments #1 and 2... or actually Amendments #1 will be in another Bill in a Conference Committee on House Bill 419. House Bill 419 also did the same thing as this Bill did. The original Bill did the same thing. That is expand this foreign banking So the effect of the receding would be to send in Chicago. Bill to the Governor and I believe it's a Bill that passed overwhelmingly... over 100 votes when we voted on it.

"The Gentleman moves to recede from Senate Speaker Breslin: Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1077. those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Representative Hastert Representative Bullock votes 'no'. There are therefore 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and And this House recedes from Senate Amendments 'present'. #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1077, and this Bill. having the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen. we are starting another list at the Clerk's well for all of those Bill that appear on the Order of Concurrence in which Members wish to nonconcur. We would like to have that list compiled within five minutes and then we will go Bills so that you can be closer to your Conference Committee and getting them started. So, one last time, you have Bills on the Order of Concurrence that you wish to

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

get called immediately in order to nonconcur, bring your number to the well. Obviously this applies also to those Bills in which Members wish to concur in some Amendments but nonconcur in others. We want to get the Conference Committees started. Ladies and Gentlemen, going to the Order of Concurrence, on page 11 on your Calendar, appears House Bill 1528, Representative Hoffman. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. On page 12 on your Calendar appears House Bill 1529, Out of... Out of the record. House Bill 1547, Representative Alexander. Tell us what the Bill does and what the Amendment does."

Alexander: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 1547, I want to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2. The thrust of the Bill is that owners of real estate who sell and transfer their interest through a land trust, they are to pay the same transfer taxes those of us who sell and transfer our property by deed. That is Amendment... Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #2 changes the title of the Act to make the title more descriptive of the Act and I wish to concur in this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1547. Is there any discussion?

Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur?' The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken. This is House Bill 1547."

McCracken: "Is this similar to the Bill that Speaker Madigan spoke on?"

Alexander: "That is correct. It is the same..."

McCracken: "Dare I oppose it?"

Alexander: "I don't think you did."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, could you put that this is a House
Bill up on the board? The question is, 'Shall the House

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1547?*

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

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1547.

House Bill 1555, Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan. Out of the record. House Bill 1567, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1567. The Bill relates to a new schedule for surcharges. However, we were informed today by Representative Ewing that there was a problem that he would like to take care of and that item has been agreed to by all parties so we would like to use House Bill 1567 for that purpose and in that regard, I would like to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Does the Gentleman move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and... The Gentleman move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1567. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1567. House Bill 1578, Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1578. The original Bill provides for an annual fee of \$36 to the Clerk of the Court in downstate counties for collecting and disbursing maintenance and child support. The Amendment clearly... it

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

clarifies the Bill itself which provides... the Amendment provides that such sum shall be in addition to and separate from the amounts ordered to be paid as maintenance for child support. I'd appreciate your support on this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1578. Is there any discussion?
Representative Ronan, on the question."

Ronan: "No, Madam Speaker. I want you to go back to 1555 after this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "We're on another... We're on another Motion right now, Representative Ronan. Is there any discussion?

The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Countryman: "Does this place the burden for this payment totally upon the respondent?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Yes, it does, Representative"

Countryman: "Why shouldn't it be split between the parties?"

Peterson: "It's a one time annual fee."

Countryman: "But it's every year, right?"

Peterson: "That's what annual means, I believe."

Countryman: "A one time annual fee means one time or once each year?"

Peterson: "Once each year."

Countryman: "Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Countryman: "I'm opposed to this because I think that the matter of child support... I don't disagree that the clerk is entitled to a fee, but I just think the parties ought to split the cost if, in fact, they are going to do it. It's a good system. It keeps track of the child support and I

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

think it benefits both parties and I think both parties ought to pay it and if you split it, it would end up being \$18 a piece. I just don't think that's that much so I'm going to vote against it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson, to close."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think this is a good Amendment and I would ask your support on the concurrence." Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1578?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1578 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we will go back to Representative Ronan's Bill,

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1555. The Senate requested a minor technical change making the Director of the Space Needs Commission as the third member of our panel as opposed to the Auditor General. The Bill passed out of the Senate 58 to nothing. I move for concurrence on Senate Bill 1555... House Bill 1555."

