

82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

MAY 21, 1981

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. The hour of nine having arrived the Senate will come to
3. order. Prayer by the Reverend Anthony Tzortzis, Saint Anthony's
4. Hellenic Orthodox Church of Springfield. And will our guests in
5. the galleries please rise.

6. REVEREND ANTHONY TZORTZIS:

7. (Prayer given by Reverend Tzortzis)

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. Reading of the Journal, Senator Johns.

10. SENATOR JOHNS:

11. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that reading and approval
12. of the Journals of Thursday, May the 14th, Friday, May the 15th,
13. Monday, May the 18th, Tuesday, May the 19th, and Wednesday, May the
14. 20th, in the year 1981 be postponed pending arrival of the printed
15. Journal.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

17. You've heard the motion. Discussion? All in favor say Aye.
18. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion prevails. Committee
19. reports.

20. SECRETARY:

21. Senator Rock, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Assignment
22. of Bills, assigns the following House Bills to committee:

23. Agriculture, Conservation and Energy:- 681, and 787: Ap-
24. propriations I - 439: Elementary and Secondary Education - 174,
25. 496, 497, 501, 694, 695, 696, 722, 814, 874, 975, 1235, 1297,
26. 1447, 1450, 1678: Higher Education - 109, and 746: Elections
27. and Reapportionment - 114, 616, 651, 643, 677, and 1750: Ex-
28. ecutive - 159, 237, 284, 604, 780, 821, 1049, 1536, 1838: Ex-
29. ecutive Appointments, Veterans' Affairs and Administration - 735:
30. Finance and Credit Regulations - 378, 419, 430, and 571: Insur-
31. ance, Pensions, and Licensed Activities - 183, 270, 289, 291, 305,
32. 326, 341, 393, 448, 449, 617, 723, 781, 835, 1367, and 1689:
33. Judiciary I - 142, 145, 455, 483, 486, 487, 488, 513, 515, 534,
622, and 985: Judiciary II - 19, 22, 65, 154, 276, 339, 349, 572,

1. and 688: Labor and Commerce - 203 and 334: Local Government -
2. 103, 146, 196, 285, 301, 390, 639, 649, 669, 868, 1377, 1391,
3. and 1608: Public Health, Welfare, and Corrections - 396, 508,
4. 525, 815, 1033: Revenue - 800, 910, 991, 1047, 1184: Trans-
5. portation - 410, 440, 655, and 904.

6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

7. Message from the House.

8. SECRETARY:

9. A Message from the House by Mr. Leone, Clerk.

10. Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the
11. House of Representatives has passed bills with the following titles
12. in the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the
13. Senate, to-wit:

14. House Bills 113, 155, 181, 239, 249, 463, 477, 490, 531,
15. 533, 535, 542, 568, 576, 577, 594, 597, 598, 645, 646, 659, 666,
16. 674, 682, 725, 726, 744, 765, 767, 772, 782, 794, 795, 803, 808,
17. 813, 819, 823, 829, 847, 857, 882, 900, 927, 940, 942, 947, 959,
18. 961, 972, 974, 978, 979, 980, 983, 999, 1005, 1006, 1016, 1019,
19. 1020, 1039, 1043, 1045, 1048, 1052, 1065, 1073, 1080, 1097, 1136,
20. 1139, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1150, 1152, 1153, 1155, 1160, 1161,
21. 1168, 1179, 1181, 1189, 1209, 1234, 1243, 1246, 1253, 1257, 1259,
22. 1263, 1270, 1277, 1280, 1288, 1291, 1294, and 1313, 1314, 1323,
23. 1339, 1348, 1354, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1373, 1405, 1407, 1409, 1417,
24. 1419, 1422, 1421, 1440, 1470, 1474, 1475, 1487, 1489, 1497, 1531,
25. 1535, 1553, 1558, 1578, 1609, 1632, 1661, 1674, 1794, 1819, 1842,
26. and 1880.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

28. If I might have the attention of the Body. We're going to
29. run House Bills 1st, and then we will go to Senate Bills 3rd reading,
30. where we'll start with Senate Bill 448. And so the members are
31. aware, Senator Ozinga will be the first one, Senator Demuzio,
32. Senator Rupp, Senator Philip, Senator Coffey, Senator Gitz, Senator
33. Marovitz, and Senator Rhoads, are the first ten sponsors of bills.

1. And we'll be starting with 448 on page 11 of your Calendar. Is
2. there leave to go to the Order of House Bills 1st reading? Leave
3. is granted. House Bills 1st.

4. SECRETARY:

5. House Bill...House Bill 187, Senator Keats is the Senate sponsor.

6. (Secretary reads title of bill)

7. 1st reading of the bill.

8. House Bill 226, Senator Buzbee.

9. (Secretary reads title of bill)

10. 1st reading of the bill.

11. House Bill 263, Senator Thomas.

12. (Secretary reads title of bill)

13. 1st reading of the bill.

14. 264, Senator Sangmeister.

15. (Secretary reads title of bill)

16. 1st reading of the bill.

17. 267, Senator Marovitz.

18. (Secretary reads title of bill)

19. 1st reading of the bill.

20. House Bill 293, Senator Maitland.

21. (Secretary reads title of bill)

22. 1st reading of the bill.

23. House Bill 322, Senator Marovitz.

24. (Secretary reads title of bill)

25. 1st reading of the bill.

26. 323, Senator Rupp.

27. (Secretary reads title of bill)

28. 1st reading of the bill.

29. 379, Senator Sangmeister.

30. (Secretary reads title of bill)

31. 1st reading of the bill.

32. 380, Senator Sangmeister.

33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

1. 1st reading of the bill.
2. House Bill 403, Senator Nedza.
3. (Secretary reads title of bill)
4. 1st reading of the bill.
5. House Bill 432, Senator McLendon.
6. (Secretary reads title of bill)
7. 1st reading of the bill.
8. House Bill 503, Senator Bowers.
9. (Secretary reads title of bill)
10. 1st reading of the bill.
11. House Bill 521, Senator Kent.
12. (Secretary reads title of bill)
13. 1st reading of the bill.
14. House Bill 523, Senator Nedza.
15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
16. 1st reading of the bill.
17. House Bill 581, Senator Gitz.
18. (Secretary reads title of bill)
19. 1st reading of the bill.
20. House Bill 636, Senator Gitz.
21. (Secretary reads title of bill)
22. 1st reading of the bill.
23. House Bill 654, Senator Johns.
24. (Secretary reads title of bill)
25. 1st reading of the bill.
26. House Bill 676, Senator Chew.
27. (Secretary reads title of bill)
28. 1st reading of the bill.
29. House Bill 698, Senator Philip.
30. (Secretary reads title of bill)
31. 1st reading of the bill.
32. House Bill 705, Senator Taylor.
33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

1. 1st reading of the bill.
2. House Bill 709, Senator Gitz.
3. (Secretary reads title of bill)
4. 1st reading of the bill.
5. House Bill 751, Senator Nimrod.
6. (Secretary reads title of bill)
7. 1st reading of the bill.
8. House Bill 753, Senator Vadalabene.
9. (Secretary reads title of bill)
10. 1st reading of the bill.
11. House Bill 755, Senator DeAngelis.
12. (Secretary reads title of bill)
13. 1st reading of the bill.
14. House Bill 756, Senator DeAngelis.
15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
16. 1st reading of the bill.
17. House Bill 757, Senator DeAngelis.
18. (Secretary reads title of bill)
19. 1st reading of the bill.
20. House Bill 759, Senator DeAngelis.
21. (Secretary reads title of bill)
22. 1st reading of the bill.
23. House Bill 778, Senator Gitz.
24. (Secretary reads title of bill)
25. 1st reading of the bill.
26. House Bill 817, Senator Davidson.
27. (Secretary reads title of bill)
28. 1st reading of the bill.
29. House Bill 860, Senator Gitz.
30. (Secretary reads title of bill)
31. 1st reading of the bill.
32. House Bill 886, Senator Taylor.
33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

1. 1st reading of the bill.
2. House Bill 933, Senator Egan.
3. (Secretary reads title of bill)
4. 1st reading of the bill.
5. House Bill 937, Senator Marovitz.
6. (Secretary reads title of bill)
7. 1st reading of the bill.
8. House Bill 963, Senator D'Arco.
9. (Secretary reads title of bill)
10. 1st reading of the bill.
11. House Bill 986, Senator Nash.
12. (Secretary reads title of bill)
13. 1st reading of the bill.
14. House Bill 988, Senators Keats and Nash.
15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
16. 1st reading of the bill.
17. House Bill 1007, Senator Berman.
18. (Secretary reads title of bill)
19. 1st reading of the bill.
20. House Bill 1029, Senator Keats.
21. (Secretary reads title of bill)
22. 1st reading of the bill.
23. House Bill 1030, Senator Rupp.
24. (Secretary reads title of bill)
25. 1st reading of the bill.
26. House Bill 1041, Senator Gitz.
27. (Secretary reads title of bill)
28. 1st reading of the bill.
29. House Bill 1126, Senator Demuzio.
30. (Secretary reads title of bill)
31. 1st reading of the bill.
32. House Bill 1362, Senator Marovitz.
33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

1. 1st reading of the bill.
2. House Bill 1365, Senator Keats.
3. (Secretary reads title of bill)
4. 1st reading of the bill.
5. House Bill 1371, Senator Egan.
6. (Secretary reads title of bill)
7. 1st reading of the bill.
8. House Bill 1435, Senator Savickas.
9. (Secretary reads title of bill)
10. 1st reading of the bill.
11. House Bill 1483, Senator Marovitz.
12. (Secretary reads title of bill)
13. 1st reading of the bill.
14. House Bill 1507, Senator Buzbee.
15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
16. 1st reading of the bill.
17. House Bill 1614, Senator Gitz.
18. (Secretary reads title of bill)
19. 1st reading of the bill.
20. House Bill 1812, Senator Davidson.
21. (Secretary reads title of bill)
22. 1st reading of the bill.
23. House Bill 1813, Senator Davidson.
24. (Secretary reads title of bill)
25. 1st reading of the bill.
26. PRESIDENT:
Senator Ozinga, for what purpose do you arise?
27. SENATOR OZINGA:
Mr. President, I have been requested by members of this side
28. of the aisle, a Republican caucus in Senator Shapiro's Office,
29. immediately. I feel that the caucus should last from about a
30. half hour to an hour.
31. PRESIDENT:
- 32.
- 33.

1. That request is in order. The Senate will stand in recess
2. until the hour of 10:45. Senate stands in recess until 10:45.

3. RECESS

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

5. ...still in recess, but Senator Maitland has an announcement.

6. SENATOR MAITLAND:

7. Thank you, Mr. President. While the Senate is in recess, I'd
8. like to introduce a class in the...in the left rear gallery, from
9. Beeson Grade School, Mrs. Hanlin and the 7th and 8th grade students.
10. I'd like for the Senate to welcome them to Springfield at this time.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

12. Will our guests rise and be recognized by the Senate. We
13. are still in recess.

14. AFTER RECESS

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. Will the Senate please come to order. When we recessed we
17. indicated we would come back to the Order of 3rd reading, and
18. begin on page 11 of your Calendar with Senate Bill 448, which
19. is exactly where we stopped yesterday. Senator Ozinga, are you
20. ready?

21. SENATOR OZINGA:

22. Well, I'm not ready, but I suppose we'd better go ahead.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

24. All right. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

25. SECRETARY:

26. Senate Bill 448.

27. (Secretary reads title of bill)

28. 3rd reading of the bill.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

30. Yes, WBBM seeks leave to record the proceedings. Is there
31. leave? Leave is granted. Senator Ozinga is recognized.

32. SENATOR OZINGA:

33. Man, I'd better go back and comb my hair. Senate Bill 448,

1. amends the Criminal Code to add the definition of official mis-
2. conduct. The knowing or reckless execution of a false document
3. authorizing the disbursement of public funds, or the disposal of
4. public property. Now, this became known sometime ago when
5. there was a situation that occurred at one of the institutions,
6. and an Attorney General's opinion was asked. All that this bill
7. does, is it adds the knowing or reckless execution of a false
8. document authorizing disbursement of public funds or disposal of
9. public property to the list of Acts constituting official mis-
10. conduct. The proposal grows out of the findings contained in
11. the management audit of the Statesville Correctional Industries,
12. where the auditors found that numerous documents had been falsified
13. to permit the department to pay Correctional Industries for goods
14. that had not been produced. The Attorney General's Office issued
15. an informal opinion to the effect that the Official Misconduct
16. Statute at the...as presently written, did not apply in this sit-
17. uation. The proposal is intended to remedy this deficiency, and
18. I would urge a favorable roll call.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

20. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is,
21. shall Senate Bill 448 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed
22. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
23. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes
24. are 53, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 448,
25. having received the required constitutional majority is declared
26. ...declared passed. Senate Bill 449, Senator Demuzio. All right.
27. Senate Bill 450, Senator Rupp. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

28. SECRETARY:

29. Senate Bill 450.

30. (Secretary reads title of bill)

31. 3rd reading of the bill.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

33. Senator Rupp.

1. SENATOR RUPP:

2. Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill does, is amends
3. the Unified Code of Corrections in regard to child abuse. The
4. present code provides a period of probation, a term of periodic
5. imprisonment or conditional discharge shall not be imposed on
6. the following offenses. And then it goes and lists some such
7. as, murder, where the death penalty is not imposed, attempted
8. murder, a Class X Felony, and we want to add in there, and this is
9. the only change that we make, is a violation of Section 12-4.3
10. of the Criminal Code, which is the child abuse where the offender
11. is other than a person engaged in the actual care of the victim
12. child. I ask for a favorable roll call.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

14. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is,
15. shall Senate Bill 450 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed
16. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
17. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes
18. are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 450,
19. having received the required constitutional majority is declared
20. passed. Senate Bill 459, Senator Gitz. Senate Bill 460, Senator
21. Marovitz. Senator Marovitz on the Floor? Senate Bill 462, Senator
22. Rhoads. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

23. SECRETARY:

24. Senate Bill 462.

25. (Secretary begins title of bill)

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

27. For what...for what purpose does Senator Hall arise?

28. SENATOR HALL:

29. Thank you, Mr. President. You took a big jump there, did
30. you have any particular reason?

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

32. Well, we were holding appropriation bills, and we're going
33. to run them on...at one time.

S. B. 469
3rd reading
5-21-81

- 1. SENATOR HALL:
- 2. Oh, okay.
- 3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
- 4. Okay.
- 5. SECRETARY:
- 6. Senate Bill 462.
- 7. (Secretary reads title of bill)
- 8. 3rd reading of the bill.
- 9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
- 10. Senator Rhoads.
- 11. SENATOR RHOADS:
- 12. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Senate
- 13. Bill 462 came from the Secretary of State's Traffic Safety Ad-
- 14. visory Committee, and is endorsed by the Motor Vehicle Laws
- 15. Commission. It updates the Bicycle Safety Code to establish
- 16. guidelines for parking, racing, and other bicycle uses. It
- 17. brings the legislation into conformance with the Uniform Vehicle
- 18. Code followed by most states. I do not know of any opposition.
- 19. I'd be happy to answer any questions. If there are none, I would
- 20. ask for a favorable roll call.
- 21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
- 22. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is,
- 23. shall Senate Bill 462 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed
- 24. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
- 25. voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are
- 26. 54, the Nays are 1, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 462, having
- 27. received the required constitutional majority is declared passed.
- 28. Senate Bill 469, Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary,
- 29. please.
- 30. SECRETARY:
- 31. Senate Bill 469.
- 32. (Secretary reads title of bill)
- 33. 3rd reading of the bill.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Senator Demuzio.

3. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

4. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
5. Senate. On Senate Bill 469, I don't believe there's any con-
6. troversy to it. It was a request of Commissioner Harris, that the
7. bill that we had passed two years ago, or last year, establishing
8. the point of sale terminals and the automatic teller machines.
9. There were some...some clarification that needed to be taken
10. care of in this specific legislative year since the banks were given
11. the authority to establish the ATM's, that there's been consid-
12. erable confusion and interpretation in...in the interpretation
13. of parts of the law. All of the changes that are in this bill in
14. the establishment and the deployment of the automatic teller
15. machines, are really technical and clarifying. There's no sub-
16. stantive changes in the...it's simply made to clarify the de-
17. ployment and the establish of automatic teller machines, that they
18. are applicable to all of the other financial institutions. I
19. don't know of any controversy or opposition, and would ask for
20. favorable support.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

22. Is there discussion? Senator Bloom.

23. SENATOR BLOOM:

24. Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, I'd like to add that this
25. bill is not part of any wars, or revolutions, or other disruptions,
26. or mutinies. Question, Vince, the present Act allows ten off-
27. premises ATM's, does it not?

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. Senator Demuzio.

30. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

31. That is correct, and this amendment simply clarifies that
32. the ATM's may be established under the Act...subject to the pro-
33. visions of the Act. It's all technical.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 469
3. pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The
4. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
5. wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the
6. Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 469, having re-
7. ceived the required constitutional majority is declared passed.
8. Senate Bill 475, Senator Hall. Senator Hall. 475. Read the
9. bill, Mr. Secretary...oh, all right. 476, Senator Hall. Read
10. the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

11. SECRETARY:

12. Senate Bill 476.

13. (Secretary reads title of bill)

14. 3rd reading of the bill.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. Senator Kenneth Hall.

17. SENATOR HALL:

18. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
19. Senate. Senate Bill 476 adds an amendment to the Illinois Pro-
20. motion Act, giving the Department of Commerce and Community
21. Affairs the power to assist municipalities or local promotion
22. groups in developing new tourist attractions, and to promote
23. tourism facility development. The department does not have this
24. authority. This bill is endorsed by the Illinois Hotel and Motel
25. Association, the amendment is agreed upon by the Department of
26. Commerce and Community Affairs. This activity is funded under
27. the Illinois Hotel and Motel tax. I'd ask your most favorable
28. support of the bill.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

30. Is there discussion? Senator Keats.

31. SENATOR KEATS:

32. Okay, thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of
33. the Senate. This bill came through the Senate Labor and Commerce
Committee, and passed on a vote five to four. Our feelings on the

SB 477
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. bill, is that we just plain don't know what it costs. This parti-
2. cular fund we're talking about, is not exactly running a large
3. surplus, if it were, then we'd say fine, let's go with it. But
4. we are expanding the operations of the Department of Commerce and
5. Community Affairs in an area where they probably don't have the
6. money to pay for it. I'm not saying the bill is not meritori-
7. ous, personally I don't think it's a bad idea, I just don't know
8. where the money is going to come from. That was the reason the bill
9. came out of committee on a five to four vote. Thank you.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

11. Further discussion? Senator Hall may close.

12. SENATOR HALL:

13. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Keats asked for a fiscal
14. note, and the fiscal note was furnished, and it says the fiscal
15. impact on this bill, would cost the State approximately twenty-
16. five thousand dollars. It's nominal, and I'd ask your most favor-
17. able support of the bill.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

19. The question is, shall Senate Bill 476 pass. Those in favor
20. vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
21. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
22. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 33,
23. the Nays are 18, 4 Voting Present. Senate Bill 476, having
24. received the required constitutional majority is declared passed.
25. Senate Bill 477, Senator Davidson. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary,
26. please.

27. SECRETARY:

28. Senate Bill 477.

29. (Secretary reads title of bill)

30. 3rd reading of the bill.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

32. Senator Davidson.

33. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

1. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. This bill does
2. as it says, it's investment tax credit, with the amendment that
3. was put on earlier this week, it applies to manufacture, mining
4. and retailing. It comes out of the corporate replacement tax,
5. this tax which is...will have...this doesn't take effect till
6. July 1, 1983, will have a surplus of a hundred and nine million
7. dollars it in, estimated. The cost of this, estimated by the
8. Department of Revenue, with the retailers in, since I cut the
9. effect of it to half of one percent, would be forty-two million
10. dollars. This is one of the only bills alive in the State Leg-
11. islature at this time, to help do something to address the unemploy-
12. ment problem, to give the manufacturers, the mining and the retailer
13. who are the employers, an opportunity to invest. This is not
14. a new concept, sixteen states have it. The Federal Government's
15. had, in fact, an investment tax credit since 1962, and it has
16. helped. I ask for a Yes vote for this, so we can get business
17. back on track and give people some employment. July...the ques-
18. tion was asked, the effective date, is July 1, 1983.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

20. Is there discussion? Senator Bloom.

21. SENATOR BLOOM:

22. Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield to a question?

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

24. Indicates he will yield.

25. SENATOR BLOOM:

26. Concerning the definition of manufacturing operations, is it
27. the intent of this legislation that the definition does include
28. receipt retention, and movement of manufacturing materials and
29. supplies by the taxpayer claiming the credit?

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

31. Senator Davidson.

32. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

33. Yes, that's the intent of the legislation.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Very good. Further discussion? Senator Rock.

3. SENATOR ROCK:

4. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of
5. the Senate. As a voice crying in the wilderness, I'm sure, I
6. rise reluctantly in opposition to Senate Bill 477 as amended.
7. In the statement that the sponsor made about the alleged
8. surplus in the Corporate Personal Property Tax Replacement Fund,
9. I don't know how you define surplus, but the fund is down, as you,
10. I'm sure, are painfully aware. And what we are doing, is de-
11. priving the local entities of some forty million dollars. I
12. just...I think if we're going to provide this kind of incentive
13. or tax credit, that we had better charge the fund that should
14. properly be charged, namely the Corporate Income Tax Fund. This
15. simply is not a good idea, as it's presently constituted, because
16. the Corporate Personal Property Tax Replacement Fund is in jeopardy
17. today, and I do not know where that alleged surplus is coming
18. from. So, I would urge an...No vote.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

20. Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

21. SENATOR WEAVER:

22. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

24. He indicates he will yield. Senator Weaver.

25. SENATOR WEAVER:

26. Senator Davidson, how much did Amendment No. 3 add to this
27. bill in the way of dollars?

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. Senator Davidson.

30. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

31. I do not have a letter, but what was given to me by phone,
32. the retailers' additional cost was another twelve million dollars,
33. and that's when I put the half percent in, cut it in half so it

1. would be an additional six million dollars, which would make a
2. total of...with what...manufacturing mining for a total of forty-
3. two million dollars cost in their estimates, since I reduced
4. the...the one percent down to a half a percent.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

6. Senator Weaver. Senator Netsch.

7. SENATOR NETSCH:

8. Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. President.
9. Part of my question to Senator Davidson, I think has been answered.
10. You are estimating an annual cost of forty-two million dollars
11. of the bill in its present form. Is that correct, Senator Davidson?

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

13. Senator Davidson.

14. SENATOR NETSCH:

15. He...he indicates that is correct.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

17. All right.

18. SENATOR NETSCH:

19. I...I had some higher figures, but I realize there is some
20. guesstimate involved in all of this, in any event. I would rise
21. in opposition to the bill, and only with a little bit of reluct-
22. ance. One of the things that strikes me, is that if we could
23. wipe the slate clean and start all over again, it would be a
24. very good move to...

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

26. Can we have a little order, please. Or in the words of Senator
27. Donnewald, can we have a lot of order.

28. SENATOR NETSCH:

29. It would be a good move to trade this even up for the sales
30. tax exemption on equipment and machinery which has proved to be
31. extremely expensive, and which I suspect cannot be demonstrated
32. to have helped the business climate or the addition of business
33. to the State of Illinois at all. It seems to me, that a carefully

1. directed, carefully defined investment tax credit has a much
2. better chance of having a measurable impact on helping business
3. to come to Illinois or to expand in Illinois. In other words,
4. the concept is much better than the sales tax exemption on
5. machinery. But alas, we did pass the sales tax exemption of
6. machinery and equipment, and even if the...we are successful
7. in trimming back the rate on that, and I must say, that piece
8. of legislation has been very quiet for some period of time, we
9. are still talking about a huge revenue loss this year, next year,
10. and the year after. Perhaps, if we could put all of these
11. proposals that are designed to help business locate, expand, and
12. stay in Illinois into a basket and look at them carefully, and
13. then determine which one will, in fact, have a...an affirmative
14. impact, we would really, in the long run, be much better off with-
15. out costing all of the revenue that...that this one does. And
16. even though this one comes out of the Replacement Tax Fund, that
17. is almost the same as if it were part of State revenues in a...
18. an indirect, but very important sense. So, it seems to me, that
19. it does not make a lot of sense to enact this, at this time, unless
20. we could scratch the rest of the packages and start over again.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Channel 3 News seeks leave to film the proceedings. Is leave
23. granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Coffey.

24. SENATOR COFFEY:

25. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. I rise in...in
26. favor of this bill, and I would like to point out, that even though
27. it has been mentioned here, that we're going to lose...there's
28. going to be some loss of revenue of some forty-two million dollars,
29. that from where I've come from, that you have to spend money to
30. make money. And if we're to have industry to expand in the State of
31. Illinois, and if we're to have new industry to locate in the State
32. of Illinois, then we certainly are going to have to do something,
33. and I think the investment tax credit is one way to do that.

1. With bringing in of...new industry and expansion of new industry,
2. it's going to make more tax dollars available. So, while we're
3. saying it's going to cost us forty-two million dollars, what...
4. what benefits is this going to bring to the State of Illinois in
5. the way of revenue from...from locating this new industry, and
6. the expansion. We have to take that into consideration. It...
7. two nights ago, I met with the corporate people of General Electric,
8. which we have two General Electric plants in our district. They
9. are talking about expansions, but they're also talking about ex-
10. pansions to some of their other facilities in some other states.
11. And I think the tax credit is one of the things that...that, for
12. instance, GE is looking at, to see whether that expansion is going
13. to take place here in Illinois or whether it's going to take place
14. in some other state. And in Danville, we just lost two industries
15. that were wanting to locate here, and with workmen's comp and
16. unemployment comp. and no tax incentives for them to locate here,
17. they located one in Indiana and one in Kentucky. We're...that's
18. happening everyday, I think the tax credit is...is badly needed,
19. even though there is going to be a revenue impact, and I would ask
20. for a favorable roll call in favor of this bill.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator Maitland.

23. SENATOR MAITLAND:

24. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
25. Senate. I think one issue that hasn't been addressed yet, is the
26. fact that...that this legislation has an effective date of January
27. 1, 1983...July 1, '83, and what we're saying today to business in
28. Illinois, is that in a time certain you're going to have this
29. break. And it seems to me, this gives to them some direction towards
30. the attitude that we have for...and the concern we have for business
31. in Illinois. They could begin to plan, they can begin, if they
32. wish to build. They can begin to encourage that growth that we
33. need so much for business in Illinois. I think this...the time
is right for this legislation, and I think an affirmative vote here

1. is very necessary.

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Is there further discussion? Senator Thomas.

4. SENATOR THOMAS:

5. Thank you, very much, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen
6. of the Senate. I concur exactly with Senators Coffey and Maitland.
7. And I rise in support of this bill because it represents a group
8. in business that so oftentimes is overlooked, and that is the
9. retail community. When the large companies, such as Caterpillar,
10. Deer and Company, JI. Case and some of the others move plants away
11. from this State, it's banner headlines. But when the little shop
12. owner down the street, the gas station owner, the baker, when
13. his doors close because he's not given any help, it only affects
14. maybe four or five or ten people, and their employment. But it's
15. that segment that never gets into the headlines and this is an
16. attempt to help the retail segment of the State of Illinois as
17. well as the mining and manufacturing interests, and I am totally
18. in support of this concept.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

20. Senator Bruce.

21. SENATOR BRUCE:

22. Well, thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate.
23. I want to rise in support of the entire concept of investment tax
24. credit. I have voted for, each time, legislation which allows an
25. investment tax credit for which the State of Illinois shares the
26. burden of increasing and improving the business climate of the
27. State of Illinois. But I think every individual on this Floor
28. ought to know that we are taking by our votes, forty-two million
29. dollars away from local units of government, cities, counties,
30. community college districts, school districts, throughout the
31. State of Illinois, and giving that to business so that they will
32. improve the climate here, in Illinois. Now, it's very easy to say
33. that the City of Olney, or the City of Chicago, or the City of

1. Rockford, should sustain this loss. If investment tax credit is
2. such a good idea, why don't we say the State of Illinois who
3. benefits from the income tax, who will benefit from increased
4. sales tax, who will benefit from all the additional payments in
5. the State of Illinois into their coffers, why don't they sustain
6. the forty-two million dollar loss. And we know why, is the Governor
7. won't sign it if it comes out of the State Treasury, because the
8. Treasury is in bad shape. Now, why do we take it out...are the
9. local governments rolling in dough? Someone talks about the surplus,
10. we lost all of our personal property tax revenue, and we're picking
11. it up through the corporate personal property tax replacement.
12. Now, profits are down, and that fund is down. And you are going
13. to turn around and take forty-two million dollars away from some
14. four thousand, four hundred units of local government. Some of
15. them will not participate in this growth. Some of them won't have
16. a new plant. Some of them won't sustain growth, won't see
17. new jobs, won't see new filling stations and merchants open in
18. their area, but it's their school kids and their policemen, and
19. their firemen that sustain the loss. Now, this is a great concept,
20. a very good way to improve the business climate, but don't take
21. it out of small communities, large communities, county government,
22. the police departments, and the fire departments of the State of
23. Illinois. This is a State improvement, and it ought to be borne
24. by the State Treasury.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Senator Lemke.

27. SENATOR LEMKE:

28. I...I rise in opposition to this bill. Yesterday I had a
29. bill that would give local governments money to encourage business
30. to come to that, and to make improvements in their counties. But
31. your side of the aisle got up and said we couldn't afford this
32. from the State Treasury. This bill takes money away from local
33. governments who can't afford it. The police department and the

1. fire department, and all the necessities that go in with business
2. community that gives services to them would be denied these assets
3. and they would have to decrease. And all we would hear is, that
4. crime is on the rampant...in local government, and the police aren't
5. able to do it. Well, at this time local governments need more
6. money to increase their police force, and to encourage law and
7. order so businesses are not ripped off with shoplifting and every-
8. thing else. And I can't see us, I don't know if this is a Rep-
9. ublican position, is to steal from the poor governments, local
10. governments, and give to the rich, State, who has all the money.
11. All they do is come and take money out, and being from Cook County,
12. I can tell you, in the six county area, when it comes to money,
13. they keep taking it out of there, and we get back twenty-five
14. percent of everything they take out. So, I mean, they're
15. going to take some more money away from us, they're going to
16. take some more money away from...from the road programs. They
17. always come into six...six county area, and District 1 and steal
18. our money to build these beautiful roads downstate and pay our
19. Ag. premium funds in. Well, ninety...over ninety percent of the
20. money comes out of the race tracks in the City of Chicago, and
21. from the people, and now we want to take more money away from
22. local government. I can't see this bill. If that's the Republican
23. position to hurt local governments so that they can raise their
24. real estate taxes and then the people are going to pay in the
25. middle again, I've got to be against this. And I ask for a No
26. vote on this.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Further discussion? If not, Senator Davidson may close debate.

29. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

30. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. A couple of items
31. came up, particularly on the last speaker I hadn't planned to re-
32. spond to, but Senator Lemke, when we passed the corporate replacement
33. tax, if you'll remember, with Senator Bruce's help, Cook County and

1. the City of Chicago got more than a fair share of that money that
2. was given to them percentage wise. But let's talk about...let's
3. talk about money to local governments, Ladies and Gentlemen.
4. Under the personal property tax, if it had stayed as it was, it
5. would have been one billion, four hundred and eleven million dollars
6. collected in '79, '80, and '81. Under the corporate personal
7. replacement tax, '79, '80, '81, there's one billion five hundred
8. and thirty million dollars, a hundred and nineteen million dollars
9. more. And I sure didn't hear any local government complaining in
10. 1979 when they got an additional hundred and sixteen million
11. dollars in replacement tax on top, on top of the personal property
12. tax they'd already collected. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a
13. good bill, it's a...somehow, somehow to let...know the people
14. who do furnish the employment for our unemployed people that we
15. are interested in them. It doesn't take effect until July 1, 1983.
16. This is your chance to do something to help do away with unemployment
17. in Illinois, and I urge an Aye vote.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. The question is, shall Senate Bill 477 pass. Those in favor
20. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
21. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
22. On that question, the Ayes are 33, the Nays are...the Ayes are 23
23. ...the Ayes are 33, the Nays are 23, none Voting Present. Senate
24. Bill 477, having received the constitutional majority is declared
25. passed. Senator Bruce has requested a verification of the roll call.
26. Will all the Senators be in their seats. The Secretary will read
27. the affirmative votes.

28. SECRETARY:

29. The following voted in the affirmative: Becker, Berning,
30. Bloom, Bowers, Coffey, Davidson, Dawson, DeAngelis, Etheredge,
31. Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gitz, Grotberg, Jerome Joyce, Keats, Kent,
32. Mahar, Maitland, McMillan, Nimrod, Ozinga, Philip, Rhoads, Rupp,
33. Sangmeister, Schaffer, Shapiro, Simms, Sommer, Thomas, Totten, Walsh,

1. Weaver.

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Are there any questions of...Senator Bruce, do you have any
4. questions of the Senators?

5. SENATOR BRUCE:

6. Senator Bowers.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

8. Is Senator Bowers on the Floor? Senator Bowers is in his
9. seat.

10. SENATOR BRUCE:

11. Okay. Senator...well, that's fine, we don't...thank you.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. The roll call has been verified.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

(END OF REEL)

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

1. Senate Bill 479. Do we have leave to go back to the order
2. of Senate Bill 460, Senator Marovitz? Leave is granted.
3. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 460,
4. Senator Marovitz.

5. SECRETARY:

6. Senate Bill 460.

7. (Secretary reads title of bill)

8. 3rd reading of the bill.

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. Senator Marovitz.

11. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

12. Thank you, very much...Mr. President and Ladies and Gentle-

13. men of the Senate. It's a very important proposal, this legisla-

14. tion which is now a pilot program, and will only cost a hundred

15. and fourteen thousand dollars. It's been prepared by the

16. Illinois Action for Foster Children, not-for-profit coalition

17. of individuals from over two hundred organizations across the

18. State. These Foster Care Review Boards would examine the case

19. plans of all nondelinquent minors placed outside their homes.

20. They would conduct full in person reviews of a selected group

21. of State wards of neglected and abused children who are most

22. at risk and drifting between foster placements. The boards

23. will make recommendations to juvenile court judges concerning

24. the continuation or final disposition of each case. The boards,

25. by drawing attention to risk situations, will help the courts

26. and the Department of Children and Family Services keep children

27. at home wherever possible or more importantly, find permanent

28. or substitute homes. The goal is to insure a permanent plan

29. for each child, that every child moves toward the achievement

30. of the permanent plan. One of the most difficult tasks in child

31. welfare today involves placing dependent and neglected and abused

32. children in permanent living arrangements. These children must

33. have the opportunity to grow up in a family setting where someone

1. cares about them, where they feel permanent and secure.
2. The goal is to insure that wherever possible, this placement
3. is in the child's natural home, the home of relatives or an
4. adoptive home. Where these options are not possible the task
5. is to place the child in a permanent foster home. We have about
6. twelve thousand children presently drifting in foster care with-
7. out any plans or review. It's the State's responsibility to
8. work toward reuniting these children with their families or
9. finding them new homes. Twelve thousand children at five thousand
10. dollars apiece or three million dollars. If we can provide the
11. counseling, the education, and the support services, of a permanent
12. review plan, we can get these children into permanent homes,
13. find them adoptions, adoptive parents and help the juvenile
14. court that is now charged with the responsibility every two
15. years to review the plans, the permanent plans, of these children.
16. This is a very important piece of legislation. It's supported
17. by the League of Women Voters, the Junior League...the PTA's
18. across the State of Illinois, the Illinois Coalition of Adoptive
19. Parents, the Juvenile Court Judges, the University of Chicago,
20. the Illinois Foster Parents Association, the Illinois Commission
21. on Children, and I would hope that it would have all of our
22. support for this important bill for children of the State of
23. Illinois.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Is there further discussion? Senator Keats.