House Bill 1555. Representative Ronan."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1555. Is there any discussion?

 The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Now, is this the Democratic alternative to 'Build Illinois'?"
- Ronan: "Representative McCracken, we still have hope for you. I move for the passage of House Bill 1555."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

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

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Is this the Bill that says that if there is a change specifications ... in i f recommended change in specifications saves money. the one who made the recommendations can save 50 percent of the amount... aet to keep 50 percent of the amount saved?"

Ronan: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And so the only possible problem would this be... with this Bill would be if there was some collusion between state employees and prospective contractors so that the specs would be arbitrarily offered ... they could be offered... they could be made so that they would be arbitrarily high and then a contractor could come in and suggest that they be changed to save money and would get to get 50 percent of that. That would be the only way that this Bill would work to... to our... the state's detriment, is that right?"

Ronan: Representative "Well. Cullerton, your concern collusion is the same concern I had. That's why we have panel established where it's the... it's not the people from the agency who make the determinations. determination is made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of Central Management Services and the Executive Director of the Space Needs Commission. If those people go along on a case of collusion, they are going a heck of a lot more than what this Bill gives them an opportunity. The 'Teapot Dome' scandal would be a minor miracle compared to what these people could do if they are evil people. So that all we're doing is setting up an opportunity for the state to save some money and

64th Legislative Day

June 28. 1985

recommendations to go in a place."

Cullerton: "Right, okay, and what's the theory behind replacing the Auditor General with the Executive Director the Space Needs Commission?"

Ronan: "The Auditor General asked to be removed. He has the responsibility to audit the actions of this Commission.

So, it appears that he felt there could be a potential conflict of interest."

Cullerton: "Right, he'd be investigating himself."

Ronan: "He'd be auditing himself."

Cullerton: "Right, okay, well, that's a... it's a good Amendment then."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1555?* A11 vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1555, and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1654, Representative Currie. Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1654. Amendment #1 simply clarifies that there is statutory authority for the Department of... for the Human Rights Commission and it's procedures to allow discovery depositions, but only upon leave of the hearing officer and for good cause shown. This is an Amendment which was worked out with the Human Rights Commission and is an agreed Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1654. Is there any Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 165424 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1654. and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1680, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1680. The basic Bill as it left
here dealt... it was an Illinois Press Association Bill
dealing with publication fees for newspapers. The Senate
Amendment reduced the per parcel fee in counties under a
million inhabitants roughly by one third. Be happy to
answer any questions. Ask for adoption of Amendment #1....
concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1680. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House... question is, 'Shall the House concur #1 to House Bill 1680? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', none and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1680, and this having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1688, Representative Keane." Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill 1688. Amendment #1 to House House Bill 1688... Amendment #1 stripped the Bill and what we put... what's been put in there is the Private Activity Bond Allocation Couple of days ago, we put another Bill... we're putting another Bill into a Conference Committee so that we can give the Governor on this... on the Industrial Development Bond Allocation Act two Bills and allow him to take his pick. This one sets up... This one sets up a Council and the other one does not. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for concurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1699. Does anyone stand in
opposition? Representative Weave."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Weaver: "Does this in any way affect the pool of industrial revenue bond as imposed by the Federal Government?"

Keane: "This replaces Executive Order #6 under which we... have you got the Amendment handy?"

Weaver: "No, I don't."