26. SENATOR KEATS:

27. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
28. Senate. I'm a cosponsor of this bill with Senator Marovitz.
29. The original bill, although an excellent bill, was probably
30. too broad and had to be amended down to try it as a pilot program.
31. This program, while experimental, would definitely be advantageous
32. to the children who have been under the custody of DCFS. So
33. that you have outside review of some of the kids and their place-

1. ment and what's happening to them. A great deal of work has
2. been done on this bill and perhaps outside review may be a
3. controversial issue, but you have to remember that these children
4. belong to families who...in many cases have been unable to care
5. for that child and this allows a more natural environment for
6. the child so that parents who have been able to work with children
7. who've had problems, can give their advice on how these children
8. should be treated. I would appreciate your support. Thank you.

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. Senator Jerry Joyce.

11. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

12. Thank you, Mr. President. On a point of personal privilege.
13. In the Gallery over here we have the Limestone Junior High, and
14. if I didn't announce them, my niece up there would, I think, be
15. very angry with me. So...would they stand and be recognized.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Collins.

18. SENATOR COLLINS:

19. A...question of the sponsor.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. He indicates he will yield.

22. SENATOR COLLINS:

23. Senator Marovitz, what kind of costs you're...you're
24. talking about here?

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Senator Marovitz.

27. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

28. The cost for this pilot program and it's only two...two
29. in...in Cook County and one outside of Cook County. This cost
30. for the pilot program is one hundred and fourteen thousand dollars,
31. 114,000.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Senator Collins.

1. SENATOR COLLINS:

2. Yeah...I...I recognize, probably more so than anyone in
3. here, the problems involved in foster placements because I had
4. to work to help to try and...and find homes and to review case-
5. workers..service plans for placement of those children when
6. I worked for the department. But, I...I think, Senator Marovitz,
7. while the idea, the concept is a good concept, that we have
8. all kinds of agencies already set up who could, in fact, conduct
9. that review. And...and I really don't see the need, I don't
10. see any impact that you're going to get any more positive
11. results from a separate review board than you are doing now.
12. A, the Commission on Children should be reviewing the placements
13. of these kids. The Public Aid Advisory Committee should be
14. reviewing the placements of those kids. The Department of...
15. DCF itself should be reporting on the status of the cases
16. of those kids. So to just keep adding on layers and layers
17. and layers because we have problems, is not the way to solve
18. the problem, and you're talking about more money.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

20. Senator Geo-Karis.

21. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

22. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The
23. remarks of my colleague just made have a lot of merit, but I
24. do think, that as long as you are willing to have volunteers
25. of citizens to help oversee the care of these children, I
26. think we should make every effort to support it. I served
27. on Human Resources Commission Committees in the House and I
28. can tell you, we had children no one knew where they were.
29. At least these people would be looking into it and helping.
30. And this is only a pilot program. I think we should try it
31. out. In all due respect to the Department of Children and
32. Family Services and I think Director Coler is doing a good
33. job. I feel that this is a worthwhile project and I think

1. we should support it with all our hearts because you have
2. your runaways, who run away from dope and incest matters
3. and you blame the children, well let's have some review in
4. overseeing of some of these things so they can help children.
5. The bottom line is what can we do to help children. They
6. are the future citizens of tomorrow and I heartily support
7. the bill.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Senator Grotberg.

10. SENATOR GROTBORG:

11. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
12. Senate. I don't know where the sponsors intend to go with
13. this concept. People have been complimenting them on the
14. concept. I think the whole concept is terrible. We need
15. another committee of do-gooders overlooking kids in this
16. State like the Methodist Church needs a ballroom. They
17. are all over the place out there now. We've got committee
18. after committee after committee. We've got committees in
19. our town and in every town that there is in the United States
20. doing good work in communities and here comes something
21. that's connected with the courts even. You can see what the
22. courts have done for us lately. Good heavens, if you've
23. got any sense at all, just vote No and keep the government
24. the rest of the way out of our families.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Senator Berning.

27. SENATOR BERNING:

28. Thank you, Mr. President. I also have some serious
29. reservations about the advisability of creating some new
30. bureaucratic procedure, even with volunteers. But more importantly
31. it seems to me, that here we have before us, a proposition that
32. will require the expenditure of some degree of public money.
33. And who is one of the primary supporters of this concept? It's
34. the League of Women Voters. And Mr. President, I remind you

1. and the members of the Senate, that the League of Women Voters,
2. instead of contributing their dollars to our economy, take their convention
3. out of the State of Illinois. In my opinion, their endorsement
4. is a serious indictment of this program.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Johns.

7. SENATOR JOHNS:

8. Will the sponsor answer a question?

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. He indicates he will respond.

11. SENATOR JOHNS:

12. Senator Marovitz, is it still true that DCFS will not
13. be a part of the Review Board? That...(Machine cut-off)...of the...

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Senator Marovitz.

16. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

17. They will still be doing their review just as they always
18. have been. These review boards will help the courts that are
19. charged with the responsibility every two years of reviewing
20. the cases of the...of the wards of the State and the abused
21. and neglected children that come before them. And the courts
22. are continually telling us, they don't have the wherewithal
23. to...to do this review and the Department of Children and
24. Family Services doesn't have the...the staff...that is...that
25. is capable and necessary and have the time, to do all this
26. review. This external review has...has worked in seven or
27. eight states in...in cooperation with the State agency and
28. working with the State agency can only make the plight of
29. these unfortunate kids a lot easier. These are...these are
30. ...as...as Senator...Collins didn't know, these are volunteer...
31. people who are concerned about kids that will help the courts
32. do this review. It has worked in seven other states.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Senator Johns.

2. SENATOR JOHNS:

3. ...What...what bothers me, is, if I'm not mistaken, we
4. have really and truly funded DCFS to the hilt and if they
5. don't have staff, I'm wondering why. But, needless to say,
6. the question still is, that the...the...the bill is...is my opinion
7. reading, is attempting to go right over...

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Say...would that TV camera up on Channel 3 or...would
10. you disband your interviewing up there...and take it out.

11. SENATOR JOHNS:

12. May I continue, Mr. President?

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Yes, Senator.

15. SENATOR JOHNS:

16. Okay, thank you. What you are attempting to do is to provide
17. oversight to the Foster...Child Care System in Illinois, right?
18. Well, Senator Marovitz, you're probably aware that I feel with
19. you and for you in this regard. And if you remember, just a
20. few days ago, I took from the Family Magazine an article called,
21. "Kids for Rent, the Plight of Foster Children." And let me
22. just read a couple of sentences. "When foster care was begun
23. in the 1960's, it was intended as a social service for
24. families who were temporarily unable to care for their children.
25. Foster care began as a temporary solution to family problems."
26. But, it says, it goes right to the heart of the matter, "the
27. reasons why children remain in care so long are complex, but
28. the primary one is economic, it pays agencies to keep children
29. as long as possible." And this bothers me a great deal. And
30. I want you to know that I'd like to be shown as a cosponsor
31. of this legislation and I'm going to support what you're trying
32. to do. It's a tremendous problem in Illinois.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Senator D'Arco.

2. SENATOR D'ARCO:

3. Thank you, Mr. President. I also rise in support of
4. this legislation. We have here a letter from Judge Hamilton
5. that indicates...and Judge Hamilton is the Chief Administrator
6. of the Juvenile Court in Cook County and he indicates that the
7. DCFS and the Judge's Review Panel are not doing their job.
8. And that point was brought up in committee because I asked
9. the question, isn't this just another layer of bureaucracy,
10. and if it is, why is it needed? And the witnesses testified
11. and so did Judge Hamilton, that the Judge's Review Panel and
12. DCFS's Review Panel are not really doing the job as is evidenced
13. by all of the problems we have in the foster care area. So I
14. rise in support of this bill and I hope everybody would vote
15. for it.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

18. SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

19. For a question.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. He indicates he will yield.

22. SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

23. Senator Marovitz, could you tell me whether or not the
24. ...whether or not Catholic Charities has a position on this
25. bill?

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Senator Marovitz.

28. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

29. Catholic Charities does not have a position on this bill.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Joyce.

32. SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

33. Did they testify at the...was there any testimony at

1. the...committee hearing?

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Senator Marovitz.

4. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

5. I don't remember.

6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

7. For the second time, Senator Collins. Oh, I'm sorry,

8. Senator Rock, our President.

9. SENATOR ROCK:

10. Yeah, whatever happened to him. Thank you, Mr. President,
11. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to
12. Senate Bill 460. This procedure, as Senator Grotberg so rightly
13. pointed out, has in fact, been tried, like in New York and
14. as...as with most other things that the Plague of Women
15. Voters stands for, I stand against. Okay. This is a program
16. which the Chief Judge of the Juvenile Court could, in fact,
17. institute at this moment with no legislative authorization.
18. This is a program which the Department of Children and Family
19. Services could institute at this moment with no legislative
20. authorization. We...we are...correct...we are...we are...we
21. are putting into place a layer of bureaucracy that has proved
22. elsewhere, and I cite specifically, the State of New York,
23. simply doesn't work. And if we're in...in fact, in favor
24. of what's in the best interests of these eleven or twelve thousand
25. children in foster placement, we ought to stay on the back of
26. the department as we have been doing and make sure the placements
27. are proper. But to bring in a...a bunch of citizens who know
28. little or nothing about the process, just for the purpose of
29. satisfying the Plague of Women Voters seems to me to be a
30. lousy idea and I urge a No vote.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. For the second time, Senator Collins.

33. SENATOR COLLINS:

1. I...with the exception of the Women's Voters League comment
2. of Senator Rock, I think he just about said what...what I was
3. going to say for the second time and I wanted to make sure of
4. that. The problem...I did know that it was a volunteer group,
5. but...but a volunteer group can...can bring in all kinds of
6. confusion and chaos and I think those agencies trying to
7. deal with the children...are having enough problems of their
8. own right now. And if, in fact, that they are not doing the
9. job, we should hold them accountable for doing the job that
10. they are mandated to do under current Statutes...and all of
11. these commissions. If not, we should wipe out the commissions
12. and we should also wipe out the Department of Children and
13. Family Services.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. For the second time, Senator Johns.

16. SENATOR JOHNS:

17. Well, I would...I like what Senator Rock has said, I
18. like what Senator Collins has said. I'm still going to support
19. the bill if it does nothing more than to irritate both of those
20. people, especially the President, with his powers, to see to
21. it that this department and the juvenile courts do act because
22. up to now, we have given, as I have said, millions upon millions
23. of extra dollars to DCFS and they still should have the staff
24. available out of all that money. And they still, apparently
25. most people feel that way, are not doing the job in this field.
26. I still intend to be a cosponsor. I still intend to support it.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz
29. may close debate.

30. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

31. Well, I...I hate for the first time to disagree with my
32. leader, but I would like to quote some results from other
33. states...and who have instituted Foster Care Review Boards.

1. South Carolina reported that since the inception of Foster Care
2. Review Boards, the average length of placement for children
3. in foster care has been reduced by eight months per year. A
4. New Jersey judge estimated that since the institution of Foster
5. Care Review Boards in his state, he sees half as many children
6. being placed in foster care as well as shorter placements than
7. before. Other states...other states have also reported cost
8. savings through Foster Care Review Board. Arizona estimates
9. that the Foster Care Review Board will save that state two
10. million dollars next year through this type of resource identi-
11. fication. In 1975, we had over a thousand...children...adoptions
12. of children who were the wards of State or neglected or abused
13. children. In 1979, that number, while we had the same amount
14. of children, the adoptions dropped to four hundred and seventy-one.
15. The kids in Foster Care Review boards today are in foster care
16. from four and a half to five years. That figure has not been
17. reduced by DCFS at all. I want to qualify this by saying that,
18. in my opinion, the...the Director of the Department of Children
19. and Family Services is probably, since I've been here for eight
20. years, the most outstanding Director of DCFS that we have had
21. and I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do. But I think
22. this will help the DCFS, it's going to help the Juvenile Court
23. System, but most important of all, and this is what we all should
24. care about, this is going to help kids who are abused and neglected
25. find a permanent place for them to begin their lives. And if one
26. hundred and fourteen thousand dollars, and that's all this is,
27. isn't the kind of a commitment that we can make for volunteers
28. who are willing to help our court system and willing to help
29. our children, then I don't know what we're here for. I would
30. respectfully solicit your Aye vote on this important bill for kids.
31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. The question is shall Senate Bill 460 pass. Those in
33. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open.

1. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
2. voted who wish? Take the record. On that question the Ayes
3. are 27, the Nays 21, 2 Voting Present. Senator Marovitz requests
4. postponed consideration. Is leave granted? Leave is granted.
5. Senate Bill 479, Senator Johns. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.
6. SECRETARY:
7. Senate Bill...
8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
9. No...Senate Bill 481, Senator Berman. Read the bill, Mr.
10. Secretary.
11. SECRETARY:
12. Senate Bill 481.
13. (Secretary reads title of bill)
14. 3rd reading of the bill.
15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
16. Senator Berman.
17. SENATOR BERMAN:
18. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 481 is a product
19. of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. What this
20. bill does, is to require that when there is a request for a
21. agency to issue a ruling, that that ruling be handled the
22. same as their rules, namely that it be published, available
23. for public inspection and that the public be aware of what these
24. requests for rulings are. This is another bill in the step
25. towards openness and access for the public to the operations
26. of State agencies.
27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
28. Is there any discussion? If not, Senator...the question
29. is shall Senate Bill 48...Senator Philip, for what...
30. SENATOR PHILIP:
31. Will the sponsor yield...for a question?
32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
33. He indicates he will.

1. SENATOR PHILIP:

2. I...I would assume that when the citizen would make the
3. request, the agency would give them a copy or a printed review
4. of that...and I'm just wondering, who's going to pay for it?

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Berman.

7. SENATOR BERMAN:

8. The...the cost of the publication would be the cost of
9. ...to the...to the agencies. Just like now, they pay for the
10. ...their publishing in the Illinois Register, this would
11. be part of what they'd be required to do.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Senator Philip.

14. SENATOR PHILIP:

15. It...it would seem to me that...that the group or citizen
16. requesting that information should have to pay for it, it ought
17. to be a fee. If you want that information, you ought to pay
18. a couple of dollars for it, at least pay for it.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

20. Further discussion? Senator Bloom.

21. SENATOR BLOOM:

22. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this.
23. The point that Senator Philip makes is a good one, however,
24. we already have the Illinois Register, it is being published
25. on a weekly basis to inform the public of the actions of
26. State agencies and what this says is, that where you have
27. declaratory rulings it would be handled in much the same
28. way as your revenue rulings and that is...which are published
29. in the Federal Register. We're just saying, so the public
30. can be informed, how fact situation A or B or C is being
31. treated, that the agencies must publish. We came across,
32. in our five year sunset review of the Department of Revenue's
33. operations that they were not...they were refusing to publish
34. their declaratory rulings on the sales tax exemption for

1. machinery and equipment and we said why and they said, well
2. we don't want to...we don't want to tell folks what trade
3. secrets are and we took a look at some of their letter rulings
4. and we found that the only thing they blocked out was the name
5. of the company. So, as a matter of fact, I think that this
6. is a step forward and that the taxpayers and that the...the
7. private sector can know exactly how the Department of Revenue
8. and other departments are treating members of the private
9. sector. I'd urge your support. Thank you.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Berman
12. may close debate.

13. SENATOR BERMAN:

14. Roll call.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. The question is shall Senate Bill 481 pass. Those in favor
17. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open.
18. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
19. voted who wish? Take the record. On that question the Ayes
20. are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill
21. 481 having received the constitutional majority is declared
22. passed. Senate Bill 482, Senator Hall. Read the bill, Mr.
23. Secretary.

24. SECRETARY:

25. Senate Bill 482.

26. (Secretary reads title of bill)

27. 3rd reading of the bill.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Hall.

30. SENATOR HALL:

31. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
32. Senate. This bill merely increases the membership on the
33. Illinois Housing Development Authority from seven to nine.

1. Now the reason that we originally introduced the bill, was, it
2. was my understanding and I was...was wrong in my understanding,
3. that most of the people were from the County of Cook. So then
4. when we got to checking, we found out that out of the seven
5. only one was from the County of Cook, so we amended the bill
6. to make it State-wide. So that I brought it in line with
7. what was called to my attention. And I'd ask your most favorable
8. support of this legislation. It's merely so we'll have a cross
9. section of representation from all over the State.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Is there any discussion? Senator Mahar.

12. SENATOR MAHAR:

13. Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I rise
14. in some reluctance to oppose this, for the simple reason is
15. that I've had some dealings with this board in the past and
16. it seems to me adding two more people to it may just...compounds
17. the problem we have. Now I understand that their mission is
18. to stimulate and finance...finance housing. But what they
19. don't do, is they don't take into consideration the local
20. areas. I've had a community in my district that's been...opposed
21. to this housing. The municipal people are opposed to it yet
22. they go right ahead when all the indications are that it's
23. not appropriate. There's no fire protection in the area, there's
24. actually no water, no private...public water source in the area,
25. no transportation, if they go ahead with their plans for this
26. type of housing. So my sole purpose in objecting to this is
27. the fact that if you add two more people to it, you're probably
28. going to compound the problem.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Hall
31. may close debate.

32. SENATOR HALL:

33. ...Senator, I can understand your frustration, it's
34. through our frustration that we're doing this. That we felt

1. that so we'd get total representation throughout the State.
2. Now, you never...evidently you're getting too much housing
3. and we who are around the State are not getting any. So, I
4. would...it would behoove us, as Legislators, to check on them
5. and find out. They're not evidently doing the job they're assigned
6. and I think this will be a great addition and maybe we can work
7. together and get it done. Please...I ask your most favorable
8. support of the bill.

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. The question is shall Senate Bill 482 pass. Those in
11. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting
12. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
13. Would you vote me... Have all voted who wish? Take the
14. record. On that question the Ayes are 40, the Nays are 12,
15. 1 Voting Present. Senate Bill 482, having received the
16. constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock..
17. SENATOR ROCK:

18. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
19. Senate. If I can have your attention. I have discussed at
20. some length, the...the proposed schedule for next week with
21. Senator Shapiro. I understand that all of us have, or could
22. have commitments for Monday. So we have determined that in
23. everybody's best interests we will, at the close of business
24. tomorrow, which I hope will be shortly before one o'clock,
25. we will return to Springfield Tuesday morning at the hour
26. of ten o'clock. Now I would urge everyone to try to be here
27. on...ten o'clock on time so we can start. There's a good
28. possibility we'll have to work Tuesday night. We have
29. five hundred bills on the Calendar and that roughly calls
30. for us to do a hundred bills a day and we're not moving
31. very rapidly. Ten o'clock, Tuesday morning.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. For...for your information, Senator, we've been here

1. since nine this morning, we've moved nine bills. Senator Rhoads.

2. SENATOR RHOADS:

3. Question of Senator Rock. Senator, because of the number
4. of legislative days remaining between now and the time that
5. Senate Bills have to be reported out of the Senate, a lot
6. of us are wondering when we can go to a time certain for
7. discharge motions. Could we set that as an order of business
8. ...Tuesday, sometime, two o'clock? That would allow us a day
9. for 2nd reading and a day for 3rd reading.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Senator Rock.

12. SENATOR ROCK:

13. Yeah, we can arrange and set a time certain for Tuesday,
14. sure, no problem.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. Senate Bill 483, Senator Hall. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

17. SECRETARY:

18. Senate Bill 483.

19. (Secretary reads title of bill)

20. 3rd reading of the bill.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator Hall.

23. SENATOR HALL:

24. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
25. the Senate. This creates the Metro East Economic Development
26. Authority Act at the request of Senator Keats. I had a fiscal
27. note prepared and the Commerce and Community Affairs'said,
28. that as introduced Senate Bill 483 would cost the State of
29. Illinois approximately five thousand dollars. This would
30. cover the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs responsibility
31. for certifying errors of critical labor surplus and for reviewing
32. applicationsfor assistance and advising authority. However,
33. the authority does have the power to receive monies granted

1. to the State. The fiscal impact of this power, at this time,
2. is of permissive nature. I would ask your most favorable
3. support of this bill.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

5. Is there any discussion? Senator Keats.

6. SENATOR KEATS:

7. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
8. the Senate. I always hate to arise against Senator Hall's
9. wonderful bills. His last one, really, was not a bad bill,
10. and I almost felt guilty opposing a bill, but at the same
11. time, that was the last one. This one, hey, you're talking
12. about some broad decision making power, unlimited bonding
13. authority, almost unlimited borrowing powers, to a newly
14. appointed Metro East Economic Development Authority. The
15. scope of the jurisdiction of the body seems to be State-
16. wide, although geographic boundaries are much more limited.
17. There's...no review mechanism whatsoever, it is mandated
18. to promote the reduction of unemployment, pollution, et
19. cetera, but it does have tremendous powers in...in the
20. pollution area, in fact...and to go with that, the unlimited
21. bonding powers in...within pollution and within the area
22. for development. The...the bill gives this authority to
23. regulate construction and maintenance of public utility
24. facilities in or near these projects, the right to require
25. and or removal or relocate various things paid for by the
26. Authority. I say, the previous bill I may have felt
27. guilty opposing, this one I would feel guilty sitting down about.
28. The breadth of the powers covered in here, forget the unlimited
29. bonding, et cetera, is amazing. It would set a...a precedent
30. that perhaps we really wouldn't wish to do. While the cost
31. to the State is minimal, the cost to the taxpayers and the
32. potential liability of the bonds, et cetera, can be amazing.
33. I would appreciate a negative vote.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Hall may
3. close debate.

4. SENATOR HALL:

5. Well, in answer to Senator Keats, that the facts are that
6. this extremely will be an effort to reestablish the tax base
7. of East St. Louis, Brooklyn, Centreville, Allerton, Illinois.
8. And there's no way these can be redeveloped without enacting
9. a vehicle to begin the...the redevelopment process. The
10. only bonds that the Authority will be able to bring about
11. will be Revenue Bonds that have to be retired from the
12. revenue resulting from the particular project. The credit
13. of the State is in no way involved. It will be clearly written
14. on the face of the bond that the State of Illinois will in
15. no way be responsible for these Revenue Bonds. Now, this
16. is a step in the right direction. Also, and I hope you fellows
17. on the other side, Ladies and Gentlemen on the other side,
18. the House for years has been sending us this bill over here.
19. So let's, in turn, send this bill over to them. Okay. I would
20. ask your most favorable support of this bill. Let's send it
21. on over to the House. We've been fighting these bills over
22. here for years. I want to send something over to them.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. The question is shall Senate Bill 483 pass. Those in
25. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is
26. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
27. Come on, one for...Wyvetter, one for Wyvetter, yeah. Take...
28. take the record. On that question the Ayes are 31, the Nays
29. 27, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 483, having received
30. the constitutional majority is declared passed. For what
31. purpose does Senator Rhoads arise?

32. SENATOR RHOADS:

33. To request a verification of the affirmative vote.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Rhoads has requested a verification...of the
3. affirmative votes. Will the Senators please be in their
4. seats. Will the Secretary please read the affirmative votes.

5. SECRETARY:

6. The following voted in the affirmative: Berman, Bruce,
7. Buzbee, Carroll, Chew, Collins, D'Arco, Dawson, Degnan, Demuzio,
8. Egan, Etheredge, Gitz, Grotberg, Hall, Johns, Jeremiah Joyce,
9. Jerome Joyce, Lemke, Marovitz, McLendon, Nash, Nedza, Nega,
10. Netsch, Newhouse, Sangmeister, Savickas, Taylor, Vadalabene,
11. Mr. President.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Is there...Senator Rhoads, any question of the affirmative
14. vote?

15. SENATOR RHOADS:

16. Is Senator Dawson on the Floor?

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator...is Senator Dawson on the Floor? He is on the
19. Floor.

20. SENATOR RHOADS:

21. Is Senator Lemke on the Floor?

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Senator Lemke. The roll call has been verified and the
24. Ayes are 31, the Nays are 27, those Voting Present are none.
25. Senate Bill 483 is declared passed. Senate Bill 484, Senator
26. D'Arco. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

27. SECRETARY:

28. Senate Bill 484.

29. (Secretary reads title of bill)

30. 3rd reading of the bill.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator D'Arco.

33. SENATOR D'ARCO:

1. Thank you, Mr. President. The Department of Public Aid
2. have proposed an amendment to Rule 410...the clinical services
3. amendment, which would provide that free standing clinics
4. would be reimbursed on a fee for service cost instead of
5. the actual cost. This legislation, which affects fourteen
6. free standing clinics in the State of Illinois, would provide
7. that the reimbursement for free standing clinics as of January
8. 1, 1981, that are participating in the program, would be for
9. the actual cost which they are now, rather than the fee for
10. service cost, which the department would initiate through the
11. amendment to Rule 410. The Joint Committee on Administrative
12. Rules, when they reviewed the department's proposed amend-
13. ment, indicated to the department that that amendment was
14. arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious, that's very strong
15. language. What this bill does, is provide for those clinics
16. that are presently being reimbursed and it is not prospective,
17. it would only provide for those clinics that are presently...
18. being reimbursed on an actual cost basis, the same formula
19. for reimbursement that they are presently under now. And I
20. think, Senator Bloom, as Chairman of the Joint Committee,
21. would like to address this bill.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Senator Bloom.

24. SENATOR BLOOM:

25. Well, Senator D'Arco is correct. The Joint Committee did
26. object because the proposed rule making was without Statutory
27. authority and they were making a distinction between free
28. standing clinics and clinics that were physically attached
29. to hospitals that was without any kind of rational basis.
30. That was the basis of our objection. I understand that this
31. ...this proposed legislation would give them the Statutory
32. authority to treat all...would mandate them to treat all clinics
33. whether free standing or physically attached to a hospital,

1. equally. Thank you.

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Senator Grotberg.

4. SENATOR GROTBORG:

5. A question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

7. He indicates he will yield.

8. SENATOR GROTBORG:

9. Senator D'Arco, do you have a cost factor on this to
10. the Department of Public Aid?

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Senator D'Arco.

13. SENATOR D'ARCO:

14. The...well it...it wouldn't cost the department anything.
15. What the department is suggesting is, that if they change the
16. formula, then they would save approximately a million six
17. in the difference between the actual cost and the fee for
18. service cost. But presently, it wouldn't cost the department
19. any new monies. Now, the department is talk about...talking
20. about changing the reimbursement formula for all hospitals.
21. Now, we're talking about a completely different situation,
22. not presented in this bill.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Grotberg.

25. SENATOR GROTBORG:

26. Well, thank you, and thank you, Senator D'Arco. The...Senator
27. Newhouse and I are supposed to be across the street now
28. working with the department and all of the hospitals involved
29. in...I don't think it would be any secret to know that these
30. are inner city hospitals that we're talking about that through
31. their outreach clinics serve the unserved portion of Chicago,
32. is that...by nodding your head, you and I agree. Now, my
33. concern is that at this point in time this reimbursement rate
34. saves some twenty-three millions of dollars and if it is

1. changed that the...the total impact would be on the other
2. side of the equation, some twenty-three million dollars.
3. representing the Appropriations Committee, we are working
4. very carefully in that whole matter. It is a very flexible
5. world out there right now with the Federal dollars and
6. everything, nobody knows where this thing is going to
7. come out. They're going to try to cap a lot of these days
8. in the hospital, they're going to try to cap a lot of
9. things to see if there's enough money left over for these
10. inner city clinics. They're getting a good hearing by
11. the Department of Public Aid, by the Public Aid Advisory
12. Commission. I think this bill, probably is untimely, Senator,
13. is my concern about it if it were to pass and be signed into
14. law, I don't know how we can support it based on those...on
15. those facts.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator...was that a question?

18. SENATOR D'ARCO:

19. No, he's...

20. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

21. I'm finished.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Senator Nimrod.

24. SENATOR NIMROD:

25. Thank you, Mr. President. I would rise in opposition
26. to this bill since what we're really doing here is telling
27. the General Assembly that we...we want to limit the department's
28. discretion in reimbursing the medical providers. It seems to
29. me that this step that's been taken, what Senator Bloom has
30. said, that's the reimbursement methodology, of course. The
31. Department of Public Aid is revising that procedure and I think
32. that's adequate in this area. Certainly it does not seem to
33. me that this is the proper way of addressing the problem.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator D'Arco may
3. close debate.

4. SENATOR D'ARCO:

5. Thank you, Mr. President. This bill does not address
6. the problem of how you are going to reimburse...hospital
7. clinics in the future. That problem, Senator Grotberg, you
8. indicated you and Senator Newhouse are working on presently.
9. All this bill says is, that the hospital clinics that are
10. free standing should be reimbursed on the same basis as those
11. hospital clinics that are adjacent to and adjoining the
12. hospital. There is no discrimination on the basis of treating
13. one hospital as a fee for service reimbursement and treating
14. the other one on an actual cash reimbursement because of...
15. geographical location, that's what we are arguing. If, in
16. fact...if, in fact, Public Aid decides to change the formula
17. for reimbursement for all hospital clinics, then the hospital
18. clinics that are addressed in this building would be under
19. that new formula. So, I'm not asking that the hospital...
20. that the Department of Public Aid give up twenty-three million
21. dollars in...in monies, that it may save as a result of this
22. bill. The fiscal impact of this bill is somewhere in the
23. vicinity of a million dollars. These are free standing hospital
24. clinics in the inner city of the City of Chicago and they do...
25. they do, in fact, participate in hospital programs for the
26. people that live in those areas. I would ask a favorable vote
27. on Senate Bill 484.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. The question is shall Senate Bill 484 pass. Those in
30. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting
31. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
32. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question
33. the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 17, 3 Voting Present. Senate
34. Bill 484, having received the constitutional majority is

SB 486
3rd Reading

1. declared passed. Senate Bill 486, Senator Bloom. Read the
2. bill, Mr. Secretary.

3. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

4. Senate Bill 486.

5. (Secretary reads title of bill)

6. 3rd reading of the bill.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

8. Senator Bloom.

9. SENATOR BLOOM:

10. Well, thank you, very much, Mr. President and fellow
11. Senators. What this bill attempts to do is to allow taxing
12. ...districts to abate property taxes for ten years and not
13. in excess of a million dollars of any industry locating
14. within the county from another state or county or newly
15. created in the State or expanding during the preceding
16. calendar year. And here's how it's tailored. First, it...
17. unlike other bills that we've considered, it does not ask
18. the State for money. Second, it is designed more for rural
19. areas, in other words, in the Revenue Committee there was
20. some discussion as to why it would be a taxing district.
21. You may have a small town in the corner of a county where
22. the largest unit of government is the school district. And
23. the idea is to try and attract private sector and...and industry
24. to that county. I'll answer any questions and urge a favorable
25. roll call.

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Would...would the Gentleman in the President's Gallery that's
28. taking pictures, please stop. Would...would our Sergeant-at-
29. Arms, our doorkeeper, go up in the President's Gallery. Is
30. there further discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate
31. Bill 486 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
32. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
33. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question the Ayes

SB 487
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. are 51, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill
2. 486, having received the constitutional majority is declared
3. passed. For what purpose does Senator Sangmeister rise?

4. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

5. Well, once again, excuse the intrusion, but this is
6. Will County's day down in...in the Capitol and up in the
7. balcony, I would like to introduce to the Senate my daughter's
8. grade school class that's down here, Mokena Grade School.
9. And along with...accompany them is their teacher, Mr. Quinn
10. and Mr. Hall. And Mr. Quinn, incidentally is the Mayor of
11. the Village of Mokena as well and we certainly would like
12. to welcome them to Springfield.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Would they please rise and be recognized. Senate Bill
15. 487, Senator Gitz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

16. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

17. Senate Bill 487.

18. (Secretary reads title of bill)

19. 3rd reading of the bill.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. Senator Gitz.

22. SENATOR GITZ:

23. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.
24. As a member of the Sunset Committee, I strongly endorse nearly
25. all the recommendations that were made. There were, in this
26. case, a minority report which some of us signed in both the
27. House and the Senate. And I want to stress that some of
28. the press which has been attached to sunset in this particular
29. item, has been somewhat misleading. And I'd like to quote
30. from that report, "repeal of the Water well and Pump Installation
31. Contractor's License Act would leave the State without a means
32. of enforcing the Code Laws." Now, the recommendation of them
33. was to amend the Code Laws and, in fact, I have that bill elsewhere

1. on the Calendar. But I think it is very important to make
2. some delineations about what we're about and why this is
3. important. And I'd like to turn for a moment, if you will,
4. to Director Kempiner's report, as the Director of the Department
5. of Public Health. In which he stated that the regulation of
6. the industry which drills the wells and installs the pump
7. is common to and a building block for all other regulatory
8. efforts. He went on to talk about the Sunset Commission's
9. later endorsement. Thank you. He stated, "you may, at
10. this point, ask yourself if a minimum construction code is
11. retained and licensing activities are dropped, what effect
12. would be felt?" He went on to say, "the licensing of
13. water well and pump installation contractors by testing, assures
14. minimum competency of persons entering the trade. Licensing
15. also assures the regulatory efforts to assure safe water
16. supplies are effective. It would require more effort in
17. inspection and enforcement if the department did not know
18. who was responsible for construction and who to contact
19. for corrective measures. And unlicensed persons could move
20. from one location to another which would necessitate several
21. separate enforcement actions with no assurance of corrective
22. action in all cases. To summarize, if licensing is discontinued,
23. the public will be subjected to after the fact enforcement
24. against persons who will be difficult, if not impossible
25. to identify." That report was the basis of my dissent, and that
26. report is one of the reasons why I think that we should
27. supply this alternative along with the sunset recommendations,
28. to make sure that this gap is fulfilled in whatever law
29. eventually passes.

30. PRESIDENT:

31. Is there any discussion? If not...oh, I beg your pardon,
32. Senator Bloom.

33. SENATOR BLOOM:

1. Thank you, Mr. President. I..I rise somewhat reluctantly
2. in opposition to this legislation. The Sunset Committee does
3. very little right, but they determined that this kind of
4. licensure certainly didn't add anything to the public health,
5. welfare and safety and was another...just another hoop to
6. jump through. The ones that were most strongly and eloquent
7. ...spoke most strongly and eloquently in support of continued
8. licensure were, oddly enough, the water well pump installers
9. and the people that were licensed. I...I don't see any reason...
10. I think that if you've got copies of the report, you'll under-
11. stand, there's no...there's no necessity to continue this
12. licensure. Thank you, very much.

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

15. SENATOR VADALABENE:

16. Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I am in
17. support of this legislation. But, however, I think the...I
18. have a statement here that I think is rather educational. I
19. asked the witness how cold is a well digger's posterity...
20. posterior and he said it was fifty-seven degrees, so I
21. thought you ought to know that.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

24. SENATOR WEAVER:

25. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I know that the Illinois
26. Water Survey depends on these contractors for various reports
27. and it's helpful to the water survey to get these reports
28. from these contractors and were they not required to report
29. to someone, I think there would be...we would be missing a good
30. bit of information that we're now getting for free. So, I
31. tend to support this legislation.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Further discussion? Senator Bruce.

1. SENATOR BRUCE:

2. Yeah, I just rise in support of this bill. The...it's
3. a very important industry, it's critical to many downstate
4. areas that these wells be drilled properly. If you break
5. in the wrong aquifer you can pollute water for upwards of
6. twenty-five years. A report just came out of the State of
7. New Jersey where an improperly constituted well has polluted
8. area...wells in an area of about ten square miles and it
9. is very important that these guys do the work properly.
10. I see no reason why we cannot license them, continue to
11. make sure that they're trained to do what they are supposed
12. to do and the industry can, in fact, police themselves and
13. that is the testimony we had. They know the bad guys, and
14. get them out of the business and I am very desirous of
15. seeing this bill passed.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Further discussion? Senator Gitz may close.

18. SENATOR GITZ:

19. Well, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Along with
20. Senator Savickas and others, I was one of the original authors
21. of sunset legislation. I do not intend to violate those
22. recommendations without certain basic things being at stake.
23. And what Senator Bloom didn't tell you is, is that they are talking
24. about after the fact, enforcement. Now, maybe that's good
25. for law business, but it's going to create some real havoc.
26. Now, I'm willing to amend those codes, but I want to see that
27. whatever bill goes to the Governor's desk that we take care
28. of a very basic problem, and this is far different than the
29. other sunset recommendations. And in that basis, I ask for
30. your favorable consideration.

31. PRESIDENT:

32. The question is shall Senate Bill 487 pass. Those in
33. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting

1. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
2. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question
3. the Ayes are 40, the Nays are 12, 1 Voting Present. Senate
4. Bill 487, having received the required constitutional majority
5. is declared passed. 493, Senator Berning. On the Order of
6. Senate Bills, 3rd reading, Senate Bill 493. Read the bill,
7. Mr. Secretary.

8. SECRETARY:

9. Senate Bill 493.

10. (Secretary reads title of bill)

11. 3rd reading of the bill.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Senator Berning.

14. SENATOR BERNING:

15. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.
16. Senate Bill 493 as it now stands, with its amendment by
17. the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, has the full endorsement
18. of the Executive Director, Mr. Lou Lowder and the commission.
19. It's a very simple bill. Changes the definition of reckless
20. driving. And unless there is some interest in...an in-depth
21. discussion, I would just appreciate a favorable roll call,
22. otherwise, I'll be pleased to answer questions.

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Any discussion? Senator Bruce.

25. SENATOR BRUCE:

26. Well, I'm not sure that I'm standing in opposition, but
27. I think that everyone ought to realize that, although for
28. years, we've allowed three moving traffic violations before
29. you revoke your license, this bill says that if you have
30. two violations, you automatically lose your license for six
31. months. And included in that is an offense of driving a
32. motorcycle on one wheel and...it seems to me that we are
33. making a dramatic change by amendment. I don't know why

1. this bill wasn't introduced. It comes in by amendment to
2. say two charges of reckless driving in a year, you lose your
3. license automatically for six months.

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Further discussion? Senator Chew.

6. SENATOR CHEW:

7. Mr. President...Senator Bruce, you were right on target
8. with this legislation. Motor Vehicle Laws did not take a
9. great stand in reducing the number of violations. When the
10. bill first came before our committee, it was also discussed
11. the Drunken Driving Act, which I reminded the distinguished
12. Senator from Deerfield, that his bill did not contain any
13. language dealing with the drunken driving, it was reckless
14. driving. I also had the State police to give us their
15. definition of reckless driving and it didn't vary too much
16. from what the actuality of reckless driving is. There
17. seemed to be an attempt, in my opinion, to legislate some-
18. thing that just isn't feasible. Now, careful study has
19. gone into three violations, Mr. President, and very frankly
20. I think it ought to remain there. Now, if a kid rides a
21. motorcycle on one wheel and he's caught by a police officer,
22. that's a violation and two of those and he's out of business.
23. Cannot even operate an automobile on an emergency. The
24. bill came out of the committee, but I do not plan to
25. support this bill on the Floor because the change is too
26. drastic and there's been nothing that happened, Mr. President,
27. that would cause for this reduction.

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Further discussion? Senator Egan.

30. SENATOR EGAN:

31. Senator Berning, I haven't read the bill, but will this
32. prevent me from riding my unicycle?

33. PRESIDENT:

1. I beg your pardon, Senator Berning.

2. SENATOR BERNING:

3. If Senator Egan can ride a unicycle, I personally will
4. plead his defense.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Further discussion? Senator Egan.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

END OF REEL

2. Further discussion? Senator Johns. Alright. Senator
3. Berning may close.

4. SENATOR BERNING:

5. Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. The bill in its present
6. form is much less punitive than it was as a...an originally
7. find...filed bill. Mr. President, some of the conversation
8. over there is by those who...have expressed reservation about
9. the bill. I'd like to point out that as originally filed,
10. there was a suspension for one violation, one charge and the
11. whole thing stems, members of the Senate, from a serious problem
12. that many of you will recognize if you'll listen just a moment.
13. Drunken driving has been on the increase, and as you all know,
14. it's been a simple matter to plea bargain down to reckless
15. driving. Consequently, we have drunken drivers who continue
16. to violate the law...provide a threat to you and me and the
17. rest of the driving public because by the simple expediency
18. of reducing a charge from drunken driving to reckless driving
19. they are back on the street. It appeared to me and those who
20. contacted me, including the...municipalities up my way, who are
21. faced with a serious problem of drunken driving as a result of
22. a great many of the young people from all over the northern
23. part of the State channeling through such villages as Round
24. Lake, Antioch, Fox Lake on their way to and from the watering
25. holes in Wisconsin. There have been many serious accidents,
26. lives are placed in jeopardy everyday and particularly on
27. weekends. It seemed highly appropriate, Ladies and Gentlemen
28. of the Senate, to close that loophole, that gap in the Statute,
29. by making the reckless driving penalty almost on a par with the
30. drunken driving. This, then, gives us an opportunity to pre-
31. vent the drunken driver from forever avoiding penalties because
32. of the plea bargaining. The wheel, the single riding of a
33. bicycle or motorcycle on one wheel, was at the suggestion of the

1. Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, as brought to me through the
2. Executive Director, Mr. Lou Lowder. I accepted it as...a com-
3. mission recommended amendment. There...one or two other
4. technical changes which the...Executive Director informed me
5. were necessary and were the position of the...Motor Vehicle
6. Laws Commission. They now, then, do support or at least the
7. Executive Director and Miss Jean Flynn, speaking, again, for
8. the Commission, do support Senate Bill 493. And I, respect-
9. fully, suggest to all of you that this is one small step to-
10. ward, perhaps, saving some lives. Certainly, the potential
11. is vastly greater than any...other type of highway control
12. that I can think of and, Mr. President, I would, respect-
13. fully, request an Aye vote.

14. PRESIDENT:

15. The question is, shall Senate Bill 493 pass. Those in
16. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
17. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
18. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
19. that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 22, 3 Voting
20. Present. Senate Bill 493...the sponsor requests further...
21. consideration be postponed. So ordered. 494, Senator
22. Vadalabene. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate
23. Bill 494. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

24. SECRETARY:

25. Senate Bill 494.

26. (Secretary reads title of bill)

27. 3rd reading of the bill.

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Vadalabene.

30. SENATOR VADALABENE:

31. Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 494 relates
32. to a plant under construction in East Alton, a first of its
33. kind, an experimental demonstration gasification system,

1. specifically designed to burn Illinois No. 6 high sulfur coal.
2. It's called the Kiln Gas System and would be one of the...of
3. a generation of coal gasification devices, which will sub-
4. stantially increase the market for Illinois coal. As you
5. recall, the State of Illinois contributed eighteen million
6. dollars to this plant...last year plus, I think, around a
7. hundred and fifteen to a hundred and thirty-five million
8. dollars of private money. Senate Bill 494 seeks to put this
9. new method for reducing pollution control, which is specif-
10. ically designed to utilize Illinois No. 6 coal on a parity
11. with conventional pollution control equipment for the pur-
12. poses of property taxation. It should be clearly understood,
13. the purpose of Senate Bill 494 is to provide for the valu-
14. ation of this complete and integrated system at its salvage
15. value for the purpose of property taxation and I would appre-
16. ciate a favorable vote.

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Further discussion? Any discussion? Senator Buzbee.

19. SENATOR BUZBEE:

20. Thank you, Mr. President. The kiln gas process that...
21. Senator Vadalabene is addressing with this bill is an abso-
22. lutely unique process,...which was developed by Allis-Chalmers
23. and they have built...they have put about eighty million
24. dollars of their corporate money into the process at the Wood
25. River Plant. Twelve utilities from across the country...have
26. participated in this, the State of Illinois, through our
27. bonding authority, has contributed, or is in the process of
28. contributing, eighteen million dollars. This is the first
29. synthetic fuels process or...or new process, I should say
30. rather than synthetic fuels, that...has come to the State of
31. Illinois and it's kind of unique in that we've done it all
32. without any Federal dollars involved. Now, what the current
33. Illinois law is, that any pollution control...facility that's

1. put onto a power plant is exempt from local property taxation.
2. This particular process happens to be a pollution control
3. facility, but it's unique in that it removes the sulfur dioxides
4. and the particulates during the process of combusting the coal.
5. All of the other processes, that are...are exempt under the
6. pollution control...definition, are exempt because they are a
7. post-combustion process, so this one is unique. When the
8. boiler is fired they are in the process of cleaning up the
9. fuel at that point, so as a result, they are going to be
10. taxed simply because their process is new, whereas all the
11. other processes that we presently do not tax...are...are an
12. older process. This particular process probably has, for the
13. ...for the current run...probably has more...possibilities
14. for the continued use of Illinois coal than...than any other
15. technology that is...that is...in a development stage today.
16. For us to place a property tax on them for that portion that
17. is pollution control is simply unconscionable and so this is
18. a way of getting around that, a way of giving them the same
19. tax exemption that any other plant that puts on a flue gas
20. desulfurization post-combustion process would...would get.
21. So, I rise in support of the bill, it's a very good idea
22. and it will...it will help promote the future use of Illinois
23. coal.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Further discussion? Senator Johns.

26. SENATOR JOHNS:

27. I was watching, Mr. President, and I know both of them
28. intended to tell you that, although, this is a local approval
29. and, although, it originally would take out monies from
30. the local scene on taxes, in the long-run it does not, be-
31. cause it comes under the State Mandates Act. Am I right?
32. Okay. Now, it was...it's my belief that eventually the tax is
33. rebated by the State to the local government. Am I wrong?

1. So, this does not take away monies from the local government.

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

4. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

5. Would the sponsor yield to a question, please?

6. PRESIDENT:

7. The sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

8. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

9. Last year a bill passed this Senate and House, and most of
10. us voted for it 'cause we thought it was something else,
11. where Commonwealth Edison got their towers and everything
12. else...rather walls and what have you, classified as pollution
13. items and that...therefore, cost my area...my county twenty-
14. two million dollars of tax evaluation. Now, does your bill
15. specifically say that whatever break...is given simply for
16. the production and...operation of a...low...low sulfur...
17. desulfurizing process that whatever is saved in taxes by the
18. companies will be paid back to the local governments or not?

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Vadalabene.

21. SENATOR VADALABENE:

22. No, it does generate taxes. It will bring, approximately,
23. a hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually to the City of
24. East Alton. And...and it's an experimental...it's a demonstra-
25. tion not for profit construction plant.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Geo-Karis.

28. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

29. And...does your bill specifically limit it to just this...
30. operation in East Alton?

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Senator Vadalabene.

33. SENATOR VADALABENE:

1. This is a product of the Illinois...Energy Resources
2. Commission, of which I am also a member, and I would like
3. to yield to the chairman.

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Senator Buzbee.

6. SENATOR BUZBEE:

7. Thank you. Senator Geo-Karis, what this does is, it says that part of
8. the process, which will be attributable to pollution control,
9. will be exempt from property taxes the same way any other pol-
10. lution control device is at the current time. That part of the pro-
11. cess that is not attributable to pollution control will be
12. taxable. So it will increase the property value of that power
13. plant at East Alton, Wood River considerably and the local
14. communities will collect additional property taxes, but the
15. portion that is attributable to pollution control will not
16. be taxable.

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

19. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

20. This is what I'm driving at. Last year Senate Bill 767
21. did exactly that and all of your public utilities were able
22. to get off scot-free on their tax evaluations because...they
23. cited them as...pollution control devices, like walls and
24. so forth. What I'm trying to find out from you, I don't want
25. to oppose the bill, but if it is limited strictly to these
26. ...coal producing facilities or not.

27. PRESIDENT:

28. Senator Buzbee.

29. SENATOR BUZBEE:

30. The bill, as amended, requires that sulfur dioxide...be the
31. type of low sulfur emissions, which would qualify a coal-fuel
32. device...coal-fuel device, for the thirty-three and a third
33. assessed valuation of actual fair cash value. And it provides

1. that the Pollution Control Board shall certify the coal-fuel
2. devices eligible for the thirty-three and a third percent of
3. actual cash value assessment.

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

6. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

7. One last question, so then you are telling me, Senator
8. Buzbee, and you and I know that I am certainly in favor of
9. coal development, you're telling me, then, that this...will
10. specifically apply only to the production of...coal to be
11. sulfurized, is that...desulfurized?

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Senator Buzbee.

14. SENATOR BUZBEE:

15. That's correct. It's to the...

16. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

17. Alright.

18. SENATOR BUZBEE:

19. ...pollution control portion...

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Further discussion? Senator Nimrod.

22. SENATOR NIMROD:

23. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Geo-Karis, this does
24. not apply to nuclear plants so you don't have to worry. This
25. is a good bill and it's something that needs to be addressed.
26. And if we are going to force people who are, in fact, using
27. ...coal...to put on...sulfur...removal equipment,...then,
28. certainly, we ought to give them the incentive of saying that
29. they ought to be exempt. And I think it...satisfies the State
30. and it's a healthy situation that we're creating in order
31. to encourage,...not only the better burning of coal, but certainly the
32. removal of sulfur.

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Further discussion? Senator Bruce.

2. SENATOR BRUCE:

3. Thank you, Mr. President. I...I just want clarification
4. from someone about the amendment and how it affects presently
5. operated coal powered...generating plants. I have one in my
6. district at...Newton, Jasper County and it states that...the
7. thirty-three and a third percent value of any low sulfur
8. dioxide emission coal-fuel device shall be only the value
9. which will be defined as the net value, which could be
10. realized of its own or sole or removed the...item and I
11. just want an answer from somebody. Does this in any way
12. affect the power of Jasper County to possess a...an existing
13. CIPS coal fired boiler generating plant at all?

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Senator Vadalabene.

16. SENATOR VADALABENE:

17. All I can give you is a flat no and not an explanation.

18. PRESIDENT:

19. Senator...further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

20. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

21. Yes, I just wanted to...thank you, Mr. President and members
22. of the Senate. I understand that the...the Mayor and the...
23. local individuals have been satisfied in the East Alton and
24. Wood River area by virtue of Amendment No. 1 and I rise to...
25. support the...legislation.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Any further discussion? Senator Johns.

28. SENATOR JOHNS:

29. I...I just want to ask the sponsor if this falls under
30. the State Mandates Act? That's...

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Senator Vadalabene.

33. SENATOR VADALABENE:

1. No, it does not fall under the State Mandates Act. It
2. will bring revenue into the City of East Alton. Two hundred
3. and fifty people are going to be employed from the area, a
4. hundred and eighty-two of them will be pipefitters and under
5. ...when it's constructed, there will be eighty full-time
6. employees. It will not be a State mandated program and...

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Any further discussion? Senator Vadalabene, do you
9. wish to close?

10. SENATOR VADALABENE:

11. Yes, I would appreciate a favorable vote.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. The question is, shall Senate Bill 494 pass. Those in
14. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting
15. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
16. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
17. the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none Voting Present.
18. Senate Bill 494 having received the required constitutional
19. majority is declared passed. 497, Senator Carroll. Senator
20. Carroll. The bottom of page 13, on the Order of Senate Bills
21. 3rd reading, Senate Bill 497. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

22. SECRETARY:

23. Senate Bill 497.

24. (Secretary reads title of bill)

25. 3rd reading of the bill.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Carroll.

28. SENATOR CARROLL:

29. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
30. the Senate. This and its companion bill, 498, are the annual
31. attempt to take control over the expenditures of State dollars,
32. including those that are Federal funds. As you know, we
33. generally pass this, the Governor vetoes it, and the House

1. has not, in its wisdom, saw fit to override that veto. It
2. is absolutely essential in these economic times that we do,
3. in fact, appropriate all monies that flow for State purposes.
4. I would ask for a favorable roll call and answer questions.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Further discussion? Senator Grotberg.

7. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

8. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I think we, on our side
9. of the aisle respect...this bill from the same standpoint.
10. It's our biennial effort to...remind the taxpayers of
11. Illinois that their elected representatives from their local
12. areas have the final say on budgetary matters and I recom-
13. mend an Aye vote and let the Governor veto it again.

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Any further discussion? Senator Bruce.

16. SENATOR BRUCE:

17. Well, just...just curious, I noticed the change in this
18. year's draft concerning disbursements to local units of
19. government on page 2 are school districts by the Federal
20. Government. Does that have anything to do with Title I grants
21. going to...to...school districts and any change in the waiting
22. factors that are presently in the Federal rules and regulations?

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Senator Carroll.

25. SENATOR CARROLL:

26. The easy answer, Senator Bruce, is no. It does not
27. direct the direct payment to the school districts, it does
28. affect that which comes into the State Treasury.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Senator Bruce.

31. SENATOR BRUCE:

32. Well, that's my question, since we're involved in the
33. whole question of categorical grants. What impact is this

1. going to have in the distribution of educational funds from
2. Washington based on the distribution of categorical grants
3. between Chicago and downstate school districts, since you
4. mandate that any money we received shall be...just flow
5. through. I...I wonder why we put that language in, it
6. gives me great concern.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Senator Carroll.

9. SENATOR CARROLL:

10. Senator Bruce, it's my understanding that the problem,
11. you...I...I hear you attempting to address,...is not a
12. problem in this legislation. In other words, this would
13. not change any formulations that we evolve as to how that
14. money is...will be spent.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. Senator Bruce.

17. SENATOR BRUCE:

18. Well, let's just presume that the...administration in
19. Washington is successful in...in changing grants and they
20. leave the Title I funding...and stating that Title I will go
21. as it does presently. Does this not say that we won't have
22. any right to redesignate that money? Aren't we locking in
23. all categorical grants...in the educational field solely to
24. go to Chicago if they're in Chicago when they come from the
25. ...from Washington, D.C.?

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Carroll.

28. SENATOR CARROLL:

29. No.

30. PRESIDENT:

31. Senator Bruce.

32. SENATOR BRUCE:

33. Alright, just to point out the language of the bill,

1. ...it states, "Federal funds which have been designated by the
2. Federal Government for distribution to such units and districts,
3. including school districts,"...and it does not preclude that
4. disbursement without...local control here. I just...I'm just
5. curious as to why, when we want to control everything else, we
6. did not control that?

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Alright. Any further discussion? Senator Carroll...
9. may close.

10. SENATOR CARROLL:

11. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. The question is, shall Senate Bill 497 pass. Those in
14. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting
15. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
16. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
17. the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, 2 Voting Present. Senate
18. Bill 497 having received the required constitutional majority
19. is declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading,
20. Senate Bill 498. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

21. SECRETARY:

22. Senate Bill 498.

23. (Secretary reads title of bill)

24. 3rd reading of the bill.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Senator Carroll.

27. SENATOR CARROLL:

28. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
29. the Senate. This is the second part of that biennial pack-
30. age that provides for the distribution of funds by the
31. State Board of Education by action of the General Assembly
32. and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is,
2. shall Senate Bill 498 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye.
3. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all
4. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
5. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are
6. 55, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 498
7. having received the required constitutional majority is de-
8. clared passed. 499 is to be amended, I take it. 501...no
9. ...504, Senator Schaffer. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd
10. reading, the top of page 14, Senate Bill 504. Read the bill,
11. Mr. Secretary, please.

12. SECRETARY:

13. Senate Bill 504.

14. (Secretary reads title of bill)

15. 3rd reading of the bill.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Senator Schaffer.

18. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

19. Mr. President,...this is a simple bill. It extends the
20. life of an existing commission by two years, the Chain of
21. Lakes Commission, which has just completed a rather major
22. study in which we're in the process of holding hearings on.
23. I think it's been a good commission, it's not a large dollar
24. commission and I'd like to see it extended.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
27. Bill 504 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
28. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
29. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
30. record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are 4,
31. none Voting Present. Senate Bill 504 having received the re-
32. quired constitutional majority is declared passed. 507, Senator
33. Schaffer. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate

1. Bill 507. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

2. SECRETARY:

3. Senate Bill 507.

4. (Secretary reads title of bill)

5. 3rd reading of the bill.

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Senator Schaffer.

8. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

9. Mr. President, this is a relatively simple bill. It...
10. would require the Regional Transportation Authority to...
11. comply with certain Audit Acts and allow the Auditor
12. General to audit it and to provide certain information on
13. routes,...efficiencies, and salaries. We have had some problem
14. getting this information...and it has been amended...at the
15. request of the Auditor General to meet his standards. I'd be
16. happy to answer any questions on it. I think it's information
17. that we should have, that the whole State should have, if we
18. are to act responsibly on the subject of funding the Regional
19. Transportation Authority.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Any discussion? Senator Savickas.

22. SENATOR SAVICKAS:

23. Yes,...Mr. President, would Senator...Schaffer yield to
24. questioning?

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Indicates he will yield. Senator Savickas.

27. SENATOR SAVICKAS:

28. This bill requires that the RTA publish reports con-
29. cerning its operation and who would receive these reports?

30. PRESIDENT:

31. Senator Schaffer.

32. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

33. I would assume anybody who was interested in getting them.

1. Certainly the members of the General Assembly could get
2. this information. I don't think they ought to send it to
3. anybody who doesn't request it, I think it's just a matter
4. of making the information available. I am,...frankly, have
5. problems with bills that say that you've got to send a copy
6. of this to everybody under the sun, ad nauseam. I think we
7. all get copies of reports that were requested twenty years
8. ago and...I would not...like to see us get into that gambit.
9. I just want the information available for those who
10. want it.

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Senator Savickas.

13. SENATOR SAVICKAS:

14. Yes, Mr. President, in looking at the bill on page 2,
15. line 4, it says, "whether the audited agency has obligated,
16. expended, received and used public funds," any public funds,
17. not just of the State, any public funds. So what you're
18. saying, that any unit of local government that contributes
19. to the operation of the RTA will be audited by the State and
20. they must supply these reports to the State. They must supply
21. these reports to the State whether it's...the Village of
22. Bolingbrook or whoever, the City of Chicago, counties, any
23. public funds.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Senator Schaffer.

26. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

27. Well, I don't interpret it as power to audit the source
28. of the funds. I interpret it as power to audit the way
29. those funds are spent and, obviously, the problem, which
30. I would refresh the members, we did give the...Auditor General
31. the power to audit State funds and then we promptly passed the
32. sales tax and withdrew State support, which left the Auditor
33. General with, in effect, very limited audit...involvements.

1. The purpose of the bill is to expand it so that he can, in
2. fact, audit at...on our behalf as an arm of the Legislature,
3. the entire scope of the RTA. This information, I think,
4. should be available and that's what we're trying to do,
5. Senator.

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Senator Savickas.

8. SENATOR SAVICKAS:

9. Well, the question arises and...the problem in my mind
10. arises that you are giving the Auditor General the power to
11. audit non-State funds. And if we continue this practice and
12. set this precedent,...I think, we would have a...a question on
13. his ability to do this.

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Further discussion? Senator Chew.

16. SENATOR CHEW:

17. Mr. President, I believe in committee hearing this bill
18. was stated that all of the auditing of the requested agency
19. was let out by the Auditor General to private auditors. Now,
20. since the creation of RTA, and I go on record as not being a
21. lover of the agency, my distinguished friend has had a basket
22. full of bills each year to do something, opt out, opt half out,
23. not pay, get service, not get service, no pay. I believe he
24. could go into his district and, if he could spell Regional
25. Transit Authority, he could get reelected. He doesn't have
26. to have another issue. And I appreciate his thoroughness and
27. consistency and doing something to RTA. Fortunately, he has
28. not been successful. We don't care who auditors...RTA or the CTA,
29. but here we get into an area where we aren't putting any money
30. into a portion that we're requesting someone to audit, making
31. information available to Joe Blow, who has no interest what-
32. soever. He does not specify to the General Assembly. This
33. bill doesn't...contain that language, Mr. President, so I

1. can't find a purpose for the bill in its origin and I doubt
2. seriously whether the sponsor could find it. And I would
3. ask all of us to vote the bill down, because it is absolutely
4. not necessary. There was not an amendment that was drafted
5. by the Auditor General's Office. If it were, at least, the
6. chairman of the committee didn't see it. And,...Senator
7. Schaffer, if you ever get a chance to spend a good weekend in
8. Chicago, I'd like to be your host so I could show you some of
9. the things that the RTA is doing. Even though it's not funded,
10. it's still an agency and I know very well your statement about
11. ...we can get on about funding the RTA was as mythical as mythical
12. could be. You have never voted to fund or create, all of
13. your votes have been to dissolve, to cripple, to interfere, with
14. the Regional Transit Authority and if that is your election
15. campaign, let me come out and campaign for you.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Joyce.

18. SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

19. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I
20. rise in support of Senate Bill 507. I support it on a
21. philosophical basis, that I think this Body has a right and
22. this...and the people of this State have a right to know where
23. the monies are going and how they're being spent. And as
24. far as you're concerned, Senator Savickas, with the burdens
25. placed upon the Auditor vis-a-vis his relationship with the
26. City of Chicago, I can assure you that he has no problems
27. adapting himself to the...requirements of the city administration,
28. so you can put that concern to rest. And I support this
29. and I urge your...I urge this Body to support this.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Rhoads.

32. SENATOR RHOADS:

33. Mr. President, perhaps I can,...Senator Chew...perhaps I

1. can...help you out on...on the...the background of where the
2. bill came from. This wasn't Senator Schaffer's bill originally,
3. it was a recommendation from the Auditor General, Bob Cronson.
4. Now, what happened was, late last year the Auditor General had
5. encountered some difficulties when he went up to Chicago to
6. audit some books. And there was a misunderstanding on both
7. sides and there...apparently, the Statutory authority in
8. that case wasn't clear. Mr. Cronson...came...there was a...a
9. meeting of Senator Shapiro, Senator Rock, and myself to see
10. what we could do to clarify the language and...and get this
11. in compliance with the Auditor General's wishes. Now, this
12. bill is a product of that. It isn't a run-of-the-mill Senator
13. Schaffer anti-RTA bill, it's not intended to be anti-RTA or
14. ...or delay their progress in any way. It's...intended to be
15. an aid to the Auditor General. So, that was the genesis of
16. the bill and I...I think it's a good bill and ought to be
17. supported.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Senator Rock.

20. SENATOR ROCK:

21. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
22. the Senate. I, too, rise in support of Senate Bill 507.
23. It is exactly as Senator Rhoads said and there is no one,
24. not the RTA, not the CTA, not anybody that should be...in
25. opposition to this, it's clarifying. The only suggestion
26. I might have to Senator Schaffer if, in fact, there is a
27. Republican alternative transit program, this might be your
28. last vehicle. I wouldn't move it so quickly.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Is there further discussion? If not, the question is,
31. shall Senate Bill 507 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye.
32. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all
33. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

1. On that question, the Ayes are 57, the Nays are 1, none Voting
2. Present. Senate Bill 507 having received the constitutional
3. majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 511, Senator Gitz.
4. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

5. SECRETARY:

6. Senate Bill 511.

7. (Secretary reads title of bill)

8. 3rd reading of the bill.

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. Senator Gitz.

11. SENATOR GITZ:

12. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
13. Senate. 511 in its amended form, I think, meets with the com-
14. mon agreement on both sides of the aisle as a sound piece of
15. legislation and is also supported, in its present form, by
16. the Farm Bureau. Most of you supported legislation last year which
17. created agricultural districts. The only problem of it is,
18. is that we have them on paper, but in terms of really doing
19. anything or providing any real protection, it doesn't do that.
20. I always felt that we...at least ought to follow Wisconsin
21. and offer some financial incentives and I don't think that
22. Illinois...that far along. But, clearly, if we're going to
23. have agricultural districts authorized, we ought to be very
24. careful about allowing major State agencies or any other
25. entity in the name of public policy to simply roll through them
26. with the exercise of eminent domain. This bill in its amended
27. form makes allowances, for example,...by common agreement it
28. was felt that there ought to be an exemption for five acres
29. per mile for highway improvements. It will not inhibit some-
30. body from straightening out a curve. It will also make other
31. allowances for power transmission lines and underground...lines
32. which are necessary. We feel that in its form this is a
33. sound and reasonable approach to putting some real teeth

1. in agricultural areas.

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Is there any discussion? Senator Maitland.

4. SENATOR MAITLAND:

5. Yes, Mr. President, thank you. And very briefly, Senator
6. Gitz is...is absolutely correct. This bill does address more
7. of the problems that we had. With Amendment No. 1 he has
8. taken care of some of the objection from the utilities. I
9. think they are...are generally in favor of it now and I rise
10. in strong support of Senate Bill 511.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Is there further discussion? Senator Joyce.

13. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

14. Thank you, Mr. President. One thing that...was not
15. mentioned here and I think...it's a primary thing of this
16. bill, is designed to keep Mike Royko out of the Country.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Gitz may
19. close debate.

20. SENATOR GITZ:

21. Thank you. Your favorable consideration is requested.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. The question is, shall Senate Bill 511 pass. Those...
24. those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay.
25. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
26. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
27. that question, the Ayes are 44, the Nays are 5, none Voting
28. Present. Senate Bill 511 having received the constitutional
29. majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 512, Senator Philip.
30. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

31. SECRETARY:

32. Senate Bill 512.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

33. 3rd reading of the bill.
34.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Philip.

3. SENATOR PHILIP:

4. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
5. Senate. Senate Bill 512 is merely a housekeeping bill, it
6. changes numerous semicolons to periods throughout the Act.
7. It's a recommendation of the Pension Laws Commission. Probably
8. what happened when they put the...Agreed Bill List together
9. it was probably on 2nd reading and it was avoided. I'd be
10. happy to answer any questions.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
13. Senate Bill 512 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
14. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted
15. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
16. that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none. Senate
17. Bill...2 Voting Present...Senate Bill 512 having received the
18. constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 515,
19. Senator Lemke. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

20. SECRETARY:

21. Senate Bill 515.

22. (Secretary reads title of bill)

23. 3rd reading of the bill.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Senator Lemke.

26. SENATOR LEMKE:

27. What this bill is meant to do is to stop gang harassment
28. of prosecuting witnesses. What it says is that a defendant,
29. who committed the murder with the intent to prevent the murdered
30. individual from testifying in any criminal prosecution or
31. giving material assistance to the State in any investigation
32. or prosecution, either against the defendant or another. In
33. other words, it extends the aggravated circumstances, in this

1. case, to...to stop the harassment of witnesses against gang
2. leaders and so forth. I ask for a favorable vote.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Lemke...if not,
5. the question is, shall Senate Bill 515 pass. Those in favor
6. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is
7. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
8. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays
9. are none, 1 Voting Present. Senate Bill 515 having received
10. the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator
11. Bowers, for what purpose do you arise?

12. SENATOR BOWERS:

13. Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. State your point.

16. SENATOR BOWERS:

17. Seated in the gallery to my rear are the students from
18. the Winfield Middle School from the beautiful DuPage County
19. and we just want to prove Senator Sangmeister isn't the only one
20. that has school children down here. And I'd like for them
21. to stand and be recognized by the Senate. Thank you.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Please stand and be recognized. Senate Bill 518, Senator
24. Taylor. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

25. SECRETARY:

26. Senate Bill 518.

27. (Secretary reads title of bill)

28. 3rd reading of the bill.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Senator Taylor.

31. SENATOR TAYLOR:

32. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate
33. Bill 518 creates a bomb explosive unit throughout the State of

1. Illinois. Some amendments have been added that has alleviated
2. some of the objection. The Secretary of State, now, supports
3. the bill because of the fact that...it allows them to create
4. their own unit, but there is no protection anywhere in the
5. State of Illinois on the State highways and other areas
6. other than that of the United States Army and Navy and they
7. will only take care of their own areas and bomb units dealing
8. with the government. But we, here in our State, in many of the
9. counties are not protected and it is permissible for those
10. cities over sixty thousand and we're asking that the State
11. create at least two units, one if necessary. So, I ask for
12. your support on Senate Bill 518.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
15. Senate Bill 518 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
16. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
17. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
18. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 33, the Nays
19. are 21, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 518 having received
20. the constitutional majority is declared passed. For what
21. purpose does Senator Chew...seek recognition?

22. SENATOR CHEW:

23. Open the machines, Mr. President, by God, this...this...
24. this bill should not have passed. You came up there with
25. some green votes and you know very well you didn't get no
26. explanation of that bill and I demand a new vote on it.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Senator, if you would have sat in your seat and sought
29. recognition and spoke...

30. SENATOR CHEW:

31. I have a substitute and we voted...

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Poor substitute. The bill is declared passed.

SB 524
3rd reading

SENATOR CHEW:

- 1. This is his first bill over here, Mr. President. Don't
- 2. you understand it?

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

- 4. Senator Taylor has been such a...stalwart here, I assumed
- 5. that this has been just one of many of his good bills that he's
- 6. passed. Senator Hall.

7. SENATOR HALL:

- 8. Some of us were inadvertently...we would like the record
- 9. to show that we would have voted Aye on this bill.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

- 11. Senate Bill 524, Senator Simms. Read the bill, Mr.
- 12. Secretary.

13. SECRETARY:

- 14. Senate Bill 524.
- 15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
- 16. 3rd reading of the bill.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

- 18. Senator Simms.