Keane: "Alright, it ... it ... Executive Order #6 has been the way that we have been allocating those funds. And the There's two systems that... We are sending two Bills to the Governor because at the present time, we're not sure what the best way to go. This Bill sets up a Private Activity Bond Allocation Council that is made up of ten member, Bureau of the Budget, the Director, the Director of Commerce and Community Affairs, the Director of Illinois Economic Development, Finance Authority, the Illinois Farm Development Authority, the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the State Scholarship Commission, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

That's the Council that will... it will flow through."

Weaver: "Is Mr. Hart on the list as well?"

- Keane: "No, we... He may be added later by a later Amendment, but then we have... we are putting over another Bill and I'll be telling you about that probably tomorrow which gives the... sets the system up so that it's much like Executive Order 6 is now."
- Weaver: "Would this reduce any municipality's ability to... to issue industrial revenue honds?"
- Keane: "Not to my knowledge. It would... It would... It sets the amount. The Executive Order sets the amount that goes to municipalities and how they come in. The Bill's won't change that. It's by a pecking order of the time you were... you come in. Representative O'Connell has dealt with this. He may be a little more conversant on it than I. I would like to yield, Madam Speaker, to Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell."

- O'Connell: "I'm not familiar with this Amendment, but I can address the previous Bills that we had did not in any way alter Executive Order #6. It simply changed who would be the entity that distributes the allocated funds. So, I guess I'm asking Representative Keane if that is still the same."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. The Chair indicated Representative Keane had yielded his time to Representative O'Connell to answer Representative Weaver's question. That not being the case, Representative Weaver, any more questions or have you completed it? There have are several other people seeking recognition. Representative O'Connell now has question to posed a Representative Keane. Representative Keane."

Keane: "I'm advised that all of the provisions... Mike, all of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the provisions are as they... they exist now. All of the distribution provisions exist as they exist now. The only thing we are changing is is the process through which the decision making goes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, on the question."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McCracken: "I remember a similar Bill which Representative
O'Connell and I discussed indicating that that Bill... that
House Bill did not change the manner of allocation relative
to Executive Order #6. Is that still true?"

Keane: "That is correct."

McCracken: "And that's based on population and time of request, is that correct?"

Keane: "Right. Right."

McCracken: "So you haven't made that a political issue?"

Keane: "No."

McCracken: "Alright, has the... How does this differ from the current manner in which Executive Order #6 is implemented?"

Keane: "It doesn't... it does not change it. What we are
 attempting to do..."

McCracken: "No, no, my question is, "Why the board rather than just the use of the Executive Order?"

Keane: "Well, we don't want... We would rather put the Executive Order in statute rather than run it on... as a... as an Executive Order, we would... because at that point, by any Governor that comes along, by a future Executive Order it could be changed."

McCracken: "Okay, and this allocation methodology is required by the Internal Revenue Code now?"

Keane: "Yes. What we have... What we have, let... We have two allocation processes that we are going to put one on each

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill and... before the Governor and he'll have his choice."

McCracken: "Well, uh-oh, uh-oh, tilt. Why two different ones?"

Keane: "The allocations are the same, I'm sorry. There are two different approval processes."

McCracken: "Okay, okay."

Keane: "That was my fault."

McCracken: "Now, under... under Executive Order #6 now, are these same persons or directors part of a Committee?"

Keane: "No."

McCracken: "Alright."

Keane: "It's handled directly through the Governor's Office.

This Committee would replace them in the... with this...

if, in fact, the Governor signs this legislation."

McCracken: "Is former House Bill 1148 going to be the alternative or how does this differ from the alternative you are referring to?"

Keane: "I... I can't... I don't remember the vehicle, but I mentioned it when I put it into... when we... I passed it back to the Senate. We are attempting... and I'll get you the Bill number later, but we have made a commitment to Senator Etheredge that that would also go to the Governor's desk."

McCracken: "So both are going."