19. SENATOR SIMMS:

- 20. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
- 21. Senate. Senate Bill 524, as amended by Senator Maitland's
- 22. amendment,...exempts...from...definition, day care centers...
- 23. programs which are operated as integral part of a local
- 24. church ministry or a religious non-for-profit school, provided
- 25. that appropriate health...State health and fire safety standards
- 26. are maintained. This legislation was introduced on the basis
- 27. of...maintaining the first amendment privileges of keeping the
- 28. separation of church and State and it's supported by the
- 29. Illinois Association of Christian Schools. I would urge for
- 30. a favorable passage.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

- 32. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
- 33. Senate Bill 524 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
- 34. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

SB 525
3rd Reading

1. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
2. the Ayes are 47, the Nays are 2, none Voting Present. Senate
3. Bill 524 having received the constitutional majority is declared
4. passed. Senate Bill 525, Senator Egan. Read the bill, Mr.
5. Secretary.

6. SECRETARY:

7. Senate Bill 525.

8. (Secretary reads title of bill)

9. 3rd reading of the bill.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Senator Egan.

12. SENATOR EGAN:

13. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. The
14. Senate Bill 525 amends...the General Interest Act, the Consumer
15. Finance and Installment Loan Act, and the Retail and Motor
16. Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act and by amendment we
17. included the Retail Charge Agreements, those revolving charge
18. agreements. To comply with the Federal regulations,... we
19. would have to continuously pass Illinois laws...and,...most
20. of which would be too late. So, what this bill does is it...
21. it will conform with the Federal Truth in Lending Acts and
22. the forms, then if they are in compliance with the Federal law
23. will then be in compliance with Illinois law. And I ask for
24. your favorable consideration.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
27. Senate Bill 525 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
28. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
29. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
30. question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are 1, 1 Voting Present.
31. Senate Bill 525 having received the constitutional majority
32. is declared passed. Senate Bill 529, Senator...Nedza. Senate
33. Bill 531, Senator Egan. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

1. SECRETARY:

2. Senate Bill 531.

3. (Secretary reads title of bill)

4. 3rd reading of the bill.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Egan.

7. SENATOR EGAN:

8. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate
9. Bill 531 is really a streamliner for the State's Mandate Act.
10. It provides that the home rule units, which do not exercise
11. their power to avoid the State Mandate, may be reimbursed...
12. like home rule units, like...like local units that are not
13. home rule units. And it...it also provides that...the state-
14. ment of its objectives can be filed before the committee hearing
15. rather than at the time you file the bill, which is merely
16. a streamliner and I ask for your favorable consideration.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
19. Senate Bill 531 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
20. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
21. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
22. question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting
23. Present. Senate Bill 531 having received the constitutional
24. majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 533, Senator Gitz.
25. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

26. SECRETARY:

27. Senate Bill...533.

28. (Secretary reads title of bill)

29. 3rd reading of the bill.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Gitz.

32. SENATOR GITZ:

33. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This

1. bill does exactly what it says. If teachers are not covered
2. by a collective negotiated bargaining agreement, they may
3. elect to receive payment of wages over either a ten or twelve
4. month period of time annually. Teachers are the only pro-
5. fession, that I'm aware of, in the State that can work in
6. a nine month period, but a school board can require them to
7. be paid over a twelve month period. If you did that in the
8. private sector, you flatly would be violating this State's
9. Labor Laws. I think it's simply a matter of simple equity
10. and justice. Under many collective bargaining agreements
11. now, teachers are able to decide that by their own option.
12. And I've been somewhat...amazed at the hue and cry that was
13. raised against a very simple matter.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Senator Maitland.

16. SENATOR MAITLAND:

17. Thank you, Mr. President. This legislation has been
18. around before and it's around again. This is certainly
19. an infringement upon local control. The school board...
20. should be able to make this...decision. I think that's
21. what local control is all about. I would resist Senate Bill
22. 533 very much.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Etheredge.

25. SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

26. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate,
27. I, too, rise in opposition to this...to this bill. It...
28. I view this as an unwarranted intrusion of State Government
29. into local government. Each one of the school districts
30. that would be impacted by this legislation is governed by a locally
31. elected board of education...

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Excuse me, Senator. Will the doorman...doorkeeper up

1. there kindly inform the students that they're not allowed to
2. take pictures? Where's the doorkeeper up there? Will the
3. doorkeeper kindly tell the students not to take pictures
4. up there? Go ahead, Senator Etheredge.

5. SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

6. I would...further point out that there are cost implications
7. ...for this legislation as well insofar as the local
8. boards of education are concerned. So, I would urge a No
9. vote on this bill.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Senator DeAngelis. Is there further discussion? If
12. not,...Senator Buzbee.

13. SENATOR BUZBEE:

14. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I'm sure there are cost
15. implications,...but there are cost implications to the teachers
16. that don't get paid...at the time that they work. They
17. work nine months...out of the year, that's what their con-
18. tract calls for. And if they choose to get paid over a nine
19. month period, I think most of them probably do not choose that,
20. they would rather have it spread over a twelve month period,
21. but if they're going to work for nine months and get paid
22. for nine months, why can't they draw their paycheck at the
23. end of each month for nine months that reflects their full...
24. compensatory...agreement? Sure there are cost implications,
25. but there are also cost implications to those teachers who
26. do not currently have that right by having to spread their
27. salary over twelve months if they don't want to take it that
28. way. I think it's a good idea and I support the bill.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Senator Bruce.

31. SENATOR BRUCE:

32. Well, I'm always amazed we have trouble with this
33. bill which says that people who work get checks in a timely

1. fashion. I mean, everyone...there...there is no one on this
2. Floor that can give me any good reason, at all today, with
3. computer drafted checks, that says a teacher who works nine
4. months ought not to get paid in ten months. This doesn't say
5. nine months for nine months, it's nine months you get paid in
6. ten months. It is outrageous that anyone in the State of
7. Illinois can be informed by their employer when they leave
8. the school building in May or early June that you're not going
9. to get your last paycheck until August. Now, the...the whole
10. sense of equity says that someone is wrong. Now, the reason
11. they want to keep the money is because the cost of money
12. has gone up and sure they want to keep it, but the other side
13. of the coin is that the teachers would like to have their
14. money because they are facing inflation and they are...facing
15. higher interest rates for purchase of cars and the goods that
16. are in their homes. I cannot understand the rationale that
17. says a person cannot get their check. You cannot name me
18. any doctor, any lawyer, any plumber, any manufacturing worker,
19. any other employee in the State of Illinois working for a
20. public or a private body that says pay me eight weeks after
21. I finish work. And, Gentlemen, these are not...we're not
22. talking about people on twelve month contracts who are trying
23. to accelerate their payments, we're talking about people who
24. walk out of the school building, conclude the school year,
25. work during the summer doing something else, but wait to
26. get their checks. There's no reason for it, except the
27. districts want to keep the money. They want to keep the
28. money. That's the only rationale. You cannot justify this
29. on any other basis. They are not covered by workmen's comp.,
30. if they're injured during the summer, they're not an employee,
31. they cannot draw unemployment comp. during that eight weeks,
32. they cannot do anything as an employee, except they don't get
33. their checks. It just seems silly that we keep fighting over

1. this thing year after year after year and it's basic equity
2. thay they get their checks in the time period of which they work.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Senator Maitland.

5. SENATOR MAITLAND:

6. Well, Mr. President, I...I apologize for arising the
7. second time. I never do that. But Senator Bruce makes the
8. same argument that the IEA does. The school...the school
9. boards now many times will...the option is granted to them
10. now in many cases and that's a possibility. The fact of
11. the matter is, the Legislature has no right to tell that local
12. school board what they can and cannot do. That's the objection,
13. Senator Bruce.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Senator Nimrod.

16. SENATOR NIMROD:

17. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
18. Senate. I know that this bill has been before us before, but
19. it seems that many main contracts with teachers are on an annual
20. basis. And when, in fact, that school board...we start saying that
21. they're going to pay them in nine months or ten months then
22. we're telling those school boards who...the teachers who are
23. on an annual contract that even though they are working for
24. the nine months that, in fact, they'll be paid on that basis.
25. Now, if that's the case, why doesn't it hold true for the
26. Legislature too? We...we went ahead and decided ourselves,
27. we're here what, six months out of the year,...and we went on
28. ...on a monthly basis and pro rated it across the year and that
29. was the hue and cry for it. Well, I don't think the teachers
30. are any different than us or anyone else. We're here annually
31. on our salary, teachers are there annually on their salary,
32. I think it ought to be a...monthly basis and we ought to
33. continue the same without having that go through the same
34. shenanigans.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator DeAngelis.

3. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

4. Thank you, Mr. President. I was not going to speak, I
5. had my light on and then Senator Etheredge covered the point
6. I wanted to cover. But to clear the record for Senator Bruce,
7. I have in my district already three situations, and the
8. representative of BES is sitting in the gallery, in which
9. teachers that were given wages on a ten month basis were
10. declared to be unemployed because they were not drawing any
11. compensation in that period of time. Now, you say there are
12. no reasons because they're not covered for worker's comp., etc.,
13. etc., I will tell you that it has been ruled in the contrary
14. because the...they were not drawing pay during the summer
15. months.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Bruce.

18. SENATOR BRUCE:

19. Well, I...I don't want to speak twice either, but Senator
20. Maitland brought my name up. Senator, you still didn't answer
21. the question why not. Now, this Legislature is here to do
22. business. If...if we cannot say to local units of government,
23. do these things reasonably, we ought not to be here. What
24. if the school district said we're going to pay you once a
25. year? Are you telling me that we cannot say that's a mistake.
26. Ninety percent of the districts in the State of Illinois allow
27. this. We're not talking about a revolution being committed by
28. this bill, we're saying that equity ought to be done to every
29. school teacher, that's all. It's not a question of local control.
30. No school district can locally say that they justify this
31. because of cash flow or anything else. They just want the
32. money. And, Senator, as I understand Senator Sommer and I
33. have gone through this many times on the Floor, the Federal

1. Government will not allow the payment. If you make the payment
2. BES won't get reimbursement from the Feds. And as I under-
3. stand the reading of the 500-C5 and 603 and 601-C3, all dealing
4. with exemptions, I don't think teachers are qualified. For
5. whatever it's worth, they say they've got three cases,
6. there's sixty-five thousand teachers...or more than that,
7. three cases doesn't seem to make a whole lot of book law,
8. but my impression of the Employment Security Act is that you
9. cannot draw unemployment as a full time teacher during the
10. summer months.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Is there any further discussion? If not, Senator Gitz
13. may close debate.

14. SENATOR GITZ:

15. The basic issue is, is whether we are going to allow
16. one single element, namely the school boards, to do some-
17. thing that we would not allow any private employer or any-
18. one else to do. Now,...I submit to you that the financial
19. ramifications of this are relatively small. Certainly far
20. smaller than the Governor's announced intention of, perhaps,
21. trimming the school aid budget by thirty million dollars.
22. I think that's pretty significant. I think we have the
23. right to give teachers simple equity. This makes sense to
24. me. I'm kind of embarrassed that we even have to offer this
25. bill to get the job done. It's a matter of equity and on
26. that basis, I hope that we will send this bill to the House
27. and send it to the Governor and sign it into law.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. The question is, shall Senate Bill 533 pass. Those in
30. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is
31. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have
32. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the
33. Ayes are 26, the Nays are 22, none Voting Present. Senator

1. Gitz.

2. SENATOR GITZ:

3. Well, in light of the quick call, let's just put it on
4. Postponed Consideration.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Gitz requests postponed consideration. Is leave
7. granted? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 534, Senator Marovitz.

8. SECRETARY:

9. Senate Bill 534.

10. (Secretary reads title of bill)
11. 3rd reading of the bill.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Senator Marovitz.

14. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

15. Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentle-
16. men of the Senate. Senate Bill 534 amends the crime of theft
17. to provide that theft of property...we would raise the level
18. of...felony level of theft for property from one hundred and
19. fifty dollars to three hundred dollars. This is a product of
20. the Judiciary II Committee in compromise reached on the Floor
21. with...Senator Geo-Karis and members of the J II Committee.
22. It originally came out at five hundred dollars, we lowered
23. it to three hundred dollars. There's a long history in the
24. State of Illinois of amending...this criminal Statute to
25. make provisions of this Act...in this Statute consistent with
26. reality. In 1833 the value assigned by the Statute was five
27. dollars, in 1867 it was increased to twenty-five dollars,...
28. in 1921 it was, again, increased and it appears that the
29. one hundred and fifty dollar level has been used since we
30. first passed the Criminal Code in 1961 and, I think, taking
31. into consideration...inflation...this would put...passing
32. this would keep the State's Attorneys from being put in
33. the difficult position of having to plea bargain cases and

1. reduce cases and create legal fictions. And I would...ask
2. for the passage of Senate Bill 534.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Is there any discussion?

5.

6.

END OF REEL

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

1. If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 534 pass. Those in
2. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open.
3. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the re-
4. cord. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are 1, none
5. Voting Present. Senate Bill 534, having received the constitu-
6. tional majority is declared passed. Senator Buzbee, for what
7. purpose do you arise?

8. SENATOR BUZBEE:

9. I'd like to know how it is that two redlights are showing on the
10. board...there, it just now changed, and there was only one red
11. light reflected in the numbers, but it just now changed. We
12. got a foul-up in the computer or...

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. It's modern science, Senator. The Yeas are 51, the Nays are
15. 2, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 534, having received the
16. constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 538,
17. Senator Gitz. Senate Bill 540, Senator Taylor. Read the bill,
18. Mr. Secretary.

19. SECRETARY:

20. Senate Bill 540.

21. (Secretary reads title of bill)

22. 3rd reading of the bill.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Taylor.

25. SENATOR TAYLOR:

26. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Senate
27. Bill 540 is a very simple bill, it just changes the name from
28. Chicago Transit Board to Chicago Transit Board...Authority Board
29. of Commissioners. I solicit your support for Senate Bill 540.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is...Senator
32. Rhoads.

33. SENATOR RHOADS:

1. Senator, you know, there's a lot of transit bills on the Calendar
2. and a lot of negotiations going on. Could you perhaps hold this
3. till next week when we...after we go to discharge motions...so
4. forth?

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Taylor.

7. SENATOR TAYLOR:

8. This bill is...is not a part of any negotiation, I have
9. not been involved in any negotiations. I'd like to send this one
10. out now, if I could.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Senator Rhoads.

13. SENATOR RHOADS:

14. Well, I think it...I think it would be preferable to...to leave
15. the bill in the Chamber, but have it your way.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. The question is, shall Senate Bill 540 pass. Those in favor
18. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
19. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
20. wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 28, the
21. Nays are 28, none Voting Present. Senator Taylor.

22. SENATOR TAYLOR:

23. Postpone consideration, please.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Postponed consideration has been requested. Senate Bill 543,
26. Senator Chew. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

27. SECRETARY:

28. Senate Bill 543.

29. (Secretary reads title of bill)

30. 3rd reading of the bill.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator Chew.

33. SENATOR CHEW:

1. Just changes the date, Mr. President, on the reduced fee
2. system for license, from the 16th to the 15th, beginning in June
3. and ending in December. I would ask for a favorable vote. Motor
4. Vehicle Laws Commission. did a study and the Secretary of State's
5. Office.. is in total support of this. It costs less to administer
6. it under this new program, if we pass it, than it does under the
7. old program that we currently have.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
10. Senate Bill 543 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
11. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
12. voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are
13. 54, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 543, having
14. received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate
15. Bill 544, Senator Vadalabene. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

16. SECRETARY:

17. Senate Bill 544.

18. (Secretary reads title of bill)

19. 3rd reading of the bill.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. Senator Vadalabene.

22. SENATOR VADALABENE:

23. Yes, thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate.
24. Senate Bill 544 as amended does exactly what the...what the...what
25. the Digest says, it provides that annual fees applicable to newly
26. acquired second division vehicles will be reduced on a quarterly
27. basis until December 1st, 1983. This is also an agreed bill with
28. the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, and with the Secretary of State.
29. And I ask for a favorable vote.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall
32. Senate Bill 544 pass. Senator Bruce.

33. SENATOR BRUCE:

1. Hold it a minute here, what are we...what are we reducing
2. fees on, and what's going to be the cost to the State of Illinois?
3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Senator Vadalabene.

5. SENATOR VADALABENE:

6. The proposal would extend a testing period for two years in
7. order to see what the fiscal impact would be, and to maintain a
8. present cash flow of the collection of such fees and taxes. What
9. we are doing, we're making it a quarterly...on a quarterly basis,
10. rather than on a semi-annually basis. And we're extending that
11. time.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Senator Bruce.

14. SENATOR BRUCE:

15. Well, I don't understand the language. I under...I see
16. where we're going to go from a fiscal year basis to a quarterly
17. year basis, that's no problem. Then it starts on...talking about
18. the fee shall be reduced by fifty percent on or after June 15th
19. and they shall be reduced fifty percent on or after December 15th.
20. Now, it seems to me, we are eliminating the fee.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator Vadalabene.

23. SENATOR VADALABENE:

24. I think the fifty percent means from a semi-annual to a
25. quarterly, which would be a fifty percent reduction that way.

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall
28. Senate Bill 544 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
29. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
30. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
31. On that question, the Ayes are 35, the Nays are 9, 7 Voting
32. Present. Senate Bill 544, having received the constitutional
33. majority is declared passed. Senator Degnan, for what purpose

1. do you arise?

2. SENATOR DEGNAN:

3. A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

5. State your point.

6. SENATOR DEGNAN:

7. Can I ask the Senate to recognize in the gallery, from the
8. Canaryville area, of the south side of Chicago, the children of the
9. Grammer School of Saint Gabriel's.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Would they stand and be recognized. Senate Bill 546, Senator
12. Bloom. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

13. SECRETARY:

14. Senate Bill 546.

15. (Secretary reads title of bill)

16. 3rd reading of the bill.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator Bloom.

19. SENATOR BLOOM:

20. Thank you, Mr. President, and fellow Senators. Senate Bill
21. 546 is known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act, that Senator
22. Donnewald and I are offering. It is to provide some relief to
23. smaller businesses. It does exactly what the synopsis says it
24. does. You may recall that on 2nd reading, an amendment was offered
25. after consultation with the staff on both sides of the aisle of
26. the Executive Committee, tightening down the definition of small
27. businesses. I'd respond to any questions, otherwise I urge a
28. favorable roll call.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
31. Bill 546 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote
32. Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
33. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 57,

1. the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 546, having
2. received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate
3. Bill 547, Senator D'Arco. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.
4. SECRETARY:

5. Senate Bill 547.

6. (Secretary reads title of bill)

7. 3rd reading of the bill.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Senator D'Arco.

10. SENATOR D'ARCO:

11. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a bill that I am the joint
12. co-sponsor on with Senator Rock. And, in fact, Senator Rock called
13. me on the bill and asked that I...I sponsor it along with Senator
14. Rock. What the bill provides, is that no farmer, food processor
15. or producer, distributor, wholesaler, retailer, or gleaner of
16. food who donates food to a not-for-profit food organization,
17. charitable organization be liable for ordinary negligence in the
18. distribution of the food to the organization. And it also provides
19. for limited liability of the charitable organization in the dis-
20. tribution process of the food to the food banks, and to the various
21. food pantries that need this food so desperately. In the City
22. of Chicago, we have a limited budget for distribution of food from
23. the City of Chicago to needy people. We reduced the budget and
24. the amounts of one million to three hundred thousand. And big
25. food chains are somewhat reluctant to distribute food to food
26. pantries and food distributors for the...for the necessity of
27. distributing that food. Also, I would suggest that we have in
28. Chicago the Chicago Food Depository which Leah Krons is the
29. director of, and they started operations in the distributing of
30. food, and they're doing a very good job at it, and I don't think
31. there is any opposition to this bill. And I would move that we
32. pass the bill.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Is there any discussion? Senator Lemke.

2. SENATOR LEMKE:

3. I rise to support this bill. Recently we have been involved
4. in the community of raising food for Poland. And one of the things
5. that has stopped us from getting contributions from various businesses
6. is, is they're afraid a liability will occur on some of this excess
7. food. I think it's a good bill, and I ask for its support.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Senator Rupp.

10. SENATOR RUPP:

11. May I ask the sponsor a question?

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. You sure can.

14. SENATOR RUPP:

15. I was wondering Senator, if you have checked with Mike Royko
16. to see if it's alright to bring this downstate food into Chicago?

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator D'Arco.

19. SENATOR D'ARCO:

20. Mike Royko is not a friend of mine, has never been a friend
21. of mine, and he never will be a friend of mine.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Now, the question is, shall Senate Bill 547 pass. Those in
24. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. Have all voted who
25. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
26. the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate
27. Bill 547, having received the constitutional majority is declared
28. passed. Senate Bill 548, Senator Lemke. Read the bill, Mr.

29. Secretary.

30. SECRETARY:

31. Senate Bill 548.

32. (Secretary reads title of bill)

33. 3rd reading of the bill.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Lemke.

3. SENATOR LEMKE:

4. What this does, is sets out in the School Code a section,
5. Article XIV-D calling for Americanization Programs. We presently
6. have Americanization Programs in the Act, but this section will
7. follow right after bilingual so it will clear up any questions
8. we have by people who say, why do we have a section for bilingual
9. and not a section for Americanization. I think it's a good bill,
10. and I think it's time...high time we start on our...our process
11. of making people citizens. I ask for a favorable roll call.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Is there any discussion? Senator Bloom.

14. SENATOR BLOOM:

15. Will the sponsor yield?

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. He will.

18. SENATOR BLOOM:

19. To a question. Okay, my handler is giving me a...how much
20. is this going to cost?

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator Lemke.

23. SENATOR LEMKE:

24. It will cost...it will not cost additional money because it's
25. already being done by the State.

26. SENATOR BLOOM:

27. Well, the new language says, "such programs shall be eligible
28. for reimbursement for the cost of such programs from funds ap-
29. propriated for that person...purpose upon making application and
30. therefore." So, I think it will cost something. The other thing,
31. if it won't cost anything, why are we doing another mandate? As
32. you know, for every...every page of law, you get about four or five
33. of rules.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Further discussion? If not, Senator Lemke may close
3. debate.

4. SENATOR LEMKE:

5. All we're doing is taking the language from the Adult Ed-
6. ucation Section, and inserting it in a separate paragraph. We're
7. already doing this, there's no additional cost, we already spend
8. this money. If you look at the school budget, they appropriate
9. a million and a half dollars for Americanization, and that's what
10. we're using. It's the same appropriation every year, it's just
11. breaking it out in a special line item, and saying this is...this
12. is for Americanization, we in the State have Americanization Pro-
13. grams and the State Board does this. We're spending a million
14. and a half dollars for Americanization, but in...and we're also
15. spending a bunch more for bilingual. And I think it's time that
16. we break this out and tell the people in the State we have
17. Americanization Programs. I ask for a favorable vote, it will
18. not cost additional money.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

20. The question is, shall Senate Bill 548 pass. Those in favor
21. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
22. all voted who wish? Would you get me...have all voted who wish?
23. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the
24. Ayes are 35, the Nays are 18, 1 Voting Present. Senate Bill 548,
25. having received the constitutional majority is declared
26. passed. Senate Bill 549, Senator Taylor. Read the bill, Mr.
27. Secretary.

28. SECRETARY:

29. Senate Bill 549.

30. (Secretary reads title of bill)

31. 3rd reading of the bill.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Senator Taylor.

1. SENATOR TAYLOR:

2. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. And
3. Senator Rupp, I should...I think I should start off, and let you
4. know that Mike Royko has not been too kind to me, and I don't
5. consider him as a close personal friend either. But Senate Bill
6. 549 creates an Act in relation to a Work Study Program for high
7. school students in grades 11th and 12th, living in an area where
8. unemployment is nine percent or more of the work...as determined
9. by the Department of Labor and the U.S. State Department...United
10. States Department. I introduced this bill some years ago, and I
11. only had it for a specific area, but because of the situation be-
12. ing as it is today, this particular piece of legislation would cover
13. the entire State, I believe, because our State is nine percent or
14. better. Under my proposal, this would be able to put, at least,
15. fifty-nine thousand high school students to work on jobs, doing
16. twenty hours of work a week with the State paying half of the salary,
17. and the employer paying the other half. I think that this would
18. give incentive to businessmen who complain about not being able
19. to get the kind of work out of a high school student for minimum
20. wages that he has to pay. This would give him an opportunity to
21. hire two persons for the price of one. It would do one other thing
22. in my particular area, it would take some of the kids that are on
23. welfare and give them a decent opportunity, who complains that
24. they cannot...attend school because they do not have the fund. I
25. know it will help the Department of Public Aid, it will stop the
26. dropout situation, it will eliminate some of the crime that exists
27. on the street today, because in order to be in this particular
28. program, they must be enrolled in school taking four major subjects.
29. Mr. Speaker, and members of the Senate, I solicit your support
30. for a good bill, Senate Bill 549.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator Davidson.

33. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

1. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. I rise in opposition
2. to this bill regardless of how good or how bad you talk about it.
3. There's a couple of things this bill doesn't do, one of the biggest
4. objections to this, this program doesn't require any student to
5. enroll in any vocational training class, and therefore it's not
6. considered a real educational process. If the student is expected
7. to carry a full class...load, then work another twenty hours on
8. top of it, you're asking for extraordinary effort on their part.
9. The third most important thing, in this present time, only by
10. large populated areas or by a whole county, is the Department of
11. Labor able to give you the unemployment statistics. Therefore
12. small areas who have more than nine percent unemployment, and there's
13. many of them, would not be able to participate in this even if
14. the money was available. Two million dollars, Ladies and Gentlemen,
15. is not a scratch in the bucket. There's not any urban area in the
16. State of Illinois today, that I'm aware of, other than maybe the
17. Bloomington-Normal, or the Champaign area that's not above nine
18. percent unemployment. This bill's been tried before, it's been
19. defeated before, and I urge you to give it the same kind of necessary
20. merciful death now, so we don't mislead some person that they're
21. going to have an opportunity to participate in a work program that's
22. not going to function.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Collins. Collins.

25. SENATOR COLLINS:

26. ...thank you, Mr. President. I rise in...in support of this
27. bill. This kind of concept, I passed a bill two years ago and
28. it worked very effectively, it was called the Youth Incentive
29. Unemployment Program, and it was signed and supported by the
30. Governor. And many high...it provided incentive for many students
31. to stay in school. Although it was a very limited pilot program,
32. the records show that it was a very successful program. Unfortunate...
33. we did have a sunset clause on their program, and it would expire

1. this year. I think this bill, 549, will pick up where that
2. program left off. Now, I understand that the Governor indicated
3. that he was very concerned in this area about providing jobs for the
4. unemployed, and particularly our youth, and this is a good
5. opportunity to make good on his word. Whatever dollars that
6. we have coming in, for summer employment or...or employment of
7. our youth, this is the most effective way of using that money.
8. Rather than having young people walking up and down the streets
9. with brooms, or doing nothing, and giving the illusions that all
10. you have to do is waste some time and draw a paycheck, is defeating
11. to the whole concept of what we're trying to...to teach our children
12. to be. And that is to be responsible citizens, and if you want
13. something you have to work for it. That's what this bill provides
14. an opportunity for, and I support it, and ask that you support it
15. also.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Sangmeister.

18. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

19. Yes, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Just looking
20. over our analysis on this bill, and I don't know, Senator Davidson,
21. whether you're right or not, our analysis says that a student must
22. be enrolled in four major and one minor subjects in order to qualify.
23. So, certainly he would have to be enrolled in school. Frankly,
24. I...I think you ought to take a good look at this piece of leg-
25. islation, this isn't all bad, this will help in the area of the
26. exact...the exact age group of people that we're going to want to
27. put to work this summer, and I think it could alleviate a lot of
28. other problems that might be arised if we don't...that might arise
29. if we don't get some of these people employed. It helps out em-
30. ployers in the area. The only problem, of course, obviously
31. is the estimated cost is two million dollars. That's the thing
32. that I think you have to consider, and I...I realize that that's an
33. expensive tab. But you take a look at the other end of what it

1. might cost us, this might not be a bad program, in fact, I think
2. we ought to support it.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Is there further discussion? Senator Davidson.

5. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

6. Sorry, but since he asked the question, I'm well aware
7. of the times irregular, what I talked about, Senator Sangmeister,
8. was vocational education. What you're really saying to this child
9. is, you go to school, and you go out and look for a part-time job
10. like any other one. What I'm saying is, if you're going to put
11. it...make it work, put vocational ed in so it makes part of the
12. educational program. That's what it's all about, the two million
13. dollars is a pilot program only, Ladies and Gentlemen, it doesn't
14. talk about what's down the road, and what the pilot program...
15. suppose the pilot program is successful, you could spend a hundred
16. million dollars right out of the School Formula, zip, if that's
17. what it took.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Taylor may close
20. debate.

21. SENATOR TAYLOR:

22. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. This
23. is just the substantive legislation, at this particular time, the two
24. million dollars is in another bill, and by the time that bill is
25. called, I might have been able to work out the proper and reasonable
26. solution with the Governor and his staff. But I think that this is a
27. good concept, it does...ask the student to do anything other than
28. what they normally do in school. Because they need to learn how
29. to work. It's not necessary that they all have to be mechanics,
30. which you'll get in vocational ed and a few other things. But
31. this particular bill calls for work, and that's what I intend to
32. do, is to try to get many of those off the street in many of the
33. areasthroughout the State of Illinois, that would have problems this

1. summer if we did not do something to help them. Mr. President,
2. and members of the Senate, I solicit your support for Senate
3. Bill 549.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

5. The question is, shall Senate Bill 549 pass. Those in favor
6. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
7. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
8. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 31,
9. the Nays are 23, 2 Voting Present. Senate Bill 549, having re-
10. ceived the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate
11. Bill 555, Senator Egan. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

12. ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

13. Senate Bill 555.

14. (Secretary reads title of bill)

15. 3rd reading of the bill.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Egan.

18. SENATOR EGAN:

19. I just want to say, Mr. President, that Mike Royko is a con-
20. stituent of mine, and a good friend, and I agree...everything
21. he says. Oh, you said Mike Royko, I thought it was...

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Will those Republican Senators that are playing with their
24. rubber duckies wait till you get home tonight.

25. SENATOR EGAN:

26. Senate Bill 555, Mr. President, and members of the Senate,
27. does what the Digest and the Calendar says, indeed. It does
28. require Senate confirmation of gubernatorial appointments to the
29. Downstate Teacher's Board, that number...four, he appoints two every
30. two years, and this will require Senatorial confirmation. It
31. does not affect the present board. It also requires, in addition,
32. thereto, that no appointed trustee be gainfully employed or ad-
33. ministratively connected with any school system, institution of higher

1. learning, education employee, organization, or school board
2. association, whether public or private, nor a member of an ed-
3. ucation employee organization, school board or school board of
4. trustees. And no trustee may be an annuitant under the system
5. nor the parent, child, or spouse of a member or annuitant. Now,
6. the bill comes to be as a result of a study that a sub-committee
7. of the Pension Laws Commission worked on for several months, in-
8. volving conflicts of interest with the boards of trustees of the
9. various retirement systems, State supported, in our State. That
10. study began as a result of the PERISA legislation in Congress, and
11. the pending ERISA legislation in Congress to tighten up the
12. controls of State supported pension systems. And because I
13. am chairman of that commission, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
14. I was requested by a coalition for the security of teacher
15. retirement to sponsor the bill, and after that long, hard task
16. that the sub-committee had worked on, and because of some facts
17. that occurred during that study with the Downstate Teacher's Board
18. I consented to sponsor the legislation. It simply does that,
19. it tightens up the...the...the intent, I believe, of setting
20. forth the membership on the board who control billions of dollars
21. of private funds, these are funds that are not State funds, they're
22. owned by the teachers, themselves. We have a fiduciary standard
23. law in Illinois, that also does what...what this bill will attempt
24. to accomplish, and that is, keep it clean. It's a good thing, I
25. don't see that any opposition could emanate other than a partisan
26. type individual objection. And I commend it to your favorable
27. consideration.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Rock.

30. SENATOR ROCK:

31. As a non-partisan type, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 555,
32. and would...point out to the membership, that there are a number
33. of State supported pension systems, the membership of which do not

1. have to be confirmed. We are singling out only this one. If
2. we do it for all, that's one thing, but to do it for just this
3. one is, in my judgment, inequitable. And I urge a No vote.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

5. Senator Rupp.

6. SENATOR RUPP:

7. Thank you, Mr. President. And being of the same non-partisan
8. group as the President of the Senate, I too, object to this. If
9. it is such a commendable process, I'm a little bit puzzled as to
10. why there wasn't a movement to also have this same thing apply to
11. the other systems, particularly the Chicago system. We have not
12. seen any movement in that. I ask that this bill be defeated.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Senator Friedland.

15. SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

16. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
17. Senate. Well, I rise in support of this good bill. I think those of
18. you that do have some concerns, you're just concerned if the con-
19. firmation feature would be tied.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. Senator Berning.

22. SENATOR BERNING:

23. Thank you, Mr. President. I urge the members on this side
24. of the aisle to support this legislation. The other commission
25. pension systems boards are under consideration, and subsequent
26. legislation will be presented by the commission. This is the first
27. step, it deserves your favorable vote.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Buzbee.

30. SENATOR BUZBEE:

31. Thank you, Mr. President. I also rise in opposition to this
32. horrible bill, as expressed by the Senate President. You know,
33. I don't...I fail to understand why it is that those with the vested

1. interest in a pension should not have the ability and the
2. authority to serve on the board that invests those funds in their
3. pensions. Now, I don't think it ought to be their...I don't think
4. it ought to be them exclusively, but when we eliminate the annuitants,
5. and those who are going to become annuitants, as members of the
6. board, I think they have an interest there. In all of our down-
7. state firemen's pension systems, and...and police pension systems,
8. and so forth, they're run almost exclusively by the people who
9. have the pension coming to them. And I think that the fact that...
10. that they are, in fact, teachers and retired teachers who now
11. serve on that board, is only right. They should continue to
12. exercise that right, because it's their pension that they are
13. concerned about. And it's their funds that they're investing.
14. They are concerned about how those funds are invested. And I
15. think that's...that's the only way to go. I think this is a bad
16. bill and ought to be defeated.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator Bruce.

19. SENATOR BRUCE:

20. Thank you, Mr. President. The State Employees Association
21. ...our pension system for State employees has three appointed,
22. none subject to confirmation, the universities have nine appointed,
23. General Assembly, five appointed. We don't even confirm our own.
24. Judicial system, three. Chicago teachers, three. And the ITRS,
25. four, none of whom are appointed or confirmed by the Governor.
26. Just tell you about this bill, we can do all kinds of things, and
27. as we have with teachers, we debate salary schedules, we debate
28. whether or not we ought to have collective bargaining, whether
29. they're going to get paid on ten months or twelve months, we're
30. going to debate curriculum, whether we're going to teach
31. various courses. We're going to talk about height, weight, and
32. direction of school buses, we're also going to talk about school
33. formulas, and I'll tell you what, teachers get agitated. But let

1. me tell you about this bill. If you want a bill that's going
2. to excite people, fool around with pensions. Tell the people
3. who have annuitants, who have pensioners, who have orphans on
4. this system, that you're going to do this, and you'll have a
5. fire storm very similar to what President Reagan found out late
6. last week when he said he was going to reduce social security.
7. Now, this is a good one to get out of here, if you want to get
8. people really excited in your district. You want gun control,
9. you're going to have gun control problems, yeah, you're going to
10. get a lot of letters. You want letters, you start telling the
11. teachers of the State of Illinois, single them out, the nine
12. systems don't...don't put anything with State employees, don't say
13. anything about judges, don't say anything about our own system,
14. but you tell the downstate teachers system.. Senator Egan doesn't have
15. one of those people in his district, mainly represents the Chicago
16. teachers, and you tell them that you're going to do this, and you
17. go back home. I'm going to guarantee you something, you're going
18. to hear from them when you fool around with people's pensions. And
19. that's exactly what you're doing here by saying Statutorally, that
20. people who are members of this system have no right, no right,
21. to be on that board. You're going to rue the day this bill
22. passes.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Geo-Karis.

25. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

26. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. He indicates he will.

29. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

30. I don't have the bill in front of me, but all your bill does,
31. is say that whoever the Governor appoints, she or he has to be
32. confirmed by the Senate. Am I correct, Senator Egan?

33. SENATOR EGAN:

1. Well, that's partially correct. It further stipulates
2. that no appointed trustee may be gainfully employed or admin-
3. istratively connected with any school system, institution of
4. higher learning, education employee organization or school board
5. association, whether public or private. Nor a member of an
6. education employee organization, school board, school board of
7. trustees. The...the intent of which is, the public members ought
8. to be public. That...that's...that is to...to prevent a conflict
9. of interest. An incidentally, if you want to put it on all of
10. the other State supported systems, I agree, I vote Aye. I don't
11. see that there's anything bad about a lack...about eliminating
12. the possibility of a conflict of interest. These...these funds...
13. these funds are trust funds, and they should be very carefully
14. guarded. Why anybody would want to grab them is something that I
15. don't understand, because they can't...they're bound by the fidu-
16. ciary standards anyway. But, this merely clarifies the intent
17. of the...of the law as it exists.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Channel 20 seeks permission to film. Is leave granted?
20. Leave is granted. Senator Geo-Karis.

21. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

22. Your bill will not prevent...would not prevent retired
23. teachers from being members of the board, would it?

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Senator Egan.

26. SENATOR EGAN:

27. If they are not members of the system, nor...nor appointed
28. trustee, nor gainfully employed, or administratively connected,
29. et cetera, et cetera.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Geo-Karis.

32. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

33. Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I

1. have heard from some of my teachers. They feel that too many
2. IEA members have been appointed to some of these boards, and not
3. enough consideration has been given to the teachers who are not
4. members of the IEA, or who are members of another organization.
5. Therefore, I'd like to speak in favor of this bill, because the
6. word I got was not from anyone outside, but from teachers themselves.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

8. Senator Maitland.

9. SENATOR MAITLAND:

10. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm...I'm really, really amazed
11. at the...at the comments coming from the opposition. What they're
12. telling you is that we are losing teacher representation on this
13. board, and that's absolutely false. Senator Bruce, the Statutes
14. are very complete, and you know that, there are four representatives
15. on that board...board from the teachers. And that...that...one
16. of those can be an annuitant if...if they so desire. What we're
17. doing here, is calling for Senate confirmation of the public
18. members, and that's all we're doing. What you're telling us, is that
19. yes, teachers now do have more authority because...or do have
20. more representation on that board because the IEA controls some
21. of the public members, and that's what we're objecting to, and
22. that's the only thing we're objecting to. I, like Senator Geo-
23. Karis, have received phone calls and letters from teachers who
24. don't like the direction that that board is going now, and this
25. affords them some protection. I rise in strong support of this
26. legislation. And Senator Egan, I join with you in suggesting that
27. the other pension trustees should have Senate confirmation also.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Collins. Senator Gitz.

30. SENATOR GITZ:

31. Well, very briefly, Mr. President, and members of the Senate.
32. Senator Maitland, I don't have any problem with the idea of Senate
33. confirmation of public members, but I find it very, very strange

1. that the people say, well we don't have any problem of including
2. these other systems. Where were the amendments, and why is this
3. bill offered by a sponsor who doesn't have anything to do with
4. downstate teachers? I don't mind this Body reviewing the public
5. members, and ruling on their confirmation, but it seems to me, that
6. what is good for the goose ought to be good for the gander. And
7. if you come in here with a bill that starts talking about all the
8. systems and confirmations, fine. Let's...I suggest start with
9. our own, and let's also include the Chicago Pension Systems,
10. let's include everyone of them. I think that we have made much
11. ado about nothing. And I kind of resent the fact that this one
12. retirement system, above all, is singled out for this kind of
13. treatment. That is bizarre, to say the least.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Is there further discussion? Senator Walsh.

16. SENATOR WALSH:

17. Well, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Just briefly
18. in response to the last speaker. Senator Egan represents a suburban
19. district to a certain extent, and...and I represent a suburban
20. district. Our teachers are members of the Downstate Teachers
21. Retirement System, and so we do have a personal interest in the
22. outcome of this legislation. If the Gentleman had any amendments,
23. he should have offered them. I urge support of this bill.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Senator Berning, for a second time.

26. SENATOR BERNING:

27. Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Partly in response to the
28. last speaker once removed. I'd like to point out, that Senator
29. Egan is the sponsor because the Pension Laws Commission joined
30. with these organizations, the Civic Federation, the State Chamber
31. of Commerce, the Illinois Taxpayer's Federation, the Illinois
32. Principal's Association, the Farm Bureau, and the Illinois Man-
33. ufacturer's Association. It was members of each of those groups

1. who conducted the study and evaluation of the current appointment
2. process, and the membership as it's now made up with the present
3. gubernatorial appointment. And the consensus was, that public
4. members, yes, ought to be public members, with no ties whatsoever
5. to education, nor teachers. And that is the reason for the bill,
6. Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It is a
7. bill that we ought to support and, that as I mentioned the first
8. time I was on my feet, the study is continuing for similar action
9. for all the pension systems.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Egan...Senator
12. Bruce, for the second time.

13. SENATOR BRUCE:

14. Just so I understand, Senator Egan, I have a question for
15. you. Just so we understand, let's just take the Judicial system,
16. if this bill passes, your commitment is that either in the House
17. or the next year you will introduce a bill doing the same thing for
18. Judicial system, and it will state in there that no one gainfully
19. employed by any Judicial system or who is connected with any
20. institution of higher education that trains lawyers, or is a
21. member of any association of judges or attorneys, or is a member
22. or former member of any Bar Association, or who has.. is an annuitant,
23. nor a parent, a child, or a spouse or member as an annuitant can serve
24. on this board, that is what you're going to say for judges, then,
25. next Session? And similar language for all the other eight systems?

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Senator Egan.

28. SENATOR EGAN:

29. I vote Aye.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Egan may close debate.

32. SENATOR EGAN:

33. Well, all right. Apparently there...there is some mistrust
of what I say. Senator Bruce, I'm not trying to hurt the system,

1. I'm not trying to hurt the IEA. I was asked to sponsor the bill,
2. and I sponsored it. There's a nice coalition of people that are
3. sincere in attempting to make public members, public in this
4. system, as I believe they should be public in every system. And
5. if it's necessary to amend every system, I'll do it. I will help
6. if I am asked. And this is...this is simply that, and I ask for
7. your favorable vote.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. The question is, shall Senate Bill 555 pass. Those in favor
10. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
11. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
12. wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 31, the
13. Nays are 22, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 555, having received
14. the constitutional majority is declared passed. For what purpose
15. does Senator Bruce arise?

16. SENATOR BRUCE:

17. Because I want everyone not to be able to say that
18. they had their switch punched on this one, I would like to have a
19. verification of both the affirmatives and the negatives on this
20. one.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator, we will verify the affirmative, since verifying the
23. negatives will not change the outcome. Senator Bruce has requested
24. a verification, and will all the Senators be in their seats.
25. The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

26. SECRETARY:

27. The following voted in the affirmative: Berning, Bloom,
28. Coffey, D'Arco, Dawson, DeAngelis, Degnan, Egan, Friedland, Geo-
29. Karis, Grotberg, Jeremiah Joyce, Keats, Kent, Lemke, Mahar, Maitland,
30. McMillan, Nedza, Nega, Nimrod, Ozinga, Philip, Rhoads, Shapiro,
31. Simms, Sommer, Thomas, Totten, Walsh, and Weaver.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Senator Bruce, would you question any of the Senators' names?

1. SENATOR BRUCE:

2. Senator Dawson.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Senator Dawson on the Floor? Senator Dawson. Strike his
5. name from the record.

6. SENATOR BRUCE:

7. Senator Lemke.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Senator Lemke on the Floor? Senator Lemke. Strike his
10. name from the record.

11. SENATOR BRUCE:

12. Senator J.E. Joyce.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Senator J...Jeremiah Joyce on the Floor? Senator Joyce.
15. Strike his name from the record.

16. SENATOR BRUCE:

17. Thank you.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. The roll call has been verified, and the Ayes are 28, the
20. Nays are 22, those Voting Present are none. Senate Bill 555,
21. having failed to receive a constitutional majority is declared
22. lost. For what purpose does Senator Marovitz arise?

23. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

24. Mr. President, I'd like the record to reflect that I was in
25. the phone booth, did not get a chance to vote on this bill, but
26. had I voted on this bill I would have voted No.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. The record will so indicate. For what purpose does Senator
29. Bloom arise?

30. SENATOR BLOOM:

31. Thank you, Mr. President. On Senate Bill 549, I was off the
32. Floor, and I'd like the Journal to reflect that had I been on the
33. Floor, I would have voted No.

SB 556
3rd Reading

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. The record will so indicate. Senate Bill 556, Senator
3. Schaffer. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

4. SECRETARY:

5. Senate Bill 556.

6. (Secretary reads title of bill)

7. 3rd reading of the bill.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. Senator Schaffer.

10. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

11. Mr. President, this is a relatively simple bill. A number
12. of years ago we passed the Election Consolidation Act, and in
13. doing so we turned a couple of...quite a few nice, quiet, County
14. Clerk operations into complete nightmares. Recognizing the
15. additional hour that we passed and the workload, we increased
16. the salaries of Election Judges last year. This bill simply would
17. add a three...thirty-five hundred dollar a year stipend to
18. each of the County Clerks in the State. I think this is justified
19. because of the increased workload that, we as a State, have put on,
20. each of these Clerk's office. I think it's very simple. I was
21. a big advocate, and still am, of election consolidation. And I
22. know what I've done to the Clerks in my office. in my district,
23. and I know the number of hours, heartaches, and problems that
24. this has caused them. I think it's still a good idea, but I think
25. it's only fair that we do give the Clerks this extra stipend.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill
28. 5...I beg your pardon. Senator Joyce.

29. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

30. Yes, just one simple question, maybe an explanation. This
31. is not a stipend to the office, this is direct pay to the Clerk.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator Schaffer.

1. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

2. It's a...it's a pay to the Clerk, personally, yes.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Nimrod.

5. SENATOR NIMROD:

6. A question of the sponsor.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Indicates he'll yield. Senator Nimrod.

9. SENATOR NIMROD:

10. Who pays...who pays the Clerk now?

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Senator Schaffer.

13. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

14. The County Clerk is paid exclusively by the county. The...
15. if this bill is successful, he will...he or she will be...paid
16. by the county and at whatever rate they choose within the guidelines
17. that we pass by law and through an appropriation in the State
18. Board of Elections for the thirty-five hundred dollar amount.
19. We did, in fact, pass the Election Consolidation Law, we did,
20. in fact, change the ball game and increase the scope and workload
21. of that office.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Senator Nimrod.

24. SENATOR NIMROD:

25. I...I think that we're just starting off on the wrong foot.
26. I support...local control and all of you have been talking about
27. wanting to have local jurisdiction. You know, if...if it's been in-
28. creased and the workload's been increased, it's an elected office,
29. every time somebody increases our workloan or somebody else's
30. workload we shouldn't be going around increasing the pay. That
31. responsibility, and that amount of work belongs to the county board,
32. they ought to decide on what their elected officials get, and that
33. ought to be their pay regardless of what happens with us. But we

1. certainly shouldn't be involved in...in trying to get...now
2. starting off with the Clerks. Before you know it, we're going
3. to be taking...paying the whole County Clerk's pay, and that'll
4. be the next step.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Further discussion? Senator McMillan.

7. SENATOR MCMILLAN:

8. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. I rise in opposition
9. to the bill. There's a bill coming up later, which I am sponsoring,
10. which I think gets us out of the position of having to make all the
11. decisions with regard to certain elements of county officials
12. salaries. But more important than that on this particular bill,
13. even in our relatively smaller counties, in my area there is one
14. county that has only a very small number of...of cities and so forth
15. that have their own small elections. There's another county that's
16. still a rural one that has thirty or forty small communities. To
17. provide the same salary to the County Clerk's of all counties, some
18. of whom may have literally fifty or sixty or seventy different
19. jurisdictions to worry about, another one of which may only have
20. four or five, is...is simply not equitable. And I think for a
21. lot of reasons, this is not a good bill.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Further discussion? Senator Sangmeister.

24. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

25. Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Indicates he will yield. Senator Sangmeister.

28. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

29. Senator Schaffer, in the Constitution of the State of
30. Illinois, under Article VII, Local Government, there's...
31. Section 9, sub-paragraph B, that says, "an increase or a de-
32. crease in the salary of an elected officer of any unit of local
33. government shall not take effect during the term for which that

1. officer is elected." How do you feel that this legislation is
2. outside that constitutional limitation?

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Schaffer.

5. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

6. Well, I'm not going to practice constitutional law, so you'll
7. pardon me for not sounding like the ultimate authority, but I believe
8. if you look at the bill, it is described as an additional stipend.
9. I also believe that we do this with other county officials, that we
10. do provide partial salaries. It's not the first time it's...that
11. we've done this. And my understanding, frankly, in talking to the
12. sponsors of...of the bill, was that this was not a problem. I
13. ...I plead no absolute expertise in the area, but no one has
14. broached the topic before. I don't think there's a problem.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. Senator Sangmeister.

17. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

18. Well, whether you call it a stipend or whatever it may be,
19. you know, somewhere that's got to be a salary increase. I would
20. think there would be a problem with it, but I'm not proclaiming
21. to be an expert either, I just raised the question.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Pardon me. Further discussion? Senator Coffey.

24. SENATOR COFFEY:

25. A question of the sponsor.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. He indicates he will yield. Senator Coffey.

28. SENATOR COFFEY:

29. Yes, if...if you have an Election Commission in your county,
30. and they take care of all the election problems, does the County
31. Clerk still get this money?

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator Schaffer.

1. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

2. Yes. I'm frankly not aware of any county that does that, al-
3. though I suspect there are a couple though. Frankly, again, I
4. think regardless, I suspect that the County Clerk still has ad-
5. ditional problems. As I understand in the Election Consolidation
6. Law, I don't think there's a county in the State that the County
7. Clerk doesn't have additional duties because of the Election Con-
8. solidation. I would respectfully point out that even in a small
9. county with relatively small numbers of units of government elections
10. you'll also find that that County Clerk may be a one or two person
11. office which means all the additional work got heaped on his or
12. her shoulders. And I might add, those counties also pay very low
13. salaries, and suddenly those Clerks are found doing all of the work.
14. But there may be some counties, I know, I think of Kane, which has,
15. at least, one election board I think in Aurora, but I know that that County
16. Clerk also does a ton of work in all the rest of the county, and
17. I think this would probably be true throughout the county...the
18. State.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Coffey.

21. SENATOR COFFEY:

22. Well, I think you attempt to...to help with the problem is
23. probably a good idea in some ways, but in, for instance, my home
24. county they're forming now, Election Commission which will deal
25. with all elections; which will take it out of the hands of the
26. County Clerk. It will also add extra cost to the county to form
27. that commission. And yet...and their responsibilities will be even
28. less than it was before because they won't be responsible
29. even for the elections that they were in the past, and it's
30. going to cost the county officials extra money to form this
31. commission, and we have another county doing the same thing. We
32. have one that already has one, and we're not addressing those
33. types of problems. And as it was mentioned by Senator Maitland,

1. the...there is a lot of difference from one county to the other,
2. and the burdens that they receive. And I am aware that the...
3. that in many of my own counties, that has created an additional
4. problem, but I don't think this is an answer to that problem,
5. Senator, and I would ask for a No vote on this...on this bill.
6. PRESIDENT:

7. Further discussion? Senator Philip.

8. SENATOR PHILIP:

9. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
10. Senate. And maybe I ought to clarify something for Senator
11. Schaffer. My County Clerk called me last week and asked me to
12. support the bill. As you know, in DuPage County, we have an Election
13. Commission, now if this bill passes, DuPage County Clerk will not
14. receive the thirty-five hundred dollars, because we have an
15. Election Commission. So, it only involves those counties that
16. have a County Clerk and no Election Commission.

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

19. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

20. Yes, Mr. President. I'm sorry for rising the second time, but
21. this is per annum, this is a thirty-five hundred dollar a year
22. increase. I'm wondering about that, it seems to me maybe we
23. could support a thirty-five hundred dollar, a one time shot while
24. they get used to...to working the problems out with the Consolidation
25. of Elections. But to just give them a thirty-five hundred dollar
26. a year, every year hereafter, seems a bit much.

27. PRESIDENT:

28. Any further discussion? Senator Schaffer may close.

29. SENATOR SCHAFFER:

30. Well, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Frankly,
31. we've brought up a couple of questions which may have some validity,
32. I don't know, and I think we could address them as the bill
33. progresses. The bottom line is, that I think most of us, particularly
those of us downstate know what the Election Consolidation has

1. done to the County Clerk's Office. They're suddenly running
2. five elections every two years, instead of two. Some of them are
3. getting additional help from their county boards, some of them are
4. not, or not getting it to the degree they should. We have
5. turned those offices into a completely different animal. Not
6. the county board, this Body and the Body across the hall, passed the
7. laws, and I remember when Mark Rhoads held the law up, it was only
8. about eight inches thick, and we have asked them to implement
9. that law. We have created tremendous hardships for them, and
10. I think this bill is justifiable, and...and desirable, and I
11. urge a favorable roll call.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Question is, shall Senate Bill 556 pass. Those in favor will
14. vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
15. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
16. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 30,
17. the Nays are 16, 2 Voting Present. Senate Bill 556, having re-
18. ceived the required constitutional majority is declared passed.
19. Channel 20.4.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

(END OF REEL)

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

1. requests permission to shoot some film. Is leave granted?
2. Leave is granted. 558, Senator Egan. The bottom of page
3. 15, Senate Bill 558. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

4. SECRETARY:

5. Senate Bill 558.

6. (Secretary reads title of bill)

7. 3rd reading of the bill.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. Senator Egan.

10. SENATOR EGAN:

11. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.

12. Well, I...I really should kind of suffix my remarks about
13. Mike Royko. I hardly know him and...and I don't really agree
14. with everything he says. I've got three simple pension bills
15. in a row here and I...they are really simple. The first
16. one of which Senate Bill 558 just allows the Executive Director
17. of the Pension Laws Commission to buy in eight years of time
18. under which he was paid by contractual services. She will
19. make the contribution according to the Statutory formula
20. and...we do this all the time. I ask...it...it applies only
21. to, I think, one or two people, so I ask your favorable
22. consideration on that.

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Any discussion? Senator Johns.

25. SENATOR JOHNS:

26. Does this just involve two people?

27. PRESIDENT:

28. Senator Egan.

29. SENATOR EGAN:

30. It may only involve just one, I'm not sure if Mary Ellen, the
31. secretary wishes to get into the system; but Betty wants to
32. get into the Pension System. She doesn't have a pension. She
33. was not allowed to have a pension, even as Executive Director

1. of the Pension Laws Commission and I think that...it's a
2. fair bill.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Any further discussion? Senator Grotberg.

5. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

6. The...the...the Calendar shows the Legislative Advisory
7. Commission also, Senator, is that one you can tell us who
8. it is and how long and how much?

9. PRESIDENT:

10. Senator Egan.

11. SENATOR EGAN:

12. I am not...I am sorry, I am not aware that it included
13. them and perhaps Senator Newhouse can answer it. Did we
14. amend it or change the bill originally so that you could put
15. somebody in? Well, it...it really...I don't think it's
16. covered by the bill. I think that's just a...a misstatement.
17. It...it amends Section 14-104.2 of the Illinois Pension Code.
18. Yeah, alright. But I...it...it is not intended to cover any
19. individual in that commission. If it does, I certainly don't
20. object.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall
23. Senate Bill 558 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
24. opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted
25. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
26. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 34, the
27. Nays are 4, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 558 having
28. received the required constitutional majority is declared
29. passed. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, the top
30. of page 16, Senate Bill 559. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

31. SECRETARY:

32. Senate Bill 559.

33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

34. 3rd reading of the bill.

1. PRESIDENT:

2. Senator Egan.

3. SENATOR EGAN:

4. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate
5. Bill 559...reduces from four months to two months the waiting
6. period for refunds of contributions. It's simply an adminis-
7. trative measure that has no opposition and I ask for your
8. favorable vote.

9. PRESIDENT:

10. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
11. Bill 559 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
12. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
13. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
14. record. On that question, the Ayes are 49, the Nays are 1,
15. none Voting Present. Senate Bill 559 having received the
16. required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the
17. Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 560. Read the
18. bill, Mr. Secretary.

19. SECRETARY:

20. Senate Bill 560.

21. (Secretary reads title of bill)

22. 3rd reading of the bill.

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Senator Egan.

25. SENATOR EGAN:

26. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.
27. Senate Bill 560 allows the...remarriage of surviving spouse
28. after age fifty-five, a provision that we are including in
29. all of the systems. There is no opposition, it is...unanimous
30. ...among...of the...the systems and I...I ask for your favor-
31. able consideration.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate

5-21-81
5-21-81
5-21-81

1. Bill 560 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
2. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
3. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
4. record. On that question, the Ayes are 47, the Nays are none,
5. none Voting Present. Senate Bill 560 having received the
6. required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the
7. Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 564. Read the
8. bill, Mr. Secretary.

9. SECRETARY:

10. Senate Bill 564.

11. (Secretary reads title of bill)

12. 3rd reading of the bill.

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Senator Vadalabene.

15. SENATOR VADALABENE:

16. Yes, Senate Bill 564 enables the Illinois Racing Board to
17. permit duly licensed racing associations in Illinois to accept
18. wagers within their enclosure, this is not an off-track betting
19. bill, of their race track on races of national or international
20. significance run in other states and countries and I would
21. appreciate a favorable vote.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
24. Bill 564 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
25. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
26. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
27. voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes
28. are 29, the Nays are 19, 2 Voting Present. The sponsor re-
29. quests further consideration be postponed. So ordered. 565,
30. Senator Hall. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate
31. Bill 565. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

32. SECRETARY:

33. Senate Bill 565.

1. (Secretary reads title of bill)

2. 3rd reading of the bill.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Hall.

5. SENATOR HALL:

6. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
7. Senate. 565 permits a park district to levy an annual tax
8. for the purpose of establishing a working cash fund for any
9. four years. This bill does not affect the working cash fund
10. of the Chicago Park District which is governed by another
11. Statute. The fund is supported through the sale of bonds.
12. According to the Illinois Association of Park Districts,
13. a majority of the three hundred and forty-four...forty-five
14. park districts in the State are now levying the tax. I'd
15. ask your most favorable support of the bill.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Is there any discussion? Senator Maitland.

18. SENATOR MAITLAND:

19. A question of the sponsor.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Indicates he will yield, Senator Maitland.

22. SENATOR MAITLAND:

23. Is this without referendum, Senator Hall?

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Senator Hall.

26. SENATOR HALL:

27. Backdoor referendum, Senator Maitland.

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Maitland.

30. SENATOR MAITLAND:

31. That means it's not a frontdoor referendum.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator Hall.

1. SENATOR HALL:

2. When you say backdoor, you don't mean frontdoor.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Maitland.

5. SENATOR MAITLAND:

6. I would...I would just urge all of the Senators...in this
7. Body who are...are strongly in...supportive of local control
8. and of the...the right of the people to make a decision that
9. they oppose this bill.

10. PRESIDENT:

11. Further discussion? Senator Bowers.

12. SENATOR BOWERS:

13. Well, I think I'd like to disagree with the Gentleman
14. that sits in front of me. I think, and you correct me
15. Senator Hall, that this is the same provision that every
16. other taxing body has with...or most other taxing bodies
17. have with respect to...working cash funds. Isn't that
18. correct?

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Hall.

21. SENATOR HALL:

22. You're correct, Senator Bowers, and I'll yield to my
23. co-sponsor there, Senator Rupp.

24. SENATOR BOWERS:

25. Well, I...I think, Mr. President, I would like to point
26. out to the Body that municipalities have this power, counties
27. have this power and, as far as I know, almost all local govern-
28. ments have the power and I, frankly, don't know why park
29. districts haven't had it a long time ago. There is the
30. provision in there that says if they abandon it, they have...
31. they can't reinstate it for ten years. That's been the prin-
32. cipal objection of some of us who...who have worried about
33. them putting on a working cash fund levy and then getting

1. the money, putting it into the general fund, abandoning it
2. and then reestablishing it. This is the protection that's
3. already built into this and I would urge a favorable roll
4. call.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Any further discussion? Senator Hall, you...wish to
7. close?

8. SENATOR HALL:

9. Just roll call.

10. PRESIDENT:

11. The question is, shall Senate Bill 565 pass. Those in
12. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
13. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
14. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are
15. 35, the Nays are 17, 1 Voting Present. Senate Bill 565 having
16. received the required constitutional majority is declared
17. passed. 568, Senator Nega. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd
18. reading, the middle of page 16, Senate Bill 568. Read the
19. bill, Mr. Secretary.

20. SECRETARY:

21. Senate Bill 568.

22. (Secretary reads title of bill)

23. 3rd reading of the bill.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Senator Nega.

26. SENATOR NEGA:

27. Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill
28. eliminates the fees which are currently charged for taking
29. the Civil Service Test. It will permit the sanitary district
30. to charge if they so wish. Last year in 1980 fourteen hundred
31. forty-three people took an examination and the cost brought
32. ...the money brought in was forty-three hundred and twenty-
33. nine dollars. This didn't even pay the bookkeeping expenses.

1. The Office of Equal...Equal...Employment Opportunities has
2. always criticized...the reason for charging a fee to take
3. any examination. The National Civil Service League supports
4. this legislation. I ask for your favorable support.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
7. Bill 568 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
8. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
9. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
10. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the
11. Nays are 1, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 568 having re-
12. ceived the required constitutional majority is declared
13. passed. 569, Senator Nega. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd
14. reading, Senate Bill 569. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

15. SECRETARY:

16. Senate Bill 569.

17. (Secretary reads title of bill)

18. 3rd reading of the bill.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Nega.

21. SENATOR NEGA:

22. Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill does
23. two things. Number one, it removes the requirement that the
24. general superintendent must be a resident of the sanitary
25. district and number two, it provides the sanitary district
26. shall have the power to set residence requirements for all
27. employees and officers hired after October the 1st, 1981. I
28. ask for your favorable support.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Any discussion? Senator Walsh.

31. SENATOR WALSH:

32. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Indicates he will yield, Senator Walsh.

2. SENATOR WALSH:

3. Senator, ...I'm sorry, ...I...I...missed part of your
4. explanation, but is this the bill that...relates to the...
5. increase in the...in the working cash fund of the sanitary
6. district or is there an amendment? There's not.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Senator Nega.

9. SENATOR WALSH:

10. I wonder if you could just briefly run through it
11. again?

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Senator Nega.

14. SENATOR NEGA:

15. Actually what this bill does is, permits the general
16. superintendent to live outside the sanitary district.
17. Evidently, he had...he had...the ability to buy a home
18. in Barrington, which was out of the district, and he couldn't
19. do so because of the present residency requirements. Number
20. two, it would also give the sanitary board the power to set
21. residence requirements after...for the people who are hired
22. after the 1st of October of this year. That's all it does.

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Senator Walsh.

25. SENATOR WALSH:

26. The...now, relative to the residency requirement,...
27. what is the existing law?

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Nega.

30. SENATOR NEGA:

31. I believe, they must leave...live in the district.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator Walsh.

1. SENATOR WALSH:

2. And...is that by...by some rule of the sanitary district
3. or is there State...a State law that requires that?

4. SENATOR NEGA:

5. It's a State law, that's why we're changing it. Or hope
6. to change it.

7. SENATOR WALSH:

8. Alright. The...the State...the State law now provides
9. that they must live within the sanitary district and this
10. would provide that all employees could live other than with-
11. in the sanitary district...

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Senator Nega.

14. SENATOR WALSH:

15. ...with the exception of the general superintendent. Is
16. that right?

17. SENATOR NEGA:

18. I'll defer my...my answer to Senator Nash, who probably
19. knows it better than I do.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Senator...Senator Nash.

22. SENATOR NASH:

23. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate,
24. presently employees of the sanitary district can live any-
25. where they want. There's no restrictions. The only re-
26. striction is in the general superintendent, he must reside
27. within the limits of the sanitary district. And this law
28. just clarifies that. This Statute just clarifies that.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Senator Walsh.

31. SENATOR WALSH:

32. Alright. Well, then...then once again so I understand...
33. Senator Nega and Senator Nash. The...the present...the

1. present state of the law is there are no residency requirements
2. for anybody, is that right, with the exception of the general
3. superintendent. And the only substantive effect of this new
4. bill would be that there would be no residency requirements
5. for anybody, including the general superintendent. And the
6. rest of the bill is technical in nature, is that correct?

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Senator Nega. Further discussion? Senator Bowers.

9. SENATOR BOWERS:

10. Thank you, Mr. President. I...I just want to clarify
11. Senator Walsh. As I read this bill and, Senator Nega, you
12. correct me if I'm wrong, all you've done is stricken the
13. word residency with respect to the power of...the powers
14. of the director. It would appear to me that as the Statutes
15. ...exist today, the director may establish rules and regu-
16. lations as to residency. Now, if you adopt this bill, he
17. no longer has that power, isn't that what we're doing here?

18. PRESIDENT:

19. Senator Nega.

20. SENATOR NEGA:

21. You are correct, Senator Bowers. I wasn't aware of
22. that.

23. PRESIDENT:

24. Senator Bowers.

25. SENATOR BOWERS:

26. Well, is there...is the present director doing something
27. the board doesn't like? I...I'm...I guess we're just a little
28. nervous about the genesis of this. It...as I say, it appears
29. the director now has the power, I assume the board hires and
30. fires the director, they don't want him to have that power
31. and...and they don't want it either, is that what we're saying?

32. SENATOR NEGA:

33. I don't believe this is not...this is contained in the

1. bill. There's no reference to that in the bill.
2. PRESIDENT:
3. Senator Bowers.
4. SENATOR BOWERS:
5. I'm sorry, no reference to what?
6. PRESIDENT:
7. Senator Nega.
8. SENATOR NEGA:
9. To the power of the superintendent to hire or fire.
10. SENATOR BOWERS:
11. Well, I...I don't know. On page 5 of the original bill
12. that I have in my hand, the...the law reads, all applicants and
13. so forth and so on...which shall be public and...competitive...elimination
14. specified in the rules of the director as to residency, age,
15. so forth and so on. And it says rules of the director, as to
16. residency, age and so forth and it strikes the word residency.
17. And I, you know, I...I may very well be confused, I guess
18. I'm just asking.
19. PRESIDENT:
20. Senator Nash.
21. SENATOR NASH:
22. Senator Bowers, as I previously stated, presently, the
23. employees of the sanitary district have no residency require-
24. ments with an exception of the general superintendent, he must
25. reside...within the district as must the trustees or the
26. commissioners, they are called now, who run within the
27. district. And all this bill does is clear that up to let
28. the board set the residency requirements.
29. PRESIDENT:
30. Further discussion? Senator Nimrod.
31. SENATOR NIMROD:
32. Yeah. One question of the sponsor.
33. PRESIDENT:

1. Indicates he will yield, Senator Nimrod.

2. SENATOR NIMROD:

3. Does this not then give the board of commissioners the
4. right then to set...residency requirements for all of the...
5. employees of the sanitary district?

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Senator Nega.

8. SENATOR NEGA:

9. Yes, Sir, it does that.

10. PRESIDENT:

11. Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

12. SENATOR NETSCH:

13. Now, I...thank you...I was just reading an earlier part
14. of the law, which does say, specifically, the board shall
15. have the power to set domicile requirements for all employees
16. and officers hired after October 1, 1981. That was added,...
17. that's on page 2 of the bill. So, as I understand it, they're
18. taking that power away from the director but they're giving
19. it to the board, which is probably where it ought to be.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Any further discussion? Senator Nega may close.

22. SENATOR NEGA:

23. Move for a favorable roll call.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. The question is, shall Senate Bill 569 pass. Those in
26. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
27. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
28. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
29. question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting
30. Present. Senate Bill 569 having received the required con-
31. stitutional majority is declared passed. 570, Senator David-
32. son. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill
33. 570. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

1. SECRETARY:

2. Senate Bill 570.

3. (Secretary reads title of bill)

4. 3rd reading of the bill.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Senator Davidson.

7. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

8. Mr. President and members of the Senate, this does
9. exactly what the Calendar says, this is the other part of
10. the bail bond that's no longer necessary, as most of you know,
11. with the change in the court where...decision and the Judicial
12. conference recommendation in March of '78 was recommended...
13. this section of the Act be repealed. Those people who post
14. bond now are posting fifty thousand dollars with the Depart-
15. ment of Insurance, certificate, another fifty thousand of
16. Cook County, then over and above that they got a...a...
17. post another fifteen thousand certificate...deposit to meet
18. this section. The Department of Insurance and the
19. Judicial officer...Judge Gulley, who is Administrator,
20. Office of Judicial, support this. I'd appreciate a favorable
21. roll call.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
24. Bill 570 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
25. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
26. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
27. the Ayes are 48, the Nays are 3, none Voting Present. Senate
28. Bill 570 having received the required constitutional majority
29. is declared passed. 571. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd
30. reading, Senate Bill 571. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

31. SECRETARY:

32. Senate Bill 571.

33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

34. 3rd reading of the bill.

AB 572
3rd Reading

1. PRESIDENT:

2. Senator Nega.

3. SENATOR NEGA:

4. Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill was
5. requested by the State Treasurer to make it a uniform
6. percentage of six percent for people to collect on payments
7. that are held under protest. I ask for a favorable roll call.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
10. Bill 571 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
11. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
12. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
13. record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none,
14. none Voting Present. Senate Bill 571 having received the
15. required constitutional majority is declared passed. 572,
16. Senator Simms. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading,
17. Senate Bill 572. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

18. SECRETARY:

19. Senate Bill 572.

20. (Secretary reads title of bill)

21. 3rd reading of the bill.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Senator Simms.