Keane: "Both are going."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Does anyone stand in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate... in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1688?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Bill 1688. and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will change the Order of Business to the Order of Concurrences on which Members wish to The first Bill on that Order is House Bill 419. Ιt page 4 OП your Calendar. Representative Cullerton."

you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Cullerton: "Thank the House. First of all, I would like to announcement as further evidence that the Vinson jinx has The Cubs are winning two to nothing with regard to House Bill 419, I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 and understanding is that the Bill will go to a Conference Committee. This original Bill dealt with the Banking Office Act. The original Bill is on its way to the Governor and so we would use this Bill as a Conference Committee to resolve the differences between the two Houses with regard to the other Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in #1 to House Bill 48... 19. Amendment Is there discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate... Senate Amendment #1 and House Bill 419?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 419. The next Bill is House Bill It appears on page 3 on your Calendar. Representative Wait. Representative... Excuse, Representative... 83, Representative Wait."

Wait: "I'd move to nonconcur on House Amendment 83."

Speaker Breslin: "Tell us why."

Wait: "Because the Democratic staff didn't like one of the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Amendments, Amendment #1 that was put on, and so we'll send it back to the Senate."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 83. Ιs there any discussion? Hearing none. the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #... Senate Amendment #1 to House 93?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House 83. The next Bill is House Bill 137. It appears on page 3 Calendar. your Representative Churchill. Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would, at this point, move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137.

 Yesterday, I brought this Bill before the Body to try and pass it. Representative Cullerton questioned whether or not the Amendment was acceptable to the county which had to have population between 275,000 and 300,000 people. I have been told at this point that nobody really knows why that Amendment was put on. So, I'm moving to nonconcur, send it back to the Senate..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate #1 to House Bill 137. Amendment Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Amendment #1? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to Bill 137. House The next Bill is House Bill 474. Representative Laurino. Ιt appears on page your Calendar. Is Representative Laurino in the chamber? not. Out of the record. House Bill 679 appears on page 7 House Bill 679. That's an appropriation on your Calendar. Bill. I * m going to... Representative.. Representative

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Friedrich, would you come... Representative Friedrich, would you come to the well, please? Out of the record. Representative Laurino has returned to the chamber. House Bill 474 appears on page 4 on your Calendar. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur and ask for a Conference Committee on House Bill 474."

Speaker Breslin: "Tell us why."

Laurino: "It needs some cleanup and technical Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 474. All those in favor... Is there any discussion? Hearing none, question is. Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3?! All those in favor say those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Amendment #1 and 3 to House Bill 474. House Bill 1801 appears on page 12 on your Calendar. Representative Didrickson."

- Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2. The original Bill, as it left the House, required..."
- Speaker Breslin: "We only show that there is one Amendment on the Calendar."
- Didrickson: "On 1801? There should be two. Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment
 #1 of House Bill 1801. Is there any discussion? Hearing
 none, the question is..."
- Didrickson: "And Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "We have already done that yesterday, I understand, according to the Clerk's Office."
- Didrickson: "There was confusion on that and we pulled it out of

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

the record and that's why I have been confused on this Bill

to begin with. There was a different ruling yesterday than

there is today."

- "In that case, we'll do both of them. Speaker Breslin: The moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1801. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 House Bill 1801. House 1924, to Bill Representative Stephens. appears on page 13 on YOUR Calendar. Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur on Amendment #... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1924.

 The..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1924. Is there any discussion?
 The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield? I
 didn't quite understand his explanation."
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield. Explain why you wish to table

 Amendment... or to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Stephens: "Thank you. It was a technical Amendment and we...
 we'd like to send this back to the Senate for a Conference
 Committee Report at the request..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative, if you want to go to a Conference Committee, you can't do so when you have concurred in the others. Why don't you just nonconcur in all of them?"
- Stephens: "I'll amend my Motion to nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3,"
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1924. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

McCracken. There is no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1924?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1924. House Bill 2263 appears on page 15 on your Calendar, Representative Bullock."

- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 and I intend to send this Bill to Conference Committee for the purpose of implementing recommendations on the salmonella investigation."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2263. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2263. House Bill 2445, on page 16 on your Calendar. Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1. This is a Bill to amend the Health Maintenance Organization Act and Senate Amendment #1 was found to be technically incorrect."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 and 2..."
- Parcells: "Well, one is the only one that is wrong, but if I should nonconcur on both, I'd be happy to. But it was #1 that was found to be technically incorrect by a very fine Democrat staffer."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you wish to get to a Conference Committee or do you wish the Senate to recede?"

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Parcells: "To a Conference Committee."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2445. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion? The question 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2445. It has been brought to the Chair's attention we have a distinguished former Member of the House sitting in our gallery, Senator Zito, to the right. Senator Zito. Stand up and be recognized. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Would you care to speculate as to whether people are sending notes clear across the Rotunda now?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Anything can happen here. On the Order of
 Concurrences appears House Bill 1714, Representative
 White."
- White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur... just a second."
- Speaker Breslin: "It's on the Order of Concurrence, on page 12 on your Calendar, House Bill 1714."
- White: "No, you had nonconcurrence up."
- Speaker Breslin: "It should be in the Order of Concurrence, Mr. Clerk, and it's Amendment #1, Mr. Clerk."
- White: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1714. The Bill was amended in the Senate to add beverage."
- Speaker Breslin: "Tell us what the Bill does and then what the Amendment does."
- White: "Well, first of all, the Bill came out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee and it would allow the

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Chicago Board of Education to opt out of the bidding process whereby they would be allowed to buy food stuff without going through the bidding process. An Amendment was offered by me at the request of the Republican side of the aisle to add perishable food stuff and in the Senate, they added Amendment #! which put the word beverage, perishable beverage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1714, and on that question, the

Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Speaker Breslin: "I understand it applies to only perishable beverage contracts but the... can the contracts cover... or what duration of time can those contracts cover? Can they be for a year? Can the be for more than a year? Or is it on a as served basis?"

White: "It's based on as need, as the need would arise, which
means it could cover a one year or a two year period. The
reason for the Bill is that it would allow the Chicago
Board of Education, in the beginning, to save 1.5 million
dollars by being able to buy perishable items outside of
the bidding process and by being able to buy it late, they
feel as though they would save money rather than letting
out bids a year ahead of time, six months ahead of time."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

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

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Representative, are the... what's the story with other school districts?"

White: "Madam Speaker."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

White: "The volume of noise is quite loud and it's difficult to hear the..."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is difficult for the Members to hear. Proceed, Representative White."

Vinson: "May I ask him a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Vinson: "What about other school districts? Is this... Do they get this exception?"

White: "Well, in the beginning, when the Bill was introduced, it specifically identified the City of Chicago, but when it came back from the Senate, there was a little footnote that indicated that it applied not only to the City of Chicago, but to the downstate school districts as well. And if it's a savings for Chicago, I would assume that it would be a great savings for the rest of the school districts across the State of Illinois."

Vinson: "I see. I'm just a little bit concerned about a Bill
where Senator Netsch is asking us to exempt from
competitive bidding, but I suppose that we can go along
with that."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 17142 A 1 1 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1714, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill Representative Bowman. Explain the Bill and the Amendment."

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

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

House. The Bill in its form as it passed the House contained a number of incentives for development research parks. One of the incentives was deleted in the Senate by Senate Amendment #3. It was a relatively concept. It was a state tax increment finance district The Senate wasn't prepared to buy into that concept. revolutionary concept and consequently Amendment #3 deleted it. I still think there are a number of other fine things in the Bill, so rather than fight it out over one... I'm prepared to accept the Senate Amendment which deletes the state tax increment finance district. So. T move to concur."

Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Speaker Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1800. Is there any discussion? the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Hearing none, Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1900? A11 favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94... there are 93 voting 'aye', 22 voting and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1800 and this having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1806. Representative Stern. Explain the Bill and the Amendment."

Stern: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill is a... the State Board of Elections Bill which deletes obsolete references and simply sets to rights some contradictory things that resulted from the adoption of ELCO a number of years... the consolidate election Bill a number of years ago. The Amendment in which I would concur simply deletes a... an excessive number that's in there, 2(a)-47 in two locations."

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

"The question is, 'Shall the Speaker Breslin: House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1806? Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. *Shall the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1806? House concur in All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 'no' and none voting voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1806, and this having received the Constitutional Majority. hereby declared passed. House Bill 1813, Representative Stern. Explain the Bill and the Amendment."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this is another State Board of Elections Bill. The Amendment is an agreed Amendment. Thank you, Sir. The Bill amends the Election Code and provides that election authorities may act to assign voters to polling places in adjacent precincts for the purpose of conducting a referendum on the occasion when there is 25 or less that would be participating. The Amendment is an agreed Amendment between the County Clerks Association and the Boards of Election Commissions and the State Board of Elections and deals with approval of tabulating equipment used by the various counties."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1813. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1813?* A 1 1 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And this... The House does concur

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1985

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1813, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to table

House Bill 2523, of which I am the principal Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "What do you wish to do?"

Vinson: "I wish to table House Bill 2523, of which I am the principal Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Give us the number and the page again, Sir."

Vinson: "House Bill 2523 on page 16 of the Calendar."

Speaker Breslin: "The Motion is to table House Bill 2523. On that question... There being no discussion, the... all those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House Bill 2523 is tabled. Back on the Order of Concurrences, on page 12, appears House Bill 1833, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1833 is a JCAR Bill and I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment \$1. All Senate Amendment #1 does is change the effective date of the Bill at the request of the Secretary of State to July 1st, 1986.

I quess he wanted a little..."

'Shall the House concur in Speaker Breslin: "The question is. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1833. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1833? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1833 and

64th Legislative Day

June 28, 1995

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cullerton now moves that this House stand adjourned until 9:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and this House stands adjourned until 9:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "Did you adjourn?"

Speaker Breslin: "We adjourned."

Vinson: "Okay, we're fine."

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

PAGE 1

JUNE 28, 1985

	JUNE 25,	1300		
dB-0048	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	29
HB-0048	MOTION		PAGE	40
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	33
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	42
HB-0054	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	24
HB-0060	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	55
HB-0062	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	47
HB-0066	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	4
HB-0137	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	273
HB-0146	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	44
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	44
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	56
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	83
	CONCUERENCE		PAGE	47
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE		PAGE	48
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE PAGE	53 53
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	54
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	60
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	61
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	69
HB-0320	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	73
HB-0334	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	74
RB-0335	CONCUBRENCE		PAGE	75
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	75
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	77
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	78
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	57
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	57
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	81
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	272
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE		PAGE	84 274
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE Page	274 85
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	86
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	87
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	90
HB-0521	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	90
HB-0561	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	58
HB-0574	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	93
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	100
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	101
HB-0621	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	103
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	104
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	161
HB-0627	MOTION CONCURRENCE		PAGE	161
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	105
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE PAGE	106
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	116 .138
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	142
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	117
HB-0805	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	118
HB-0807	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	113
HB-0931	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	120
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	121
HB-0851	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	6
HB-0852	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	125
HB-0864	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	126
HB-0880	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	129
HB-0883	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	127
HB-0888	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	129
HB-0839	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	133
ПВ-0891 НВ-0903	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE		PAGE	133
40 0303	CORCURERNEE		PAGE	135

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

PAGE 2

JUNE 28, 1985

HR-0322	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	143
	CONCURRENCE		143
		PAGE	
HB-0950		PAGE	144
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	145
HB-0968	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	146
HB-0975	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	146
HB-0986		PAGE	164
HB-0997			
		PAGE	179
HB-1000	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	165
HB-1016	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	167
HB-1034	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	170
HB-1035	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	174
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	175
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	175
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	182
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	178
HB-1083	CONCURBENCE	PAGE	188
HB-1086	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	190
HB-1104	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	191
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	196
пв-1117		PAGE	191
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	192
HB-1177	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	197
HB-1202	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	193
HB-1204	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	194
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	198
HB-1212			198
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
		PAGE	199
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	202
HB-1301		PAGE	201
нв-1306	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	58
HB-1317	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	204
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	205
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	205
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	209
HB-1356	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	219
HB-1362	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	221
HB-1382	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	222
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	223
HB-1411	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	226
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	229
HB-1436		PAGE	230
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	232
HB-1458	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	233
HB- 1474	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	233
HB-1479	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	234
HB-1491	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	240
HB- 1510	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	241
HB-1517		PAGE	27
HB-1529	MOTION	PAGE	1
HB-1547	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	261
HB-1555	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	264
HB-1567	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	262
ПВ-1578			
		PAGE	262
HB-1654	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	266
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	267
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	267
HB-1714	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	277
HB-1800	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	279
HB-1301	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	274
HB- 1906	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	280
HB-1813	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	291
HB-1833	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	282
HB-1850	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
HB-1924	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	275
		-	•

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

PAGE

JUNE 28, 1985

HB-1961	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
HB-1966	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
HB-1977	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
HB-2263	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	276
HB-2276			
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-2421	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	28
HB-2437	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	28
HB-2440	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-2444	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
HB-2445			
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	276
HB-2523	TABLED	PAGE	282
SB-0092	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	243
SB-0098	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	242
SB-0114	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	152
SB-0207	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	243
SB-0212	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	152
SB-0254			
	NON-CONCURPENCE	PAGE	244
SB-0263	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	244
SB-0416	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	156
SB-0497	NON-CONCURZENCE	PAGE	257
SB-0537	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	254
SB-0623	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	245
SB-0653	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	158
SB-0730	NON-CONCURPENCE	PAGE	6
5B-0796	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	159
SB-0913	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	159
SB-0934	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	255
SB-0856	NON-CONCURBENCE	PAGE	160
SB-0859	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	160
SB-0879	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	245
SB-0992	NON-CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	255
SB-0892	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	246
SB-0925	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	256
SB-0984	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	254
SB-1004	TABLED	PAGE	256
SB-1037	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	259
SB-1077	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	259
SB-1095	NON-CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	248
SB-1111	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	253
SB-1132	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	247
SB-1152	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	250
SB-1165	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	251
SB-1189	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	251
SB-1267	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	252
SB-1297	NON-CONCURRENCE		259
SB-1289		PAGE	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	252
SB-1294	NON-CONCURPENCE	PAGE	253
SB-1303	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	255
SB-1437	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	253
HR-0202	MOTION	PAGE	220
HR-0202	ADOPTED	PAGE	10
HR-0203	ADOPTED	PAGE	14
HR-0254	ADOPTED		
		PAGE	14
HR-0313	ADOPTED	PAGE	15
HR-0350	ADOPTED	PAGE	15
HR-0404	ADOPTED	PAGE	16
HR-0415	ADOPTED	PAGE	17
HR-0425	ADOPTED	PAGE	18
HR-0464	ADOPTED	PAGE	19
HR-0492	ADOPTED		
		PAGE	21
HR-0494	ADOPTED	PAGE	22
HR-0614	ADOPTED	PAGE	185
HR-0617	ADOPTED	PAGE	197
HJR-0040	ADOPTED	PAGE	22

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

PAGE 4

JUNE 28, 1985

HJR-0053	ADOPTED	PAGE	23
SJR-0016	ADOPTED	PAGE	23

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND RANDY PERRY	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	163
RECESS	PAGE	182
HOUSE RECONVENES - REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAI	RPAGE	182
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	183
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	183
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	184
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	184
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	283