24. SENATOR SIMMS:

25. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
26. Senate. Senate Bill 572 amends the General Interest Act to
27. provide that a revolving credit arrangement may include pro-
28. visions granting the lender a security interest in real or
29. personal property to secure the amount of credit extended.
30. Under the amendment that was placed on the bill, a line of
31. credit...may be required if an individual asks for more than
32. fifteen hundred, may include a requirement for personal property
33. as secured interest. An individual requesting...a revolving

1. line of credit in excess of three thousand dollars, the lender
2. may require that a security interest in real property be
3. placed to secure the amount of...credit extended by the...
4. lender. And...I would...urge favorable passage for this
5. legislation.

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Any discussion? Senator Demuzio.

8. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

9. Yes,...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentle-
10. men of the Senate. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question
11. if I may.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. The sponsor indicates he will yield, Senator Demuzio.

14. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

15. Senator Simms,...what we are, in fact, doing now is
16. saying that a creditor would have to put up,...what is it,
17. three thousand dollars the maximum collateral on the so-
18. called five thousand dollar stretch...checks? Is that
19. correct?

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Senator Simms.

22. SENATOR SIMMS:

23. What we are indicating, if an individual...requests credit
24. in the amount of fifteen hundred dollars or...above, the lender
25. may require personal property as security. If the...if the
26. individual wishing to have...credit in excess of three thousand,
27. the lender may require a...real property be placed up as
28. security. And all of the credit extended would be under the
29. Truth in Lending...Regulation Z, which they would be covered
30. under.

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Senator Demuzio.

33. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

1. So, in other words, any person who has a bank issued
2. credit cards...that are over or exceed the three thousand
3. dollar level is going to have to put up collateral. Is that
4. correct?

5. SENATOR SIMMS:

6. Well, if they...no, not necessarily. It's up to...it's
7. up to the lending institution. If they have to put up
8. collateral, they'll have to go back and...have a new state-
9. ment prepared by the lending institution, will have to go
10. back to the lending institution, whether it be a new agree-
11. ment that would have to be instituted between those that
12. were extending the credit and the individual borrowing that
13. amount of money.

14. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

15. Well, then one final question, if I may. Is this going
16. to encourage additional borrowing then by the...by the
17. individual?

18. PRESIDENT:

19. Senator Simms.

20. SENATOR SIMMS:

21. Well, I think that's up to the individual's own personal
22. needs. When the...original legislation was passed, many
23. years ago amounts of...on revolving credit were fairly small
24. amounts of money and things that were bought were in relatively
25. small...monetary amounts. But as inflation and these other
26. things have...increased,...demands of money have also in-
27. creased. So, it's up to the prospective borrower whether or
28. not he wants to enter into this type of agreement. That's
29. purely optional on his part and also on the lending insti-
30. tution if he meets their credit qualifications.

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

33. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

1. Well, just one final comment. I rise in opposition to
2. this bill. I think the creditor is going to be very much
3. surprised if this bill is signed into law, that he's going
4. to have to be putting up collateral.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Further discussion? Senator Ozinga.

7. SENATOR OZINGA:

8. A question of the sponsor.

9. PRESIDENT:

10. Indicates he will yield, Senator Ozinga.

11. SENATOR OZINGA:

12. I...I believe that under the terms of this bill, over
13. three thousand dollars they could pledge...real estate as
14. collateral. Is that right?

15. PRESIDENT:

16. Senator Simms.

17. SENATOR SIMMS:

18. That's correct, Senator.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Ozinga.

21. SENATOR OZINGA:

22. Also, this pledge of collateral of real estate would not
23. have to be recorded?

24. SENATOR SIMMS:

25. Yes, it would. It would have to be recorded the same
26. as any other mortgage.

27. PRESIDENT:

28. Senator Ozinga.

29. SENATOR OZINGA:

30. Okay. If that's the case, what would happen if the lien
31. was...if the pledge was made of the collateral and the...
32. property or the lien was not recorded?

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Senator Simms.

2. SENATOR SIMMS:

3. Well, it would have to be recorded. The creditor would
4. examine the title to the property involved and would...would
5. have to obtain a signed mortgage instrument and would have
6. to have the mortgage recorded in the appropriate recorder's
7. office. In addition, the Truth in Lending and Regulation Z
8. require that the creditor, who obtains a security interest
9. in real estate, to grant the debtor a three day right of
10. rescission and to notify the debtor of his right.

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Senator Ozinga.

13. SENATOR OZINGA:

14. In other words, the balance due would be flexible day to
15. day. Is that right?

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Senator Simms.

18. SENATOR SIMMS:

19. No, the balance due would not be...yes, it would be
20. flexible from day to day.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Further...Senator Ozinga.

23. SENATOR OZINGA:

24. So that the amount of the pledge could be other than
25. what was stated on the mortgage?

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Simms.

28. SENATOR SIMMS:

29. The amount...that is...well, it's just like any other
30. mortgage before the...the...before the interest...would have
31. to be paid off before there would be a...a release of the
32. mortgage.

33. SENATOR OZINGA:

1. I believe this...I believe this leaves quite a question
2. mark though, as far as the actual person that signs the so-
3. called mortgage. Now, this...with reference to revolving
4. credit on a credit card. Is that right?

5. SENATOR SIMMS:

6. Well, stretch checks, credit cards, but all of these
7. would have to be individuals requiring this amount of credit
8. and want to participate and ask for this amount of money
9. would have to go back into the lending institution and
10. negotiate the loan and their credit would be considered
11. the same as anybody else's.

12. SENATOR OZINGA:

13. Do you feel that the borrower would be well enough
14. informed when he pledges this as collateral, that it
15. would be a lasting collateral even though he doesn't
16. realize that when it is...when he is in default that he
17. could have his property foreclosed on?

18. PRESIDENT:

19. Senator Simms.

20. SENATOR SIMMS:

21. Well, under the Truth in Lending Regulation Z of...of
22. the government it's the same as anything else, Senator. I
23. think a person that borrows money, if you borrow money on a
24. home...or anything else, a person entering into...a credit
25. arrangement...is made aware of the financial liabilities
26. and obligations to repay that loan and...I would think that
27. ...any individual that is applying for that amount of credit
28. on a revolving basis, and I think there would be very, very
29. few, would certainly be aware of...of the implications of
30. the law.

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Further discussion? Senator Buzbee.

33. SENATOR BUZBEE:

1. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Indicates he will yield, Senator Buzbee.

4. SENATOR BUZBEE:

5. Now,...am I to understand...that your bill would say
6. that any credit card or any revolving charge account that I
7. would have...where the amount that I might borrow would ex-
8. ceed fifteen hundred dollars up to a maximum of three thousand
9. that now that institution, whether it be...American Express
10. or Bank Americard or...Standard Oil or whatever or...or if
11. I've got a Sears revolving charge card, that now they would say to
12. me, alright, I want you to put up collateral...to the tune
13. of either personal property or...another mortgage on your
14. real estate. Is...that correct?

15. SENATOR SIMMS:

16. No. What I'm...what this bill is saying is this, the
17. present charge card agreements, that are now in effect, would
18. have no application. If an individual wanted...wanted by
19. their own application to have more credit than fifteen hundred
20. dollars, between the fifteen hundred dollars and the three
21. thousand dollar amount, the lender may not...it's not a
22. mandatory thing, may ask for personal property as collateral.
23. If it exceeds three thousand, the lender may ask an interest
24. in real property. And if that is the case, they would have
25. to go back in and have a new agreement signed...a new application,
26. they'd have to be aware of the...the Truth in Lending...
27. Truth in Lending Regulation Z, fully informed. So, it does
28. not affect existing credit cards, unless they want to go
29. above that certain...limit. And again, it's up to...the
30. lender.

31. SENATOR BUZBEE:

32. Well, the fact of the matter is, though, if I have those
33. credit cards that I already identified, that the company

1. could inform me that in the future any other...any other
2. charges I make past the...any charges I make past those that
3. are already currently charged, that they are now starting a
4. new contractual arrangement and if I don't sign that new
5. contractual arrangement, which is a lien on my property,...
6. then, therefore, my...they could revoke my credit card.
7. And...and...am I correct in that?

8. SENATOR SIMMS:

9. No. I...I think there's a misunderstanding that...
10. with this legislation. This...the amendment that was placed
11. on in committee was to basically protect people that they
12. would not become involved in a credit arrangement that they were
13. not aware of. To my knowledge, most credit cards, that are
14. issued today, there's a maximum limit of credit on that
15. credit card already. And most of those are under fifteen
16. hundred dollars. If a person applied to...

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

18. Excuse me, Senator, if we could just have a little order.
19. Senator Simms.

20. SENATOR SIMMS:

21. ...if the...if the individual applied to the lender for
22. more credit or extended credit, that lender may require, it
23. doesn't say they shall, it may, and the lender always looks
24. at the credit...background of the individual that's applying
25. for a loan like anything else. The amendment was placed on
26. at the suggestion of members of the...Banking and Financial
27. Institutions Committee to protect the individual that
28. might go in and not be aware that...these extra things were
29. asked for. But I think there are very few credit cards that
30. are issued in excess of that amount of money as a...as a
31. line of credit.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

33. Senator Buzbee.

1. SENATOR BUZBEE:

2. Well,...of course there are a lot of companies that
3. allow, now, a person to...not necessarily on a credit card,
4. but such things as...as revolving charge accounts and so
5. forth, that do allow in excess of fifteen hundred dollars
6. credit. And...and I submit to you that...that a better
7. alternative would be that the company...or those who are
8. issuing the credit...extending the credit simply would deny
9. the credit, but to say now that it will be the law of the
10. State of Illinois that we're going to allow...another lien
11. ...or to allow a lien or another mortgage to be part of the
12. contractual arrangement...for these kinds of accounts just
13. seems to be not...to be not good public policy.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

15. Further discussion? Senator...I...I've got several.
16. Senator Bloom and Senator Collins. Senator Collins.

17. SENATOR COLLINS:

18. Continuing on the line of...with Senator Buzbee, I...
19. really think that this is probably one of...

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. Senator Simms.

22. SENATOR COLLINS:

23. I can't hear.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

25. Alright. Let's have a little order please. Will the
26. members please take their conferences off the Floor? Will
27. we clear the aisles? May we have some order please? Senator
28. Collins.

29. SENATOR COLLINS:

30. Senator Simms, I...I think this is probably one of the
31. most unnecessary pieces of legislation that has come through
32. this Chambers, at least the last four and a half years that
33. I've been here. I see no point to it because I think the...

1. the lenders...understands and know very well how to protect
2. their loans and they're not going to make loans...over ex-
3. tended to the ability of that...customer to pay back that
4. loan. They also have the discretion to ask for collateral
5. on any kind of loans at this point in time. I don't even
6. understand the...the origin or the objective behind this
7. kind of legislation. It is true that many people have
8. revolving charges and credit cards like American Express
9. goal, which goes up to two thousand dollars or..or even
10. over two thousand dollars, because someone as poor as
11. I am have that kind of extended credit. So, what you're
12. saying right now, that if...if I took a trip someplace,
13. mine would probably go up to twenty-five hundred dollars,
14. but they can come in and ask me to renegotiate a contract
15. or put up some other kind of collateral and I think this
16. is all insane. I think the banks can take care of them-
17. selves. We do not have to legislate any other rules and
18. regulations in terms of collateral.

19. SENATOR SIMMS:

20. Well, Senator Collins, I think you've misread the legis-
21. lation. Now, again,...credit cards have been issued and...
22. and if you would be taking a trip, again, I don't know what
23. your credit background is, but I would assume that you'd have
24. no problem having credit. This is for people that are
25. asking for extended amounts of credit beyond what the companies
26. have already issued. It doesn't affect the existing bank
27. credit cards, unless they wanted their amounts...elevated.
28. When you make a charge purchase, before that charge purchase
29. is allowed today, a...store owner or anyone else calls the
30. place to see what your line of credit is, whether or not that
31. they can extend that credit to you. If...an individual has
32. not reached that line of credit, then that...that is already
33. ...automatically issued. However, if an individual today and

1. there are more economic and financial demands today than
2. probably we've had anytime in...in the economy of our
3. country. People do want stretch checks to allow them flexi-
4. bility of credit of...of three to five to six thousand
5. dollars that they can have that type of float when necessary.
6. And it's for these people that want that type of credit
7. arrangement. No one says an individual has to ask for that,
8. but it's available to those that want it and can financially
9. afford it. At the same time it does protect the lender.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

11. Alright. Further discussion? I have...Senator DeAngelis,
12. Bloom and Rock. Senator DeAngelis.

13. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

14. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. There are a
15. couple of things that I would like to clear up. This is
16. an American Express Gold Card that Senator Collins is re-
17. ferring to and she is correct. It is good for two thousand
18. dollars, however, this card happens to be good for more
19. than that, because I have, in fact, on deposit, in a secured
20. position at that bank that amount that allows me over two
21. thousand dollars. For that...for that fact, Senator Collins,
22. it does not encourage people to spend more, because what
23. you're doing, you're saying you can only spend as much as
24. you're able to pay. And, therefore, it is not encouraging
25. people to spend more. In fact, it is saying to them,
26. you are not going to be allowed to spend anything more than
27. you're capable of paying for.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. Senator Bloom.

30. SENATOR BLOOM:

31. Mr. President,...I rise in support of this bill. I think
32. that some of the fears that have been expressed in this...
33. debate are...tenuous at best and...another reason to support

1. this legislation is that it's a marvelous...way to avoid
2. the disastrous...consequences of the Marriage and Dissolution
3. Act. I'd urge an affirmative vote.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

5. Further discussion? Senator Rock.

6. SENATOR ROCK:

7. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
8. Senate. I suggest we ought to have a roll call. This bill
9. ought to go down to ignominious defeat. I'm surprised it
10. got out of the Finance Committee in the first place and I
11. urge a No vote.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

13. Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Simms.

14. SENATOR SIMMS:

15. Well, Mr....President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
16. Senate, we've had a...long and lengthy discussion on it.
17. I think everyone knows the issue that if an individual does
18. want the credit it is available and...because of the...
19. demands upon the financial institutions and our economy
20. today, that it's necessary that people want this credit,
21. that this type of legislation would have to be passed. I
22. would urge a favorable roll call.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

24. The question is, shall Senate Bill 572 pass. Those
25. in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting
26. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
27. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
28. question, the Ayes are 26, the Nays are 27, none Voting
29. Present. The sponsor asks that further consideration of
30. Senate Bill 572 be postponed. It will be placed on the
31. Order of Postponed Consideration. 574, Senator Degnan.
32. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

33. SECRETARY:

1. Senate Bill 574.

2. (Secretary reads title of bill)

3. 3rd reading of the bill.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

5. Senator Degnan.

6. SENATOR DEGNAN:

7. Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is suggested
8. legislation by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules.
9. After yesterday's amendment...deleting that reference to
10. the Weather Modification Examining Board, it's in a form
11. that's agreeable to the Department of Registration and
12. Education. The legislation clarifies the department's
13. authority to adopt department-wide rules. It...the
14. approval of examining...various examining committees
15. will still be required before the department can adopt
16. rules relating to specific professions. But with respect
17. to rules that govern the general operation of the department,
18. they will not be necessary. I ask for a favorable...roll
19. call.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. Further discussion? Further discussion? The question
22. is, shall Senate Bill 574 pass. Those in favor vote Aye.
23. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Senator, I
24. think you're going to have some trouble on your first bill.
25. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
26. voted who really wish? Take the record. On that question,
27. the Ayes are 54, the Nays are 1. Senate Bill 574 having
28. received the required constitutional majority is declared
29. passed. 577, Senator. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.
30. 577.

31. SECRETARY:

32. Senate Bill 577.

33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

34. 3rd reading of the bill.

SB 578
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Senator Degnan.

3. SENATOR DEGNAN:

4. This, again, is suggested legislation by the Joint
5. Committee on Administrative Rules, agreed upon by the
6. Department of Registration and Education. There are two
7. committees currently...under the Beauty Culture Act, the
8. Beauty Culture Committee and Beauty Culture Advisory Com-
9. mittee, which have duplicative functions. This Act...
10. eliminates one, namely the...Beauty Culture Advisory Com-
11. mittee. I ask for a positive roll call.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

13. Is there discussion? The question is, shall Senate
14. Bill 577 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed
15. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
16. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question,
17. the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present.
18. Senate Bill 577 having received the required constitutional
19. majority is declared passed. 578, Senator. Read the bill,
20. Mr. Secretary, please.

21. SECRETARY:

22. Senate Bill 578.

23. (Secretary reads title of bill)

24. 3rd reading of the bill.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

26. Senator Keats.

27. SENATOR KEATS:

28. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
29. Senate. This is the multi-bank holding company bill. I
30. would go into a long oration telling you its merits, but
31. I think everyone knows their position, either pro or con on
32. the legislation. I think it's a much needed piece of legis-
33. lation and I'm hopeful you'll all support it and I think

1. that's all I need to say because we all know what the bill
2. is. I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

4. Is there discussion? Senator Buzbee.

5. SENATOR BUZBEE:

6. Is a motion to adjourn in order?

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

8. It's always in order, but we would hope you wouldn't
9. make it.

10. SENATOR BUZBEE:

11. Alright. I won't make it then.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

13. Is there discussion? Senator Ozinga.

14. SENATOR OZINGA:

15. Well, Mr. President, I rise not to ask a question or
16. anything else, but I have received a document here today
17. that calls to the attention the conflict of interest
18. situation and even though this bill might benefit me,
19. and I do have stock in more than one bank, I'm going to
20. have to reluctantly vote Present on this bill. However,
21. in doing so, my question to the Chair would be, that now
22. that this bill has been changed drastically, what kind of
23. a vote will this take?

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

25. Well,....

26. SENATOR OZINGA:

27. Refers strictly to the Banking Act now.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. Yes, Senator, if you'll give me about...five minutes
30. during debate, I will give you an answer, but I don't think
31. it's going...to be to your satisfaction. But...I don't
32. want to tip my hand yet. Further discussion? Senator
33. Walsh.

1. SENATOR WALSH:

2. Mr. President and members of the Senate,...for the
3. benefit of anyone who might care, I happen to own stock in
4. two banks, I just wish it were worth as much as the stock
5. in Frank's banks, but...it's something that's been reported
6. on our statements of economic interest over the years and
7. ...for what it's worth, that's the case.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. Further discussion? Senator Bowers.

10. SENATOR BOWERS:

11. Well, since that issue was raised by letter, I want to
12. be added to that list and I know there are a lot of them
13. 'cause we've been through this before and we've all announced
14. it for...for a number of years, but maybe we could quickly
15. take the roll of those of us who have bank stock or are
16. directors and have a conflict. I happen to be one of them
17. and I'd like to be recorded.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

19. Senator Weaver.

20. SENATOR WEAVER:

21. Well, I fall into the same category and I could make
22. a suggestion for those who do own bank stock and that, as
23. I plan to do, just vote Present.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

25. Further discussion? Senator Rupp.

26. SENATOR RUPP:

27. Well, I...I, too, must admit I don't own any, but my
28. wife does, but I have a two dollar Christmas Club in my
29. own name.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

31. Senator Geo-Karis.

32. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

33. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate,

1. I'm going to vote on this bill, but I do have a very, very
2. small amount of bank stock. I don't attend the board
3. meetings, I don't vote and I don't do anything, in fact,
4. they run me, I don't run them.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

6. Senator Rhoads.

7. SENATOR RHOADS:

8. Mr. President, I do not have stock in the Southwest Sub-
9. urban Bank, but my brother is Chairman of the Board and
10. ...so I have, in that sense, a conflict, however I do
11. intend to vote in favor of the bill, having never done
12. so before. There was always a division of opinion in
13. my district, it now appears that all the major banks
14. in my district are in favor of the legislation. In this
15. case, I feel that I do have to represent my district, so
16. I'll be voting Aye.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

18. Senator Mahar.

19. SENATOR MAHAR:

20. Thank you, Mr. President. I have some bank stock and
21. I intend to vote Yes.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

23. Senator Grotberg.

24. SENATOR GROTBURG:

25. Thank you, Mr. President. I owe four banks, two of
26. them are for it and two of them are against it.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

28. You'll hear from two of them, Senator.

29. SENATOR GROTBURG:

30. I'm not quite through, I do have a parliamentary inquiry,
31. Sir.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

33. State your inquiry.

1. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

2. My inquiry is, that annually as these bills come
3. drifting through here, and there's no criticism of my
4. associates who are going to vote Present, but as I
5. understand once you declare your conflict you can go
6. ahead and vote your conscience and we always fall off of
7. this thing one way or another by about...equivalent of the
8. yellow votes. And if that's every man's and lady's...right
9. to vote how they want to. But am I correct in...parliamentary
10. wise? Once declaring, you're free to...roll and shake
11. and deal.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

13. If you...that is not the Statutory language. I'll
14. read it to you in just a second.

15. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

16. Please do. I...not to me, 'cause I'm going to vote,
17. even though I owe four banks.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

19. Fine. I won't give you a ruling, I'll read the Statute
20. to you. Senator DeAngelis.

21. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

22. I, too, own bank stock and...it's been filed properly
23. on my statement of economic interest. I intend to vote Yes
24. on this bill.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

26. Senator Keats.

27. SENATOR KEATS:

28. It's been on my statement of economic interest for years.
29. I stand up in sight of a conflict occasionally. I own a
30. couple of shares of bank stock.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

32. Senator Davidson.

33. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

1. Mr. President, I own a few shares, not enough to even
2. get it on the...my economic statement, but I'm going to
3. vote Yes.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

5. Senator McLendon.

6. SENATOR MCLENDON:

7. Yeah, Mr...Mr. President, I might own a share or two of
8. bank stock too, but I intend to vote my conscience on this
9. matter.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

11. Senator Vadalabene.

12. SENATOR VADALABENE;

13. Yes, I also have bank stock that doesn't get on the
14. economic statement and if this keeps up, I'm ready to sell.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. Senator Egan.

17. SENATOR EGAN:

18. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I...I used to own some
19. bank stock that I had to sell, because I have to pay tuition
20. for my kids. I don't have any left. I sure wish I did. I'm
21. sorry, at this point, that I couldn't keep it, because I
22. think it's going to get a little better in price. But aside
23. from that, I've got a couple of friends that are bankers and
24. they've prevailed on me to vote Aye.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

26. Senator Sangmeister.

27. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

28. Yeah, I've got a few shares, too. I'm glad to see a few
29. Democrats got some bank stock as well, so add me to the list.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

31. Senator Buzbee.

32. SENATOR BUZBEE:

33. Mr. President, I have a very serious inquiry. I...I

1. do not own any bank stock, but on the conflict of interest,
2. we voted on a bill last week, an appropriation bill, for
3. the Department of Revenue for the...return of Income Tax money
4. to those citizens of Illinois who had overpaid. Now, I did
5. not declare a conflict of interest on that, but, as a matter
6. of fact, the State of Illinois owes me about a hundred dollars.
7. And I'm wondering if I have a conflict of interest...in that
8. area, I'm wondering since I drive on the highways of the
9. State of Illinois if I should be allowed to vote on trans-
10. portation bills, I'm wondering since my father is a retired
11. school teacher if I should be allowed to vote on bills that
12. affect the downstate teachers pension system, I'm wondering
13. since my wife...teaches in a public school and my children
14. attend public schools if I should be allowed to vote on
15. any appropriations...that would go to the public schools?
16. Thank you.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

18. I believe the answer is no, Senator, basically. Further
19. ...Senator Shapiro. Senator Geo-Karis.

20. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

21. Just wanted to report, where I do have my bank stock,
22. my bank is indifferent, no matter which way I vote on it,
23. so I will vote my conscience.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

25. Senator Demuzio.

26. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

27. Well, I guess...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and
28. Gentlemen of the Senate. I guess I'm the first person to
29. ...rise that does not have any financial interest one way
30. or the other, because neither I nor members of my family
31. own any...bank stock as I had indicated yesterday when this
32. ...bill was heard. I suspect anything that could be said...at
33. least at this particular...stage is...fruitless, because I

1. think everyone in here knows...about...how they're going to
2. vote on this specific issue. I would just simply...like to
3. say in opposition to...Senate Bill 578 that...I think that
4. we here in the Legislature and I think this has simply been
5. borne out by those who have risen and...faithfully...discharged
6. ...their responsibilities by declaring their...financial
7. interest in institutions, that we are perhaps the worst
8. people in the world to decide this issue for the financial
9. industry in Illinois. The financial industry in this State
10. has been fighting among themselves for over fifty years
11. and I'm reminded of an article that appeared in...in the
12. Chicago Tribune, not the one of yesterday in this particular
13. instance, but...as I recall correctly, they related to the...
14. getting together of Menachem Begin and...Anwar Sadat and...
15. in this particular instance, we are all asked in here today
16. to...to choose sides to determine...whether or not we're
17. going to be with,...in generally speaking, with the larger
18. financial institutions in...in Illinois, which are in
19. support of this legislation or whether or not we're, in
20. fact,...going to vote the...sincere consciences of our...
21. of our legislative districts and those that we represent.
22. I think the only group that does, in fact, support this
23. legislation today is the banking...the large banking
24. institutions throughout the State of Illinois. I know
25. that the major farm groups in the State of Illinois do
26. not, because they don't think that they will be benefiting
27. by such legislation. I know that consumers have not come
28. forth and expressed...interest in this legislation in the
29. positive vein because...they too are not specifically
30. interested in this particular issue and, in fact, will be
31. harmed, at least in my judgment. Small businesses and
32. depressed urban areas and minorities and other small banks
33. will not benefit from this legislation and...I'll tell

1. you who will, in fact, benefit from the legislation today
2. and that will be, in fact, the stockholders. The stock-
3. holders or the various bank holding companies in the State
4. of Illinois that if...if this bill passes and they're
5. allowed and permitted to...purchase other banks, will,
6. in fact, have their stock...increased. There's no question
7. about that. But as I have said before, there are many
8. other reasons why we should not...vote for this bill today.
9. I think it is one that...the financial industries in the
10. State of Illinois ought to reconcile their differences
11. among themselves and they should not come to the Legislature
12. asking us to make the decision for them. I would like
13. to point out for those of you who have not read the bill,
14. and I suspect that's probably most,...that...it's difficult
15. ...it appears that this bill, frankly, has been pasted to-
16. gether as every new idea has been...been presented and
17. as...individuals have indicated that they have compromised
18. on this issue or compromised on that issue, the matter of
19. the fact is, is that the compromise has been going on only
20. with one certain banking group within the State of Illinois.
21. And if you look at this bill in its drafting, I think that...
22. you will see, that if in fact this bill is passed, that there
23. will be considerable...experimentation and...and there
24. will be considerable litigation in regards to this...to
25. this issue. And finally, I guess,...in referring also
26. to the...Chicago...editorial that I mentioned earlier,
27. excluding the one of...of yesterday, I'd like to...
28. reiterate the one that appeared today indicating that
29. Chicago, in fact, does have the largest banking institutions
30. in the State of Illinois and they are the ones who are going
31. to be benefiting most directly from this. I have three
32. financial statements...here of the three large institutions
33. in the...in the State of Illinois, which are all in...within

1. the boundaries of the City of Chicago and I'd like just to
2. ...point out that...First Chicago Corporation has...deposits
3. of eight billion dollars in...domestically, they have twelve
4. billion dollars of foreign...money; Northern Trust has
5. approximately three...billion dollars of domestic deposits
6. and about 1.2 billion in foreign and Continental, which has
7. about 13.5 billion dollars in domestic deposits and about 13.496
8. in foreign deposits. I think that we'll see an extensive
9. change within the banking and the financial community with-
10. in the State of Illinois if we, as legislators, inject our-
11. selves into this debate, when it ought to, in fact, be resolved
12. by the financial industry, the banking industry within the
13. State of Illinois and within itself. And I would urge that
14. we either vote Present or vote No at this time and to allow
15. them to reconcile their differences and see whether or not
16. that they can come to...to some agreement. Thank you.

17.
18. END OF REEL
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.

Page 159 - May 21, 1981

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Yes, and the Chair would like to disclose that I have stock
3. in banks and a savings and loan. Further discussion? Senator
4. Collins.

5. SENATOR COLLINS:

6. I just have..several questions of...of...of the sponsor,
7. and I'm...I'm sure, like Senator Demuzio, my comments will not
8. change any votes here. But I've had some real legitimate concerns
9. in reference to branch banking, and no matter what you call this,
10. this is just another form. And since I've been here, there have
11. been several different forms tried before. I'm concerned about
12. the small banks, and poor, depressed, decaying minority areas, and
13. the survival of those few banks that we have in those areas. And
14. so, I would just like to know, what impact would this legislation
15. have on the survival of those banks, if, in fact, it allowed a
16. large bank, like First National, to move into that area and com-
17. pete with those small banks for the...for the business there?
18. Will that, in fact, happen under this amendment, because I did
19. not see the last amendment?

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. Senator Keats.

22. SENATOR KEATS:

23. Thank you, Mr. President. The answer to your question is
24. several-fold, number one, you're really asking a question that
25. has little to do with banks, savings and loans, credit unions,
26. whatever. In decaying neighborhoods, the entire community is in
27. trouble, in terms of the situation with the banks in those areas,
28. you and I know in many of the poor areas there are no banks, there are
29. no savings and loans, we do have some currency exchanges. Because
30. there is not the internal capital to help the area, they do not
31. have the money there, themselves. By expanding the roles of the
32. existing banking structure, and in reality...remember, this isn't
33. branch banking, I mean this is...there are all kinds of protection

1. de novo, et cetera. By allowing a freer flow of capital, you
2. will find things you're seeing in areas such as South Loop, where
3. private money, and I mind you...remind you that it's not public
4. money, that's private money, is starting a rebirth of the South
5. Loop. The only hope for these decaying areas, is massive amounts
6. of private capital. Now, some of that capital will have to come
7. from existing banking structures and some of the other will hope-
8. fully have to come from businesses, et cetera, that will be moving
9. into the area. So, this, in reality will help decaying areas,
10. because it allows the capital to be put there.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

12. Senator Collins.

13. SENATOR COLLINS:

14. Yes, Senator Keats, as an owner of shares in...in a bank,
15. and living in a...in an affluent community "I will suggest to you
16. that you try our Jane Byrnes' example, and you move into one
17. portion of my district, and you decide that you're going to go
18. to one of the big banks downtown and you're going to get some help
19. to redevelop that area. Be it as an individual, or maybe you can
20. bring some more of your friends down there with you and form a
21. corporation, and see will...you get some money to revitalize those
22. areas.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

24. Further discussion? And I'm going to turn on the light so
25. that we remember our five minute time limit. I have Senators Bloom,
26. DeAngelis, Hall, Newhouse. Well, I think it was more rhetorical,
27. Senator. You'll get a chance, I think, more...you're going to have
28. a lot of questions. Senator Bloom.

29. SENATOR BLOOM:

30. Well, first, thank you, Mr. President. I didn't own bank
31. stock, and then my father died, and now my... my son owns beneficial
32. interest, he's richer than I'll ever hope to be. Both sides of
33. this issue are basically saying...Senator Bowers wants to know if my

1. boy is giving me allowance. I wish. Both sides are saying,
2. if you vote with the other side, they will make more money and
3. become richer, and more powerful. And if you vote with us, the
4. public interests will be served, and the...the consumer will get better
5. service and more money will be available for loans to help com-
6. munities grow. And in a very real sense both...both of those
7. statements are true. Each system would provide their consumers
8. a kind of a service, another does not. But you can't have
9. it both ways. And whichever way it goes, there are both good and
10. bad results. However, given the serious underbanking in areas of
11. the State, and given the volatile nature of the availability of
12. money, I suspect in my judgment that it falls down in support
13. on the side of supporting this legislation. I'd urge a favorable
14. roll call.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. Senator DeAngelis.

17. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

18. Thank you, Mr. President. I think there are a couple of myths
19. that ought to be cleared up in this particular issue. Somebody
20. suggested that it is the big banks that are really for this, but
21. let me tell you my experience in my district. I called a meeting
22. that ran across Senator Dawson's district, Senator Mahar's district,
23. and my own district. Twenty-three board chairmen and presidents
24. showed up, and of the twenty-three, nineteen voted in favor of
25. multi-bank holding companies, three...four voted against, one
26. changed his vote the following week when he understood the bill
27. better. But let me suggest to you, that the two major opponents
28. were the two largest banks in that particular area. What this
29. bill really does, it makes a lot of small banks capable of competing
30. with the big banks. And that's...and if you'll see where a lot of that
31. opposition comes...where there is competition, that's where it's
32. coming from. Now, in reality, what's going to happen if multi-
33. bank holding companies go through, is that it's going to be better

1. able to serve the community. Banking has five sources of in-
2. come, it has investments, consumer loans, mortgages, commercial
3. loans, and service charges. Right now, the cost of money for
4. everyone of those items is higher than the income with the ex-
5. ception of commercial loans which are tied to prime. A small bank,
6. because of its base, is generally unable to make that commercial
7. loan and has to go to a big bank in order to get approval, or
8. what they call a corresponding relationship with the larger bank.
9. If this were to continue, and these banks are to survive, the only
10. way they possibly can is to raise the rates on the consumer loans.
11. That would be the only way. They can't go out on mortgages, 'cause
12. they can't go out that long. They usually lock in their invest-
13. ments. They can increase service charges, which is another dis-
14. service. And Senator Collins, in regard to serving the areas
15. that you're talking about, the reason that that area basically
16. is not serviced, is that there is a risk potential, and not enough
17. of a capital draw. The multi-bank holding companies would go
18. through, there would be an encouragement because of the pooling
19. of resources to take those risks, and divert some of those re-
20. sources to the very areas that you're thinking about serving that
21. are not currently being served. Thank you.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

23. ...Senator Johns.

24. SENATOR JOHNS:

25. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question. Isn't it true that
26. just within the last...well, the last ten days, the first small
27. bank in Illinois has failed since the depression?

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. Senator Keats.

30. SENATOR KEATS:

31. No, there...there was...two failures in the Chicago area,
32. one in the Des Plaines Bank, which, because I know a little bit
33. about the individual involved, and many of the rest of you do too,

1. I don't think we should discuss on the Floor, I think he'll get
2. a chance to discuss that in court. The other one in Hyde Park,
3. which I'm sorry to say, was just poor business practices, but
4. both of those were carefully taken care of within the industry to
5. make sure that the consumers did not lose money. Now, in terms of
6. other banks failing, that has happened in...in sometimes through-
7. out the country.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. Senator Johns. Senator Kenneth Hall.

10. SENATOR HALL:

11. Thank you, Mr. President, and...Ladies and Gentlemen of the
12. Senate. I rise in support of this legislation, and I want to tell
13. you why. I come...part of my district is the City of East St.
14. Louis, where it has the highest unemployment in the Nation. One
15. person out of every two is either on Public Aid, General Assistance,
16. or some Federal program. We have two banks remaining in the city,
17. and one right on the edge. Now, if these banks don't get a chance
18. to expand, what's going to happen is, that they're going to close.
19. And they're going to move away. We've had over twenty thousand
20. people move out of that area in the last ten years. Unemployment
21. among teenagers is sixty percent. The only chance, and if we...
22. the services that these banks give, we would have to go twenty to
23. twenty-five miles away to get that type of service. This is the
24. only lifeline for cities that are poor and depressed. Also, in
25. line with that, my district borders Missouri, the Mississippi
26. River, all you do is cross into there, and there they have the
27. big, fine institutions. When the National Stockyards closed,
28. their bank closed, there were not enough banks, they did not have
29. the holding companies at that time, and all of that capital and
30. all of that stock went into the State of Missouri. If we'd had
31. this, we could have remained and held this in the State of Illinois.
32. This is good legislation, and I'll tell you this, it's very bene-
33. ficial for depressed areas.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Senator Newhouse.

3. SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

4. Thank you, Mr. President, and Senators. I'd like to tell
5. you the experience of my district which has some depressed areas.
6. In the past five years we've lost three minority banks, three,
7. count them. Guarantee Bank at 87th Street and Stony Island
8. closed it's doors, we were fortunate enough to have some of that
9. business and some of that stock picked up by the Seaway National
10. Bank. Guarantee Bank closed its doors, we were fortunate that
11. Independence Bank, which is two miles away was able to acquire
12. that stock to keep it going. Recently, South Side Bank at
13. 47th Street has closed its doors. All three of these banks serve
14. my area, which runs from 51st Street on the north, to roughly
15. 87th Street on the south, Cottage Grove to the lake. That's
16. the story of three banks in my area. Had those banks had a
17. connection through the multi-bank holding plan, none of those
18. banks would have failed. Multi-banks would have provided two
19. things for these banks. One, they would have supplied the capital,
20. that could have had an infusion into my community to permit
21. us to build the way we want to build. And there is some building
22. in our community. It's not totally depressed. Secondly, they
23. would have had the technical expertise, that would have prevented
24. some serious mistakes in the investments being made which I
25. think, was probably the case with South Side Bank. So, there are
26. two advantages to these small banks, particularly in the small
27. ..in...in those communities that have some deterioration. Now,
28. let me tell you how important that is, our community is not de-
29. teriorating solely because there's no money there, part of the
30. reason that it's deteriorating is because we've not had the
31. expertise to get the access to the money. That's part of the
32. problem. Now, a bank that has the kind of outreach and experience
33. that can combine the small bank experience with the large banks
technical assistance, would help my area immeasurably. That's

1. the case history, take it for what you like. I rise in support
2. of this bill. I think it ought to pass out of here with the
3. biggest majority you can find. Insofar as it concerns my district,
4. I'm for it, I'll push it, I'm waiting to vote for it.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

6. Further discussion? Senator Sommer.

7. SENATOR SOMMER:

8. Just...just briefly in response basically to Senator Newhouse,
9. but others. If I remember correctly, the...the spectacular
10. large bank failures in America in recent years, that is the
11. Franklin...Bank in Long Island, and...and the one in Detroit,
12. and the one in San Diego, were all holding company banks. There's
13. something to be...there's some thought that a holding company
14. structure operating in urban areas is equally as unsound as the
15. small banks operating in certain urban areas. It may be fun-
16. damentally unsound as the structure, and even though my own banker
17. happens to support this legislation, we have a disagreement, not
18. a disagreement on politics or anything else, it's a disagreement
19. over whether it's wise to do this in our State, and run the risk
20. of having this very spectacular bank collapse in Illinois.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

22. Senator Weaver.

23. SENATOR WEAVER:

24. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the Chair, or the
25. sponsor. I'm just inquiring under the Multi-Bank Holding Company
26. Bill as before us, and as these holding companies acquire the
27. stock and the facility of merged banks, would this be considered
28. a branch or would it be considered a free standing institution?
29. I'm wondering whether or not...what's your comment on it, Senator
30. Keats or Senator Bruce.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

32. Senator Keats.

33. SENATOR KEATS:

1. Okay, in this situation, they would not be branches, it's
2. our separate facilities. Now, you do have holding company structures,
3. and as you're well aware in other areas of private industry, you
4. can have a superstructure over several other companies. In this
5. case these are independent entities that are simply working in
6. co-operation with each other. They are clearly not branches.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

8. Senator Weaver.

9. SENATOR WEAVER:

10. I would be interested in your comment as it relates to the
11. constitutional...prohibition against branch banking without
12. the three-fifths vote, Mr. President.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

14. Well, the Chair is not qualified to comment on the legis-
15. lation. I...it...I am prepared to...rule on Senator Ozinga's
16. inquiry, however, if that would satisfy you, Senator Weaver.

17. SENATOR WEAVER:

18. Well, I think it would, and I think it might cut down some
19. chin music too.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. All right. Senator Ozinga has inquired whether or not under
22. the constitutional requirement, that branch banking requires a
23. three-fifths vote, I would make the following ruling. Consistent
24. with earlier rulings of the Chair relative to legislation authorizing
25. multi-office banking, through bank holding companies, it is my
26. ruling that Article XIII, Section 8 of the Illinois Constitution
27. requiring an extraordinary majority for the passage of legislation
28. authorizing branch banking is not applicable to Senate Bill 578
29. as amended. The vote necessary for passage of Senate Bill 578
30. as required by our Constitution under Article IV, Section 8 is
31. a majority of the members elected to the Senate, namely, thirty
32. votes. Further discussion? Senator Gitz.

33. SENATOR GITZ:

1. At the proper time, Mr...Mr. President, I hope that you will
2. explain that ruling and why that is the case. But to speak directly
3. to the bill, I'm sure that all of us have been ying-yanged one
4. way or another, and observed strong pressure from both sides.
5. I am a little bit nervous, however, and the argument: that is
6. put forth, that by the holding company legislation before us, we
7. are really seriously going to promote competition. There's no
8. question that there are good arguments on both sides, and there's
9. no doubt in my mind that there is some inequities, the fact that
10. savings and loans by a kind of a loophole are able to branch,
11. and we did not extend the same opportunities to their competitors.
12. But, you know, when you look at some of the figures which are
13. brought to the committee's attention in terms of the rate of earnings
14. in Illinois, we certainly have not suffered in that regard under
15. the unit banking system. And I think there is a very real question,
16. that one is entitled to have in small communities, that under a
17. holding bank concept, whether that money is really going to stay
18. in the community. Just because the rate of return for investment
19. in casinos in New Jersey, may be a better rate of return than
20. for example, agricultural loans, - is not my concern that that's
21. where we should put the money. I hope that money does stay in
22. the community if we adopt this concept. But I think one is
23. entitled on the basis of the evidence to have that fear and
24. concern. And I find it ironic that so many times when we say we
25. are doing things to promote competition, it actually has the reverse
26. result. Both Fortune and Newsweek and Business Week, and a
27. number of other publications have indicated in previous months
28. that we are on the verge of a major revolution, in financial
29. institutions all over the country, and that the fate of the small
30. bank is very much at issue, and that in the next five years there
31. will be a very significant reduction in the number of these financial
32. institutions. I don't submit that all this is due to holding
33. company legislation, and certainly all of us who have looked at

1. ...electronic banking facilities recognize that there are many
2. other forces at work. But there is an old saying, that old
3. saying being, if it isn't broke don't fix it, and I think we
4. are entitled, entitled to look a little bit more carefully and
5. not to move fast in this, and yes, it has been debated. But
6. if we don't adopt this concept today, we can rest assured that
7. the financial community will continue its debate among us. And
8. I don't think that the consumers or this Body or the taxpayers
9. of Illinois will be any further the worse for it. And I would
10. add in closing one other thing, I notice that it's been a long
11. time since most states have ever had a referendum in this issue.
12. The State of Colorado did do so. Now, presumably, there was a
13. lot of discussion and debate, for whatever the reasons. When that
14. was put as a public policy question, there was not one time when
15. that has ever been ratified and approved and a recommendation of
16. those consumers. On that basis, I think that the prudent vote, and
17. a wise vote may very well be a No vote.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

19. And while the Chair is ruling on inquiries, Senator Grotberg
20. inquired as to the Governmental Code of Ethics, and rules of
21. conduct for Legislators. Under Section 3-202, that legislation
22. states "that when a Legislator must take official action on a
23. legislative matter as to which he has a conflict situation created
24. by a personal, family, or client legislative interest, he should
25. consider the possibility of eliminating the interest creating
26. the conflict...situation. If that is not feasible, he should
27. consider the possibility of abstaining from such official action.
28. In making his decision to abstain the following factors should be
29. considered" in which it lists four, "his independence, his particip-
30. ation and public confidence, whether his participation would
31. have any significant effect, whether he has special knowledge and
32. he need not abstain if he decides to participate and he votes in
33. a manner which is contrary to his economic interest. If he does

1. abstain he should disclose that fact to his respective Legislative
2. Body." And that's the nature of the present Statute. Further...
3. further discussion? I have Senator Dawson and Philip. Senator
4. Dawson.

5. SENATOR DAWSON:

6. Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. There
7. was reference made about a survey taken in my district. Well, I'd
8. like to tell you something, my district is divided between the
9. city and the suburbs, which is a pretty rough area to try to
10. decipher once in awhile. But I'd like to tell you something,
11. go out to one of the banks in the suburbs and tell them you want
12. to buy something in the City of Chicago, and particularly in
13. the area that I come from and see what they tell you. They tell
14. you to get out the door and don't even look at them. And that's
15. their attitude out there as far as the suburban banks.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

17. Senator Philip.

18. SENATOR PHILIP:

19. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
20. Senate. I...I was confused by your long explanation, and you...
21. me being a layman and you being a lawyer, is this what you meant?
22. If...if you have bank stock, and I do not, I sold my bank stock
23. and took a loss on purpose, quite frankly, if...if you have
24. bank stock and...and if this bill passes, and your bank stock
25. would go up, and you would make money because of that, that might
26. be a conflict of interest. Is that what you said?

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

28. No, I read the Statute to you, Senator. It is subject to
29. your interpretation, and the interpretations of the Court of the
30. State of Illinois.

31. SENATOR PHILIP:

32. Thank you, I...I might make this comment. And if you think
33. this is a bill that helps the...the little guy and the people, I
would suggest to you, that you're sadly mistaken. And if...if

1. you're a black Senator and wondering if one of those large banks
2. is going to come out into the black area and buy one of your
3. little banks, you are sadly mistaken. Where...they're going to do,
4. they wouldn't do that, and I'll tell you this, Senator, why they
5. won't do it because you can't make any money there, and there isn't
6. any growth there. What they want to do, and what's happened is,
7. in the City of Chicago, the population is down, business is moving
8. out of the city into the suburban area, they want to get their
9. paws out in the suburban area, and they'll buy up a little bank,
10. do a lot of advertising and move out where the action is, quite
11. frankly. And I have in my little town of Elmhurst, where I
12. already have four banks, and I think five savings and loans, and
13. if you think I need anything else out there, you're sadly mistaken.
14. And this simply boils down to one thing, money. They want to get
15. out where the action...are and the action happens to be in the
16. suburban area where all the growth is. We ought to call our good
17. friend Mike Royko and see what he's got to say. He's telling us
18. suburbanites not to come into the City of Chicago. Well, I would
19. suggest to you, we ought to tell the City of Chicago banks to
20. stay in the city.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

22. Further discussion? Senator Chew.

23. SENATOR CHEW:

24. I was down in my office taking care of my business, and
25. I was...yeah, the banking business, and a little bird told me
26. that Pate Philip was going to come up here and make some racial
27. slurs. And Pate, you don't know nothing about ho black folk,
28. and black banks, and nothing else. You stay out there in that
29. ...you stay out there in that elite suburban area. There ain't
30. no action out there. You...do you know what a...what a water
31. tower place is in Chicago?

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

33. Senator Philip is neither the sponsor of the...the amendment
or the bill...

1. SENATOR CHEW:
2. We know that, Mr. President...
3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
4. Well,...four o'clock, Senator.
5. SENATOR CHEW:
6. I don't...
7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
8. All right. Senator Chew.
9. SENATOR CHEW:
10. I don't speak by time.
11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
12. Yeah, you do here. We've got five minutes on...
13. SENATOR CHEW:
14. Oh, no, I've got more seniority than you...
15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
16. Senator Chew.
17. SENATOR CHEW:
18. What do you mean talking...
19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
20. Senator Philip.
21. SENATOR PHILIP:
22. Thank...thank you, Mr. President. You know my name has
23. been used in vain. I would remind Senator Chew that his chauffeur
24. driven Cadillac has been parked in my district quite often for
25. lunch, for dinner, and I don't know what else he's doing out
26. there, but Charlie...Charlie, you know we must have a lot of
27. action in...in DuPage County because you're sure out there enough.
28. And...and I'll tell you one thing, our restaurants and our night
29. clubs certainly appreciate it, my friend, I hope you buy some gas
30. out there because it's a lot cheaper than Cook County.
31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)
32. All right, Senator Chew, your time is running.
33. SENATOR CHEW:

1. I know my time is up, but I just wanted Mr. Philip to know
2. that the white chauffeur is fired for not having driven the Rolls.
3. Royce.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

5. Senator Berning.

6. SENATOR BERNING:

7. Just to announce that I do have a couple of bank stock shares.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. All right, Senator Sangmeister.

10. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

11. I just wanted to tell Senator Philip, you haven't been told
12. yet, that's Charlie's new district he's going into out there.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

14. Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Rock.

15. SENATOR ROCK:

16. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
17. Senate. I, again, thank Senator Chew for all his help on this
18. legislation. This battle has been waging since 1971 here in the
19. State of Illinois. We, as you probably are well aware, are the
20. only State beside West Virginia, that bastion of progressivism,
21. that does not have the opportunity for true competition within
22. the banking industry. Since 1971, since I arrived here I have
23. sponsored, co-sponsor, or supported every effort at branch banking
24. or multi-bank holding company or branching for savings and loans,
25. and we just simply have been unable to do it. It now appears
26. that because of the efforts of the financial community itself,
27. and because it's finally dawned on us that competition is a good
28. thing, and good for the consumers. And I suggest to you, as
29. Senator Collins has pointed out, there are no banks or financial
30. institutions in the 28th Ward in the City of Chicago or the 27th,
31. or the 24th, and those two banks that failed out in Senator
32. Newhouse's area would not have failed had we not had such an
33. antiquated banking structure in this State. It's about time that

1. we afforded the financial community the opportunity to grow and
2. expand and offer to the consumers of our State the kind of
3. services they would be capable of, will be capable of at a lower
4. and reduced rate. And on a point of personal privilege, I for
5. one, as one who represents the 18th District in the City of
6. Chicago, in the suburban area, frankly, resent the fact that the
7. independent community banks in Illinois, sent everyone a form
8. letter apparently, suggesting that this is...this is subject to
9. conflict, and then had the audacity to send out a press release
10. suggesting a potential conflict of interest which exists between
11. certain Legislators and a controversial legislative proposal. I
12. suggest to you, that under that kind of a theory every lawyer,
13. every doctor, every dentist, every property owner, every farmer,
14. every businessman who votes on workmen's comp., and unemployment
15. insurance, every one of us is subject to daily conflict. And we
16. know it, and we live with it, but this, by those folks who are
17. unalterably opposed to this legislation smacks, in my judgment,
18. of sensationalism, and I resent it personally. I urge an Aye
19. vote, it's about time Illinois got on the right track.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. Further discussion? Senator Keats may close.

22. SENATOR KEATS:

23. As I call for a roll call, I'll say five years from today
24. we'll look back and say, it's about time we brought our banking
25. structure into the 20th Century. And Phil Rock said all I was
26. going to say, so I needn't close. I'd appreciate an affirmative
27. roll call.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

29. The question is, shall Senate Bill 578 pass. Those in favor
30. vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
31. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
32. who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 34,
33. the Nays are 20, 3 Voting Present. Senate Bill 578, having received

1. the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate
2. Bill 579, Senator Keats. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

3. SECRETARY:

4. Senate Bill 579.

5. (Secretary reads title of bill)

6. 3rd reading of the bill.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

8. Senator Keats.

9. SENATOR KEATS:

10. It's nice to have a non-controversial bill coming up. This
11. simply codifies an existing practice that allows for...indem-
12. nification of officers and allows us to set up deferred compen-
13. sation plans. Non-controversial, seven-nothing committee vote.
14. I'd appreciate your support.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. Discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 579 pass.
17. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting
18. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
19. Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays
20. are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 579, having received
21. the required constitutional majority is declared passed. For
22. what purpose does Senator Vadalabene arise?

23. SENATOR VADALABENE:

24. Yes, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

26. State your point, Senator.

27. SENATOR VADALABENE:

28. I have in the...in the past couple of weeks and as late as
29. today, to have had three bills on...get 29 votes. Now, I'm serious
30. about this, all of us take pride that we're Senators, and we're
31. in the major leagues we're...we're not minor league ballplayers.
32. This is hardball, this is not softball. Now, I've had three
33. major bills, all three of them went over the thirty mark, and
when he said take the record, the President, it dropped back down

1. to 29. Now, it's personal to me, I'm not going to speak for
2. any other Senator, but I don't think we ought to play games with
3. our switches when we're trying to roll real fast and whoever's
4. presiding sees that 30, 31, or 32, he says take the record, and
5. then two or three drop off. Now, I don't think that's fair to
6. the sponsor, I don't think that's fair to the people who have
7. an interest in the bills up in the gallery, and I don't think
8. it's fair to the people who do not have interests that are in the
9. gallery to see bills passed, then all of the sudden are defeated.
10. Now, I have another important bill coming up pretty soon. Now,
11. I don't know who you are, or where you are, or whether you're a
12. Democrat or whether you're...you're a Republican, I'm speaking
13. personally about my bills. If you don't want to vote for them,
14. I have no objection. I am an easy guy to get along with, but I
15. would appreciate from the bottom of my heart, don't play games
16. with my bills. If you want to vote Aye, vote Aye. And if you
17. want to vote No, vote No, and I'll go out to dinner with you
18. tonight. I don't have any problems that way. And I would ap-
19. preciate it. And God bless you.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

21. Senator...Senator Ozinga, did you have...all right. Senate
22. Bill 580, Senator Grotberg. Read the Bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

23. SECRETARY:

24. Senate Bill 582.

25. (Secretary reads title of bill)

26. 3rd reading of the bill. Senate Bill 580, that is. My error.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

28. Senator Grotberg, on Senate Bill 580.

29. SENATOR GROTBORG:

30. Well, thank you, Mr. President, and fellow Senators. Senate
31. Bill 580 does exactly what the Digest indicates in the...in the
32. daily Calendar, changing the number of days for which cigarette
33. distributors have to pay for their stamps, from twenty to twenty-
one...from fifteen days to twenty-one days. The original bill

1. asked for thirty. And it also re-establishes a different formula
2. for their bonding requirements. Senator Donnewald joins with me
3. in offering this. Senator Netsch and I have been working through
4. ...as she representing the Chairman of Revenue, and with the
5. Department of Revenue, and the Treasurer, and Comptroller's Office
6. have worked this out. And it's an agreed amendment. Any questions,
7. I'd be glad to answer them.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The...Senator
10. Netsch.

11. SENATOR NETSCH:

12. Just simply to confirm what Senator Grotberg said. As it
13. has been amended, certainly has the approval of the Department
14. of Revenue, and it seems to me that it is a fair provision.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

16. The question is, shall Senate Bill 580 pass. Those in favor
17. vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
18. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
19. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are 1, none Voting
20. Present. Senate Bill 580, having received the required consti-
21. tutional majority is declared passed. Senator Gitz, on 584.
22. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

23. SECRETARY:

24. Senate Bill 584.

25. (Secretary reads title of bill)

26. 3rd reading of the bill.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

28. Senator Gitz.

29. SENATOR GITZ:

30. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. This
31. bill is the implementation of the sunset recommendations as it
32. relates to water well and pump installation. Unlike the licensing
33. procedures, this would give the department the enforcement measures

Bill 584
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. they need to rectify violations. It is, frankly, an after the
2. fact measure. And I want to clarify and to stress, that in this
3. complete repealer, unless this kind of legislation is passed, there
4. will be a gap which is acknowledged by the commission and everyone
5. concerned. I do believe this option should be presented to the
6. Body, I do...believe that both of those bills should be over in
7. the House.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

9. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is,
10. shall Senate Bill 584 pass. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed
11. vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
12. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes
13. are 57, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 584,
14. having received the required constitutional majority is declared
15. passed. Senate Bill 586, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom on the
16. Floor? Senate Bill 587, Senator Vadalabene. Read the bill, Mr.
17. Secretary, please.

18. SECRETARY:

19. Senate Bill 587.

20. (Secretary reads title of bill)

21. 3rd reading of the bill.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

23. Senator Vadalabene.

24. SENATOR VADALABENE:

25. Yes, Senate Bill 587, introduced...this bill would amend the
26. Illinois Pension Code to include conservation police officers ..
27. throughout the State of Illinois, in the same formula which
28. presently includes the Illinois State Police and the State Fire
29. Fighters and special agents of the Department of Law Enforcement
30. and air pilots. The studies have consistently revealed that con-
31. servation law enforcement officers Nation-wide bear a higher risk
32. of assault than any other category of policemen, be they city, county,
33. or State. And I would appreciate a favorable vote.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

2. Is there discussion? Senator Egan.

3. SENATOR EGAN:

4. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. I
5. anticipate that there will be some actuarial reverberations
6. regarding this bill. Consequent to that we did amend the bill
7. so that the employee contribution was raised to a level that
8. practically does pay for the entire amount of the unfunded liability.
9. It occurs to me that if we let the Secretary of State's police
10. into the Police Pension System, to do otherwise with the Department
11. of Conservation, I think would be hypocritical. There are
12. approximately ten...a hundred and fifty officers in the Department
13. of Conservation that are...who's lives are endangered equally as
14. well as those troopers that currently are members of the State
15. police, themselves. I would suggest that because the bill has
16. been amended to pay the amount of employee contribution at a level
17. which practically pays the whole amount, that we should be un-
18. animous in our support of this bill. In a Session that I have
19. seen nothing but criminal bills sail out of here, and we're
20. asking for stiffer penalties for criminals, the least we could
21. do is support the people like these conservation officers who
22. are out there on the front lines. Their...their's is, indeed,
23. a dangerous job, equally dangerous, certainly to the Secretary of
24. State's police, and...in most instances to the State police. So,
25. I...I urge its passage. I ask that you support it, I think that
26. in light of the fact that the Governor has vetoed bills which would
27. raise the State contribution to pension systems after we have
28. passed them out of the...both Houses one or two times, and veto
29. bills and appropriations for increased benefits in other systems.
30. To do otherwise here is absolutely...hypocrisy, and I ask you to
31. vote for it.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

33. Senator Berning.

1. SENATOR BERNING:

2. Thank you, Mr. President. I recognize that it's not popular
3. to appear in opposition to a give away, and no matter how you
4. look at it, in a sense this does represent another give away.
5. Sure the bill has been amended to increase the contribution by
6. these participants, but I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of
7. the Senate, that irrespective of what can be construed as the
8. risks facing these people in the discharge of their duty, they
9. really are not comparable to the risks that the police officers
10. face. And while we did make an exception for the Secretary of
11. State's investigators, two wrongs don't make a right. I don't
12. believe that it's justified to put these people into the same
13. category. And irrespective of that, Ladies and Gentlemen, you
14. may look at it differently, but let me remind you, that in spite
15. of the increased contribution which is prospective, there will be
16. incurred and increased underfunded obligation of this State Em-
17. ployees Pension System. The system now, is at about fifty percent,
18. if someone else were to come into...to transfer into another
19. system, he or she would be required to make the contribution that
20. would normally be his obligation and the employer's. These people
21. have been making their employee contribution at the lowered rate,
22. and the employer's obligation has been at the lowered rate. Now,
23. by increasing the benefit, lowered numbers of years, they will
24. qualify the same as police officers. We are incurring in excess
25. of a billion...or a million and a quarter of unfunded liability.
26. That is a bill that has to be paid, and I remind you once more,
27. that if we did nothing this year in the way of increased benefits,
28. it would take two hundred million dollars of additional General
29. Revenue appropriation this year just to keep even. Mr. President,
30. it's not pleasant to rise in opposition to what appears to be a
31. laudable objective, but the facts of the matter are dollars and
32. cents.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Senator Sommer.

2. SENATOR SOMMER:

3. Mr. President, I'd like to ask a question of Senator Vadalabene
4. or Senator Egan, whomever might know. How long would an officer
5. have to serve before they would receive their maximum pension,
6. which I believe is seventy-five percent of a...a base salary
7. staged over the last years. What is the length of service to
8. qualify for the maximum pension?

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. Who would care to answer? Senator Egan indicates he'll answer
11. that.

12. SENATOR EGAN:

13. Well, there are various provisions, Senator Sommer. Let me...
14. let me just read the...from the actuaries. It grants the use of
15. alternative retirement allowances and for any...of these officers
16. with, at least, twenty years of service who attain age fifty-five,
17. or with twenty-five years of service after attaining age fifty.
18. That is the current State Police Formula.

19. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

20. Senator Sommer.

21. SENATOR SOMMER:

22. Then...then it's not possible for someone to go to work for
23. the agency at age twenty-one and serve twenty years and retire and
24. receive a pension?

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Senator Egan.

27. SENATOR EGAN:

28. No, you have to serve twenty-five years and retire at age
29. fifty, or twenty...or twenty years and retire at age fifty-five.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Senator Johns.

32. SENATOR JOHNS:

33. Thank you, Mr. President. To the members of the Senate, we're

1. talking about the year 1981, it's not like it used to be in the
2. forest, it used to be a man's word was good, there wasn't much
3. poaching, there wasn't much confrontation, there wasn't much
4. of the gangs, there wasn't much of the raiding of...of wildlife
5. as there is today. I'm telling you this, that these men are
6. performing strenuous and hazardous duty. If you've ever been
7. out there alone in the forest or the parks of the State of
8. Illinois, today, where drug traffic is moving, there's all kinds
9. of clandestine deals going on, and I'm telling you this, these
10. men are taking their lives in their hands, and they are performing
11. great and wonderful duty out there. I've...I've talked with
12. them, I've worked with them, and I've been a part of it, and I
13. can tell you this, they deserve the support of this bill and I
14. appreciate it and would ask for a favorable roll call.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. Senator Joyce.

17. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

18. Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I also rise in support of
19. this. I think, you know, we talk about police officers and
20. stopping people on the highway and so forth, but these conservation
21. officers, over half the people they stop have got guns. So, you
22. know, they're...they're out there where they can get...have a
23. problem. So, I...I think they're...they're entitled, and I'd hope
24. we'd all support this.

25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

26. Senator Philip.

27. SENATOR PHILIP:

28. Thank you, Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
29. Senate. You know, when this bill came up last Session...to in-
30. clude Secretary of State's police, quite frankly, I didn't support
31. that position. But I have reviewed this bill, and they have
32. increased their contributions to nine and a half percent, and
33. if you go up to...Zion State Park on a Saturday night with the

1. kids drinking beer and raising hell, and we've had all kinds of
2. fist fights, et cetera, and you've been up there to see it, and
3. we have to depend on those conservation officers to slow down the
4. young boys, I, quite frankly, think they're entitled to it and
5. think we ought to support this...this bill.

6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

7. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Vadalabene
8. may close debate.

9. SENATOR VADALABENE:

10. Yes, I would like a favorable roll call on this very im-
11. portant bill.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. The question is, shall Senate Bill 587 pass. Those in favor
14. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
15. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
16. wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 46, the
17. Nays are 3, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 587, having re-
18. ceived the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate
19. Bill 591, Senator Bruce. Read the bill...oh, Senator...593...
20. Senator Joyce, for what purpose do you arise?

21. SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

22. Mr. President, my key was turned off on that. Had I...had
23. it not been, I would have...like to be recorded Aye.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. The record will show...so show. Senate Bill 593, Senator
26. Mahar. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

27. SECRETARY:

28. Senate Bill 593.

29. (Secretary reads title of bill)

30. 3rd reading of the bill.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator Mahar.

33. SENATOR MAHAR:

1. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. Presently
2. under the Military and Naval Code, officers who retire with twenty
3. years service have the privilege of using the name of the next
4. higher rank as...in their everyday life. For example, a major
5. can call himself colonel, or whatever. This has been on the books
6. for some number of years, it's been recommended that the enlisted
7. personnel and the warrant officers have the same privilege, with
8. the exception that a master sergeant, of course, can't go on to
9. the next higher warrant or commission and that a grade 4 warrant
10. officer can't take the title of an officer. There are no cost
11. figures. It...there's no change in pensions, there's no cost
12. to the State of Illinois, no cost to the Federal Government. This
13. is a follow-up which is allowed in other states, and at the end
14. of World War II it...the Federal Government used this policy for
15. a number of years, and then when pensions became a part of the
16. Federal scene, it was cancelled. I would ask for your favorable
17. vote.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Is there any discussion? Brigadier General Buzbee. Senator Buzbee.
20. SENATOR BUZBEE:

21. No, that...that is incorrect. Senator Mahar, had he retired
22. from the National Guard instead of from the United States Army
23. Reserve, you would refer to him as brigadier general, because
24. his actual rank is colonel, and it's a rank that he earned, that
25. he deserved, and that is what he is known as. I...I...I find it...
26. and he is correct, at the end of World War II in the...in the
27. Federal service, because of the war service that so many of our
28. officers put in, when they retired with...with...for just a very
29. few years after World War II, they were given an honorary title
30. of the next higher rank. The Federal Government soon looked upon
31. that as...as something beyond good sense and said you ought to be
32. called what you actually are. And so they...they repealed that...
33. that law, or ruling, or whatever it was. When a person is in the

1. military, in the United States Military, whether it be the reserve
2. or the regular establishment, and they retire at a rank, they are
3. known as that rank. If you are a major, and you retire at that
4. rank, you are referred to as major. But in the Illinois National
5. Guard, for some reason or other, we...and the Naval Militia,
6. I might add, when a person retires as a captain in the Naval Militia
7. he is then referred to as admiral. When a person retires as
8. colonel from the Army...or pardon me, the National Guard, he is
9. then referred to as general. It...it just doesn't make any sense.
10. Rank is something that one earns, and one ought to be proud to
11. bear the title of that rank. Now, this, what Senator Mahar is
12. proposing is...is not really too objectionable, I guess, if you
13. believe that they ought to be allowed to do that in the officer
14. corps because this is simply allowing the enlisted personnel and
15. the warrant officers to be given the same privilege that the
16. officer corps presently has. I think what we ought to have, is
17. a bill in, which revokes the officer corps' ability to do this.
18. It just doesn't make any sense, if the person deserved to be a
19. general, then you ought to call him general, but if a person only
20. deserves to be a colonel, you should call him colonel. And I...
21. I...it is nothing more than an honorary title. It...it doesn't
22. make any sense at all, I think we ought to have a bill in to
23. revoke the officer corps' ability to do this. I'm going to vote
24. No on the bill, not because I don't want the enlisted man to have
25. the same privilege that the officer has, but because I think the
26. officer ought to have the same privilege that the enlisted man in the
27. National Guard presently has, and that is to be called by his
28. own rightful...rightfully deserved rank.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Is there further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

31. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

32. Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As
33. an officer who's outranked by Colonel Mahar, and who came up from

1. the ranks, I'm going to speak in favor of the bill. We officers
2. had many prerequisites, and I think the least we can do is honor
3. the fact that we couldn't be officers for anyone unless we had
4. some troops with us. And therefore, I speak in favor of the bill,
5. because I think the enlisted men, the warrant officers, are entitled
6. to a consideration. And I speak for it, and I think...I urge all
7. of you to vote for it.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. The question is...well, Senator Mahar, would you care to
10. close debate?

11. SENATOR MAHAR:

12. Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I recognize what Senator Buzbee
13. has said, and that sort of thing, but I do think that one...that
14. we're...we're not talking about any funding. I think that since
15. the officer corps has this privilege, and there's been some appeal
16. for the enlisted people to have the same thing, I don't think it
17. really makes that much difference, it's a voluntary thing. If
18. a person wants to use it, he or she can, and I think we ought
19. to pass it on over to the House. I urge your support.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. The question is, shall Senate Bill 593 pass. Those in favor
22. will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have
23. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
24. wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 42, the
25. Nays are 8, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 593, having received
26. the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 597,
27. Senator Gitz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

28. SECRETARY:

29. Senate Bill 597.

30. (Secretary reads title of bill)

31. 3rd reading of the bill.

32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

33. Senator Gitz.

1. SENATOR GITZ:

2. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. What
3. Senate Bill 597 would do, is to seek to put on the 1982 ballot, an
4. advisory referendum issue with the following wording, "should
5. school districts be permitted to replace the ad valorem property
6. tax with an income tax to finance their costs for providing public
7. education." I dare say, that all of us in this Assembly are
8. quite aware of the dilemmas that we face with property taxes, the
9. fact that so many referendums are going under, that we see news-
10. paper headlines each and everyday, and I think it is important
11. for us to have some guidance in terms of how to get this issue
12. off and going, which I feel very strongly we're going to end up
13. with, and that is the need to reform the method of local financing.
14. It seems to me that the property tax makes a great deal of sense
15. for certain activities, police and fire, road improvements, sanitation,
16. et cetera. But to utilize this, to continue to finance education,
17. I think, is questionable at best in terms of it's long-range
18. ramifications. The substantive legislation, in this Assembly
19. has never had the opportunity to come to the Floor, and there are
20. admittedly good and sound arguments on both sides of the fence.
21. But I think that to put this before the voters in the 1982
22. election, would be one way of getting a good sound judgment from
23. the people of Illinois, and whether they really believe that the
24. property tax system should be changed as it applies to education.
25. And it's for that reason that I offer the bill for your consideration.

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Is there any discussion? If not, the question...Senator Buzbee.

28. SENATOR BUZBEE:

29. Well, I'm...I'm hooked on the horns of a dilemma here, because
30. I have a...I have a...a bill in which I purposefully let die in
31. committee because I'm going to go on as a joint co-sponsor with
32. Senator Sangmeister who has an identical bill, which would call
33. for the same thing, a State-wide referendum, an advisory refer-
endum. But Senator Sangmeister and...and my concept differs from

1. Senator Gitz in that we put the question in the manner of should
2. the State pick up the entire cost for the funding of our schools,
3. take it off local property taxes, and let the State pick it up
4. which, would, of course, mean an increase in either the income
5. tax or some other...something like that, as opposed to
6. Senator Gitz's idea, which is to have a local income tax by re-
7. ferendum at the local level. I just don't think that his idea
8. is workable. I've...I've considered that as a possibility, I
9. don't think it's workable. So, I'm...I'm not sure what the
10. position ought to be here, perhaps we could have both of them
11. on the ballot for the local...the local income tax, or for a State-
12. wide increase in the income tax. But I...I certainly don't favor
13. the concept that Senator Gitz has advocated. But I guess maybe
14. it wouldn't hurt if we had both referendum on the ballot. Now,
15. there are some negatives about putting either one of them on, as a
16. matter of fact. The State of Michigan just had a referendum the day
17. before yesterday where they advocated a similar thing of taking
18. the cost of education off the property taxpayer and increasing
19. the sales tax by, I think, two cents. In that case the refer-
20. endum lost by about three or four to one, which kind of locks
21. you in concretethen, if the folks don't want it...the Legislature
22. is apparently not going to pass it. But I think we ought to find
23. out if the folks do want it or not. We've heard for years people
24. scream about my property taxes, and I'd much rather pay on my
25. ability to pay which is on my income tax. So, therefore, why
26. don't you increase my income tax and...and decrease my property
27. tax. Well, this would give them the opportunity of saying, if
28. they're really serious about that, and if they're really serious
29. about it, we could find out and then we could...we could pass the
30. enabling legislation at some future time. But...I'm not sure
31. at this point what my position ought to be as to Senator Gitz's
32. bill because I don't...I don't...I don't agree with his concept.
33. But...but maybe we ought to have them on the ballot side by side.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Sangmeister.

3. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

4. Yes, well just to clarify Senate Bill 711, which will
5. be coming further on down the Calendar does provide a different
6. wording which does as Senator Buzbee indicates, should the
7. State pick up the entire tab with an income tax and I
8. certainly will be asking for your support on that. I don't
9. know whether it would be a problem putting the...both propositions
10. on the ballot or not and we leave that to your discretion. But,
11. I intend to support Senator Gitz' bill.

12. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

13. Senator Carroll.

14. SENATOR CARROLL:

15. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
16. Senate. A question of the sponsor. Would you support a
17. concept within this that allows the income that's taxed, to
18. be taxed at the location in which the income is earned?
19. So that the monies will then go to support that school
20. system where the income is earned.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Senator Gitz.

23. SENATOR GITZ:

24. I'd rather deal with that when we put it before, because
25. frankly, Senator Carroll, that is not the issue before us.

26. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

27. Senator Carroll.

28. SENATOR CARROLL:

29. Well, I...I really think that might be the issue that
30. is before us and if the income is taxed at the place of
31. earning, I think, you know, people like myself, might be
32. very supportive of a replacement of property tax with
33. an income...where earned tax. Which would then support
34. the system that's providing the income.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Maitland. Oh, was that a question, Senator
3. Carroll? No, that was just a statement. Senator Maitland.
4. SENATOR MAITLAND:

5. Thank you, Mr. President. I had no intended to rise
6. and speak on this issue. I was...I'm reluctantly support-
7. ing Senator Gitz' legislation and having heard Senator
8. Buzbee and...and Senator Sangmeister's comments on...on
9. the other issue was a totally unrelated issue, really,
10. at this point. In Senator Gitz' referendum he's talking
11. about the fact, should or should not local school
12. districts have the option of the permissive legislation
13. available to them to implement, if they desire, a
14. locally collected, a locally administered income tax
15. to replace the property tax. We're talking about
16. either State support on one side or local support on
17. the other side. We're talking about the local revenue,
18. whatever the fact is, we are never, and I don't think
19. we want, to have the State pick up total funding of
20. schools. I don't...I don't think that's the way to
21. go. We're talking about only one issue and that
22. is, should school districts have the permissive
23. legislation to allow them to implement an income
24. tax. I have concern about how the referendum will be
25. worded, but nonetheless this is what we want to talk
26. about, and I then therefore, would support Senator
27. Gitz' Senate Bill 597.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Davidson.

30. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

31. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I voted against this bill
32. in committee and I certainly urge you to vote against it now.
33. That's what you're elected for, is to come here to make a

1. decision. Not to put something on a State-wide ballot
2. that's going to be advisory. Why go through all the facade
3. of exercising everybody up and down the State, clutter up
4. the ballot, on something which is going to be advisory which
5. you can ignore, or choose to go with. That's what this
6. republic representative government is all about. That's
7. what you and I get paid to do is make a decision and not
8. to have an advisory vote, State-wide on how your conscience
9. may or may not react or how your district is. Each and every
10. one of you know how the people in your district react or
11. feel about a major issue...or you wouldn't be here and I
12. urge a No vote.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Gitz
15. may close debate.

16. SENATOR GITZ:

17. Well, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I think
18. that we need to reform the property tax system, maybe there
19. are other alternatives, Senator Buzbee, I will support that
20. referendum proposal when it comes up on the Calendar here.
21. But I think there are different options and there is a sub-
22. stantial difference between something which is phrased in a local
23. income tax level and something which is done totally at
24. the State discretion in terms of total State support, no
25. property tax at the local level. But I would like to submit to
26. you that I think it is important that we promote the public
27. discussion of this issue. To my knowledge this is the first
28. time that any discussion of this in terms of the local financing
29. of education has ever occurred on the Floor of the Senate.
30. To this date, the Senate Revenue Committee has never really even
31. voted on the issue. Now, the point is, as many people have
32. said, we think this is a meritorious proposal. We think there
33. is a lot of good to it, but we're afraid of the ramifications,
we're afraid of what the people will do to us. They're afraid

1. of that kind of a revolutionary change. Well, I submit to
2. you, we do have the right to ask people for some advice
3. and direction in this and if the people of Illinois don't
4. want to make a change, then I don't think that we should force
5. that change. I don't see what we have to fear, Senator
6. Davidson, by putting this position before the people. If
7. anything, I think it will promote a long needed and overdue
8. State-wide discussion of what is the central mission of
9. education and how is the best way to finance it. I think
10. that the wording of this bill, if somebody wants to change
11. it, fine, perhaps we can put them both in one bill, perhaps
12. we can put them both on the ballot. But what I am intending
13. to do is to put this on the ballot so that once and for all,
14. people will know where we are going with the property tax
15. system..

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. The question is shall Senate Bill 597 pass. Those in
18. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting
19. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
20. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that...question
21. the Ayes are 35, the Nays are 16, 2 Voting Present. Senate
22. Bill 597, having received the constitutional majority is
23. declared passed. Senate Bill 599, Senator Rupp. Read the
24. bill, Mr. Secretary.

25. SECRETARY:

26. Senate Bill 599.

27. (Secretary reads title of bill)

28. 3rd reading of the bill.

29. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

30. Senator Rupp.

31. SENATOR RUPP:

32. Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Downstate
33. Teacher's Retirement Article to the Illinois Pension Code.

1. It adds one hundred dollars a month to the annuity for the
2. surviving widows and children. The last increase in this
3. was made in 1975. In order to support this, the teachers
4. themselves contribute one percent of their salary. In
5. 1975, that one percent contribution raised a total of
6. thirteen million dollars, in 1981 that one percent raised
7. nineteen million. The current pay out to all survivors
8. under this, for just the last fiscal year, was eight and
9. a half million. And there always has been this balance,
10. this plus side as far as having more revenue come in
11. in the thirty-two years of experience, more revenue coming
12. in than the expenditures. This is the same as Senate Bill 842
13. that does the same thing for the Chicago teachers. I
14. ask a favorable roll call.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall
17. Senate Bill 599 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
18. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
19. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
20. Take the record. On that question the Ayes are 47, the Nays
21. are 2 and none Voting Present. Senate Bill 599, having
22. received the constitutional majority is declared passed.
23. Senate Bill 601, Senator Marovitz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

24. SECRETARY:

25. Senate Bill 601.

26. (Secretary reads title of bill)

27. 3rd reading of the bill.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator Marovitz.

30. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

31. Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen
32. of the Senate. Senate Bill 601 was introduced to allow
33. counties to partially recoup the cost of supplying public

1. defenders for convicted criminals. The reason for the bill
2. is that recently the Illinois Supreme Court held unconstitu-
3. tional our present Statute which, allows bail bonds to be
4. used to pay public defenders and other court appointed counsel.
5. That was in the case of People versus Cook. The proposed
6. Statutory change embodied in Senate Bill 601 follows the
7. Oregon Statute, which was held constitutional by the United
8. States Supreme Court in Fuller versus Oregon. The Statute
9. insures that cost of prosecution can only be assessed when
10. one, the offender has been convicted, two, the offender is
11. or will be able to pay the cost, three, the courts take
12. into account the financial resource of the offender and
13. the possible effect and ramifications on its family, and
14. four, the offender has the right to petition the court at
15. a future date to modify the order assessing costs. I would
16. ask for a favorable roll call on this bill.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall
19. Senate Bill 601 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
20. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
21. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
22. Take the record. On that question the Ayes are 50, the
23. Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 601, having
24. received the constitutional majority is declared passed.
25. Senate Bill 602, Senator Keats. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

26. SECRETARY:

27. Senate Bill 602.

28. (Secretary reads title of bill)

29. 3rd reading of the bill.

30. SENATOR KEATS:

31. Thank...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen
32. of the Senate. What Senate Bill 602 is, it increases voluntary
33. manslaughter from a Class II to a Class I Felony. What it's really

1. doing, it's a clean up, the amendment will correct what
2. seems to be a deficiency in the sentencing structure for
3. murder as revised under Class X. What happens is that you'll
4. have your...voluntary manslaughter conviction that determinate
5. sentencing is three to seven years, but murder is twenty to
6. forty. So you have no...no...no discretion between either
7. three to seven for voluntary manslaughter or twenty to forty
8. for murder. So you've got a thirteen year gap which the
9. judges are finding extremely difficult to work with, so
10. sometimes what they end up doing, is putting someone instead of
11. under voluntary manslaughter, they'll put them under attempted
12. murder, even when they have a dead body present because it
13. gives them more discretion. So this allows for the discretion,
14. so instead of being caught on three to seven or twenty, with
15. that thirteen year lag, this allows the judges to have the
16. discretion to fill in the thirteen year lag. It's a clean up
17. and I'd appreciate your support.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall
20. Senate Bill 602 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
21. opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
22. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
23. question the Ayes are 49, the Nays are none, none Voting Present.
24. Senate Bill 602, having received the constitutional majority
25. is declared passed. Senate Bill 604, Senator Carroll. Read
26. the bill, Mr...Senate Bill 606...Senator Carroll, for what
27. purpose do you arise?

28. SENATOR CARROLL:

29. If I may, Mr. President, get leave of the Senate. 604
30. is really a companion and should follow in explanation Senator
31. Netsch' 676 and 677, we learned that when the bills were in
32. committee. If we could get special leave to take it out of
33. order after her bills are called.

SB 606
3rd Reading
5-21-81

- 1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
- 2. Is leave granted? You've heard the motion. Leave is
- 3. granted. Senator Grotberg, for what purpose do you arise?
- 4. SENATOR GROTBERG:
- 5. On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.
- 6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
- 7. State your point.
- 8. SENATOR GROTBERG:
- 9. I think for the last hour or so and it just came to
- 10. my attention, that the two vice presidents of the Young
- 11. Republican...College Republicans of Illinois are in the
- 12. Republican Gallery up here, Lisa Estes and from...from
- 13. Dwight and Dan Factor from Streator, both in the 38th
- 14. Legislative District. Would you rise and be recognized.
- 15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
- 16. Senate Bill 606, Senator Sangmeister. Read the bill,
- 17. Mr. Secretary.
- 18. SECRETARY:
- 19. Senate Bill 606.
- 20. (Secretary reads title of bill)
- 21. 3rd reading of the bill.
- 22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
- 23. Senator Sangmeister.
- 24. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:
- 25. Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate Bill
- 26. 606 comes about as a result of inquiries from our school
- 27. boards and our local taxing districts that they would like
- 28. to receive their tax monies as promptly as they possibly
- 29. can upon collection by the county treasurers. When this
- 30. bill was originally heard in committee, the county treasurers
- 31. were present and said that they couldn't live with the way
- 32. I had presently drafted the bill. So I asked them, what was
- 33. a reasonable timetable within which for them to turn over
- 34. the money they collected. They told me that thirty days was

1. reasonable. I put exactly what they asked for into the bill
2. and most of them said they were turning their money over
3. within fifteen days, but thirty would give them plenty of
4. time. Obviously, if they hold it longer than that, why
5. interest would then accrue for the taxing bodies. That's
6. what the bill does. I'll be happy to answer any questions.
7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

8. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion?
9. If not...Senator...Bruce.

10. SENATOR BRUCE:

11. Well...there are some problems that I see with this
12. bill. The county treasurers have contacted me, obviously
13. they have some difficulties. County governments would have
14. difficulty supporting this bill. And the county treasurers
15. in my area have indicated that why then would they even earn
16. any interest since there's no incentive to do so. Once
17. earned interest...it would have to be transmitted onto the
18. taxing body to which the original money went. And the...
19. treasurer in my district has indicated, or one of the treasurers,
20. I have thirteen of them, has indicated his opposition. Obviously
21. the...the taxing bodies would enjoy receiving the interest.
22. But I think he may have a point and I'm not standing in
23. opposition or in support of this one. Only that I don't see
24. why a county treasurer then would...would raise any interest
25. if the county for which he works is not going to derive any
26. of that interest income.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Is there further discussion? Senator Sangmeister may
29. close.

30. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

31. Well, in answer to Senator Bruce, they've got the thirty
32. days, which, if they're going to hold it for thirty days and
33. invest it, they get the interest for that thirty days. If

1. they're going to hold it beyond the thirty days, when they
2. turn that money over to the taxing bodies, why that interest
3. should follow...to the taxing bodies. Now, their association
4. was here representing the county treasurers for the State of
5. Illinois and I've done exactly what they've asked me to do so
6. I don't know where your local opposition may be coming from.
7. And from your standpoint, I would think, Senator Bruce, you'd
8. want to support your school boards and your taxing bodies
9. to get the funds to these taxing bodies so that they have the
10. money available to pay the teachers.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. ...Senator Bruce.

13. SENATOR BRUCE:

14. Well, perhaps, Senator Sangmeister you might, I think
15. you may have persuaded me. What was the effect of your amend-
16. ment? I guess that's where we, we may have changed things.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator Sangmeister.

19. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

20. Well I had, the way I originally drafted the bill, I
21. could understand their problem. They would have had to turn
22. over the...the money immediately and I...I, you know, you
23. have to realize that that's an impossibility on their part
24. as well. So I asked them, how much time do you need. Most
25. of the county treasurers that were there and testified on
26. behalf of the association said, they turn their money over
27. within fifteen or twenty days. So we said, well how about
28. giving you thirty days, would that be plenty of time and
29. they said that would be fine and that's what we put in there.
30. And Herman Nell from Cook County, I don't know if Herman
31. is around on the Floor or not, but...they originally, Cook
32. County had some opposition, but thirty days was fine with
33. them. Treasurer Rosewell turns over the money, I understand,

1. far in advance of the thirty days. Well, I...I don't want
2. to misrepresent you, Senator Bruce, that's what the county
3. treasurers asked me to put in and I put it exactly as they
4. did, I, you know. Okay, I guess it's all squared away then.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Grotberg.

7. SENATOR GROTBORG:

8. ...Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.
9. Senator Sangmeister, this is a very familiar subject in that
10. ...can you tell me, whether or not, pardon me, Senator Bruce,
11. can you tell me Senator Sangmeister is this...is this one
12. of the products of our local Government Finance Study Commission
13. that I was on all last year, you weren't there, but is this
14. a bill of your own origin or is it a fallout from that?

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. Senator Sangmeister.

17. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

18. It was brought to my attention that whatever that
19. organization or commission that you are a part, had discussed
20. this, but that is not a product of it. I put it in, frankly,
21. because the local school boards and...and taxing bodies felt
22. that there were some county treasurers that are hanging onto
23. the money too long and they have to go out and issue tax
24. anticipation warrants in order to run their taxing bodies.
25. They just want it as promptly as they can get it and we came
26. to the thirty days.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Is there further discussion? Senator Hall. Oh, I'm
29. sorry...Senator Grotberg.

30. SENATOR GROTBORG:

31. Well, thank you, Senator Sangmeister. I believe it
32. was one of our recommendations. It may not have resulted
33. in a bill due to the static about it, but I believe it was

1. one of the recommendations.

2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3. Senator Hall.

4. SENATOR HALL:

5. Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

6. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

7. State your point.

8. SENATOR HALL:

9. I...I'd just like to announce that we...we are honored
10. by having Representative Young on the Floor.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Senator Ozinga. Oh, I'm sorry, that's...well, Gentlemen,
13. Senator Sangmeister was on his closing remarks. Now everybody
14. seems to have popped up all of a sudden. Yes, yes, Senator.

15. I was asked....I asked if there was any further debate, there
16. was none, Senator Sangmeister was on closing arguments and
17. he's proceeded to close. The next action will be the roll
18. call on Senate Bill 606. Those in favor will vote Aye.

19. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. On
20. that question the Ayes...have all voted who wish? Have
21. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question
22. the Ayes are 54, the Nays are 1. Senate Bill 606, having
23. received the constitutional majority is declared passed.

24. Senate Bill 607, Senator Marovitz. For what purpose does
25. Senator Keats arise?

26. SENATOR KEATS:

27. I just was going to say...it's Bill and my bill, if
28. Bill wants to take it, fine by me. You want to take it
29. instead of me? No problem.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

32. SECRETARY:

33. Senate Bill 607.

SB 610
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. (Secretary reads title of bill)
2. 3rd reading of the bill.
3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
4. Senator Marovitz.
5. SENATOR MAROVITZ:
6. Senate Bill 607 specifies the order of preference
7. as to who can execute a contract for an individual to be
8. admitted to a nursing home. The line of priority is
9. the person's parent or guardian, if he is a minor, guardian
10. or agent, if...if such an individual exists or the member
11. of the person's immediate family. The Department of Public
12. Health supports this bill because they believe the family
13. member should be allowed to execute contracts on behalf
14. of family members. The bill is supported by the Department
15. of Public Health, Illinois Council on Long Term Care,
16. Guardianship and Advocacy Commission and Illinois Depart-
17. ment on Aging. I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.
18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
19. The question is shall...I'm sorry, is there further
20. discussion on it? If not, the question is shall Senate
21. Bill 607 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
22. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who
23. wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
24. that question the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, none
25. Voting Present. Senate Bill 607 having received the constitu-
26. tional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 610, Senator
27. Gitz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.
28. SECRETARY:
29. Senate Bill 610.
30. (Secretary reads title of bill)
31. 3rd reading of the bill.
32. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
33. Senator Gitz.

203 6/11
3rd Reading
5-21-81

1. SENATOR GITZ:

2. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. This
3. is the implementation of the sunset report as it applied
4. to weather modification. It was felt clearly by the
5. committee that there was a necessity to have some form of
6. regulation. However, it felt that the absence of licensing
7. and going to a permit system, since this is a rather infrequent
8. use of that activity, would be a better way to go. The
9. original report recommended that these functions be transferred
10. to the Department of Agriculture, that was subsequently
11. amended at the request of the agencies and is now in the
12. Institute of Natural Resources. This is a Sunset Commission
13. recommendation implement and it is a less restrictive way
14. to regulate than what we had to begin with.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. Further discussion? Senator Bloom.

17. SENATOR BLOOM:

18. Yes, this...this is and I would urge both sides of the
19. aisle to support it. Thank you.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. Is there further discussion? If not, the question is
22. shall Senate Bill 610 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye.
23. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all
24. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
25. On that question the Ayes are 53, the Nays are none, none
26. Voting Present. Senate Bill 610, having received the constitu-
27. tional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 611, Senator
28. Gitz. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

29. SECRETARY:

30. Senate Bill 611.

31. (Secretary reads title of bill)

32. 3rd reading of the bill.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Senator Gitz.

2. SENATOR GITZ:

3. In its amended form, Mr. President, members of the
4. Senate, this bill would exempt ordinary savings accounts
5. from the first one thousand dollars from the State Income
6. Tax. I think all of us recognize that there is some serious
7. budget problems at the moment, that's why this bill has
8. an effective date in 1983 for application in that calendar
9. year. It seems to me that we do ourselves a disservice
10. when we argue for the reindustrialization of America and
11. we argue that we need to promote savings and then we turn
12. around and we tax ordinary savings accounts. We have one
13. of the lowest savings rates in the world, compared to our
14. other countries. I think this is a sound and prudent approach
15. when you consider the fact that the rate of return in an
16. ordinary savings account doesn't even begin to approach
17. what the rate of inflation does to it.

18. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

19. Is there further discussion? Senator McMillan.

20. SENATOR McMILLAN:

21. Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise in
22. opposition to the bill, granted it does not begin to take
23. money from the State Treasury until the following fiscal
24. year. But the fact of the matter is, we have before us
25. and we have already voted for a number of worthy tax
26. relief measures. Many of those have already passed and
27. others probably will. There comes a point at which each
28. additional measure of relief becomes that which is too
29. much to allow us to continue to properly fund schools
30. or to continue to properly fund many of the other programs
31. that we have. I think this is one of those, the cost of
32. which is considerable and it really goes too far and I
33. would seek a No vote.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
2. Senator Geo-Karis.
3. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:
4. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I
5. think if we could give an exemption like that, up to a
6. thousand dollars, as the sponsor said, I think it would
7. put more money into circulation. I...I really think,
8. it's not too harsh on the treasury and I think, I know
9. in my area people want it. So, I speak in favor of
10. it.
11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
12. Senator Thomas.
13. SENATOR THOMAS:
14. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.
15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
16. He indicates he will yield.
17. SENATOR THOMAS:
18. Senator Gitz, is this restricted only to savings accounts
19. at savings and loans and not credit unions or...State chartered
20. banks?
21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
22. Senator Gitz.
23. SENATOR GITZ:
24. The language is interest on accounts deposits and savings.
25. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
26. Senator Thomas.
27. SENATOR THOMAS:
28. Well, in reading the Calendar, it just said...where
29. do we go here, just lost a...it did...said that yes, from a
30. savings and loan association situated in Illinois.
31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)
32. Senator Gitz.
33. SENATOR GITZ:

1. Well, it's...it's interest on accounts deposits and
2. savings pursuant to Amendment No. 2 and would apply to
3. banks, savings and loans and I believe credit unions as well.

4. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

5. Senator Berning.

6. SENATOR BERNING:

7. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this.
8. The time has long come, in fact, perhaps gone, when we should
9. have seriously considered some additional help for the
10. beleaguered taxpayers. I submit to you that we sit here and
11. blithely vote away future taxpayers' obligations to the millions
12. of dollars in future pension liability that they're going
13. to have to pay. Let's give them a little relief right now,
14. so they can enjoy their funds before they're...it's taxed
15. away, subsequently to meet those pension obligations.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Is there further discussion? Senator Carroll.

18. SENATOR CARROLL:

19. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
20. the Senate. I too rise in support of...and am very happy
21. with some of the people I seem to be joining for a change.
22. This isn't tax relief as Senator McMillan and others have
23. said, what we're really talking about is an incentive
24. to provide monies to financial institutions so that they
25. can, in fact, loan this out to the communities. You're
26. talking about a deferred effective date, so that, in
27. fact, we will be...be well beyond the cash crunch we
28. now face and can easily afford this lessening of income
29. on a direct basis, which I believe will produce a greater
30. income into the State Treasury because of the incentive
31. it has created. I think this is a very good and innovative
32. idea and I would hope we could all support it.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Senator Lemke.

2. SENATOR LEMKE:

3. I think it's a good bill. I think that it's something
4. we've been urged for...support. And I...I think this is something
5. my people want and most of the people that save money. I think
6. it's going to stop inflation by causing savings. I ask for
7. an Aye vote.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Gitz
10. may close debate.

11. SENATOR GITZ:

12. Thank you. I think the issue has been aired, this
13. bill has been before us, I believe its time has come
14. and I appreciate your favorable response.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. The question is shall Senate Bill 611 pass. Those in
17. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
18. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
19. who wish? Take the record. On that question the Ayes
20. are 39, the Nays are 12, none Voting Present. Senate
21. Bill 611, having received the constitutional majority
22. is declared passed. Senate Bill 612, Senator Sangmeister.
23. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

24. SECRETARY:

25. Senate Bill 612.

26. (Secretary reads title of bill)

27. 3rd reading of the bill.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senators, for your information, we are being filmed
30. on live TV. Permission was granted this morning, so act
31. accordingly. Senator Sangmeister.

32. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

33. Well, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.

1. Simply what the bill does is requires the superintendent of
2. a school district when there's been an attack upon a...a
3. teacher and the teacher requests that that be reported
4. to the local law enforcement authorities that it so be
5. done. I think the increasing number of incidents that we
6. are having in the schools where teachers are being attacked
7. that I think if they want that reported to the law
8. authorities, I think that's a reasonable request and...we
9. ought to do it. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Is there any discussion? Senator Berning.

12. SENATOR BERNING:

13. Question of the sponsor. Would you like to add an amend-
14. ment to this to give them hazardous duty pay like we have been
15. doing to so many others?

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Senator Sangmeister.

18. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

19. Well, if this goes over to the House, why you can talk
20. to the House sponsor over there and see if you can get it
21. on, Senator Berning, not too bad an idea.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Senator Davidson.

24. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

25. Well, I want to give all of you CPR licensed people an
26. opportunity to practice, because I'm going to surprise
27. Sangmeister and rise in support of one of his bills, since
28. he's always saying I'm opposing it. I rise in support of
29. this bill, it's a good bill. I urge an Aye vote.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Is there further discussion? Senator Bruce.

32. SENATOR BRUCE:

33. Yes, I rise in support of this piece of legislation.

1. We've had a violent attack against a teacher here in Springfield
2. just a week ago. Senator Thomas has a bill that's going to
3. require teachers to report drug abuse. I think we're going
4. to find some violent actions against teachers because of
5. that and I think if we're going to require the reporting,
6. we ought to give them the protection they need to do that
7. and stop drug abuse in schools, at the same time protect
8. the teachers who are doing that reporting.

9. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

10. Senator Collins.

11. SENATOR COLLINS:

12. Yes, I...I rise in support of this legislation also.
13. But Senator Sangmeister, I really think the...the period
14. should be shorter than twenty-four hours. I...I really
15. think that that's something that should be, in fact,
16. reported immediately because I can tell you what happened
17. to my niece. They...a young man burst her head, well
18. she was out and had to be hospitalized for three months
19. with a serious skull fracture. And by the time they did
20. get around to it, they didn't even find the young man. So
21. it should be reported immediately.

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. I just want to remind, Senators, you are on live TV.
24. Senator Sangmeister. Is there further discussion? If not,
25. Senator Sangmeister may close debate.

26. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

27. Well...to answer Senator Collins, it says no later than
28. twenty-four hours. But, which does say, it could be up
29. to twenty-four hours too. But I would think that if this
30. becomes law, that the superintendents would report it
31. immediately upon being requested to do so. But we might consider
32. that over in the House if this passes. I would...I think it's
33. a simple bill. It does what it says, I think we ought to put it
34. into law.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. The question is shall Senate Bill 612 pass. Those
3. in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
4. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
5. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
6. that question the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none Voting
7. Present. Senate Bill 612, having received the constitutional
8. majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 614, Senator Marovitz.
9. Senate Bill 617, Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.
10. SECRETARY:

11. Senate Bill 617.

12. (Secretary reads title of bill)

13. 3rd reading of the bill.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Senator Demuzio.

16. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

17. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
18. seven...of the Senate. Senate Bill 617 is a simple bill,
19. we already required...in the Article XVI 155 of the Pension
20. Code that school boards...remit pension contributions within
21. a ten day period. Senate Bill 617 simply requires the school
22. boards to transmit...dues paid to labor organizations within
23. ten business days of the close of the payroll receipt...the
24. payroll period. It...is...it's a simple bill and I'm sure
25. that there will be some discussion as to the intrusion of
26. local school boards, but I don't see why we don't do it
27. for the dues. So I would ask for your favorable support.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Is there further discussion? If not, the question is
30. shall...Senate Bill 617 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye.
31. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all
32. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
33. On that question the Ayes are 40, the Nays are 14, none

SB 618
3rd Reading

1. Voting Present. Senate Bill 617, having received the constitu-
2. tional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 618, Senator
3. Jeremiah Joyce. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

4. SECRETARY:

5. Senate Bill 617.

6. (Secretary reads title of bill)

7. 3rd reading of the bill.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. Senator Joyce.

10. SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

11. Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate.

12. Senate Bill 618 creates the offense of aggravated indecent

13. liberties pursuant to a recommendation of an Illinois

14. Legislative Investigating Commission Study on child abuse.

15. I ask for your favorable support.

16. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

17. Is there any discussion? Mr. Secretary.

18. SECRETARY:

19. I read...I read that as Senate Bill 617, this is Senate
20. Bill 618.

21. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

22. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall

23. Senate Bill 618 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those

24. opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted

25. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On

26. that question the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting

27. Present. Senate Bill 618 having received the constitutional

28. majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 620, Senator Simms.

29. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

30. SECRETARY:

31. Senate Bill 620.

32. (Secretary reads title of bill)

33. 3rd reading of the bill.

1. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

2. Senator Simms.

3. SENATOR SIMMS:

4. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

5. Senate Bill 620, as amended...doubles the exemption for
6. the...surviving spouse on the inheritance tax. After a
7. good committee hearing, the bill did pass out with conference,
8. with Senator Sangmeister and other Senators. It was felt
9. that the most expeditious thing in order to give the
10. relief to the individuals that need it the most are the
11. surviving spouse and something that the State of Illinois
12. could afford within the affordability of our budget. I
13. would urge that the Senate pass six bill...620.

14. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

15. Is there any discussion? Senator Rock. Oh, Senator
16. Grotberg.

17. SENATOR GROTBORG:

18. Being charged with what's left of the money
19. ...in Appropriations, Senator Simms, you have a cost on
20. this bill, to the Treasury of the State of Illinois of
21. some kind?

22. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

23. Senator Simms.

24. SENATOR SIMMS:

25. There's a loss to the State Treasury of eight million
26. dollars.

27. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

28. Senate...Senator Rock.

29. SENATOR ROCK:

30. Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen
31. of the Senate. I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 620.
32. It seems to me we have already, by virtue of Senator Lemke's
33. bill, attempted at least, to afford some equity toward
34. the surviving spouse. Doubling this will directly impact

SB 623
3rd Reading

1. on the State Revenue to the tune of about fifteen million
2. dollars. I...I think we're just going a little too far,
3. too fast. And I would urge a No vote or a Present vote,
4. anything but an Aye vote.

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Simms
7. may close debate.

8. SENATOR SIMMS:

9. Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
10. The bill, as amended, probably is in the same identical
11. language as Senator Lemke's legislation. I would suggest
12. passing both bills and sending them to the House of Representa-
13. tives for the purposes of the opportunity of...relief to
14. the individuals. I'd move for a favorable passage.

15. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

16. The question is shall Senate Bill 620 pass. Those in
17. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting
18. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
19. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question
20. the Ayes are 21, the Nays are 13, 13 Voting Present. Senate
21. Bill 620, having failed to receive a constitutional majority
22. is declared lost. Senate Bill 623, Senator DeAngelis. Read
23. the bill, Mr. Secretary.

24. SECRETARY:

25. Senate Bill 623.

26. (Secretary reads title of bill)

27. 3rd reading of the bill.

28. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

29. Senator DeAngelis.

30. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

31. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of
32. the Senate. Some of you may have read the hand-out that
33. was passed out this afternoon regarding this bill. But

1. briefly, what this bill does, limits the juvenile court's
2. jurisdiction over minors who engage in noncriminal behavior.
3. In other words, if adults were engaging in similar behavior
4. they would not find themselves before the court. Under this
5. bill, the court would still have jurisdiction over those
6. minors for approving or disapproving out of home placement.
7. The current system of handling these minors or status offenders,
8. as they are sometimes called, has several drawbacks. It pulls
9. kids into the Judicial System who really do not belong there.
10. It delays getting them needed social services. It breeds
11. disrespect for the Judicial System and finally the courts
12. are not equipped to provide the social services required to
13. deal effectively with the problems these young people have.
14. And ultimately many of them find themselves progressing
15. up the steps of the juvenile court system. This bill will
16. allow the juvenile courts to focus its attention and resources on
17. dealing with juvenile delinquents. As you know, last year
18. I sponsored the Habitual Juvenile Offender Act, which became
19. a law. It dealt with juvenile delinquents. This bill provides
20. a better and more effective system for dealing with minors
21. who are having problems but who are not...engaging in criminal
22. behavior. This bill came out of Judiciary with no opposition.
23. The Governor's Task Force on Troubled...Adolescents came to
24. the same conclusions as this bill. The bill took a long
25. time in working because there are many affected interest
26. groups in this, but all the agencies that are involved have
27. now come to an agreement and I would particularly like to
28. thank those people who helped me draw up this bill and who have
29. worked so hard for it.

30. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

31. Further discussion? Senator Sangmeister.

32. SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

33. Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senator

1. DeAngelis, take my remarks in the right context because
2. I'm going to vote Present on your bill, but only for one
3. reason and that is, this bill may have very good merits, but
4. this is the first...reform of the Juvenile Court Act that
5. I've seen that has come through Judiciary I and not through
6. Judiciary II and it's not a pride of our committee having
7. to handle it, but I think those type of bills should all be
8. in one committee. Now, there's nothing wrong with Jud I
9. taking a look at it, they think it's fine legislation, that's
10. all right, except in our committee a number of you Senators
11. brought in bills to amend the Juvenile Court Act and I
12. put them all into a subcommittee for the simple reason that
13. we have a committee bill that's going to completely reform
14. the Juvenile Court Act and our first hearing is on August
15. 13th in Chicago on that bill. So I think this, if...this
16. had come to Jud II, it probably would have went into that
17. committee with all the rest of the Senate's bills that on
18. ...on the reform of the Juvenile Court Act and it has no
19. reference at all. I think you've got some merit in your
20. bill. I just...but that's the reason I'm voting Present
21. because that's where that bill, I think, should have gone.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, you wish to
24. close?

25. SENATOR DeANGELIS:

26. Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate
27. Senator Sangmeister's...comments. I do believe, Senator
28. Sangmeister that the bill that you're working on, the
29. Illinois Bar Association comes to almost the same conclusion
30. as this particular element in this part of the law. I urge
31. a favorable roll call.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. The question is shall Senate Bill 623 pass. Those in
34. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The

1. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
2. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
3. question the Ayes are 47, the Nays are none, 7 Voting Present.
4. Senate Bill 623, having received the required constitutional
5. majority is declared passed. Top of Page 19, Senator Simms.
6. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 625.
7. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

8. SECRETARY:

9. Senate Bill 625.

10. (Secretary reads title of bill)

11. 3rd reading of the bill.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Senator Simms.

14. SENATOR SIMMS:

15. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
16. Senate. Senate Bill 625 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code
17. to take care of a problem that I believe is a serious growing
18. problem and that is the individual that is involved in the
19. hit and run accident. It's one of those that's increasing
20. in...problems in the State all over. It's a loss of personal
21. life and injury, et cetera. The bill has been amended, amend-
22. ment prepared by the Secretary of State's Office, Department
23. of Law Enforcement, that the provisions would be after an indivi-
24. dual has been convicted of a hit and run accident of knowingly
25. striking and leaving the scene of an accident of personal
26. injury. Or if property damage in excess of a thousand dollars
27. that has been adjudicated so by a court, the Secretary of
28. State, then upon the conviction would be required then to
29. suspend the driving privileges of that individual. I would
30. urge that this legislation be passed to stop a serious problem, and
31. that is of the hit and run driver.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Any discussion? Senator Marovitz.

1. SENATOR MAROVITZ:
2. Question of the sponsor.
3. PRESIDENT:
4. Indicates he'll yield, Senator Marovitz.
5. SENATOR MAROVITZ:
6. How does this change present law? Under present law
7. does there have to be a suspension upon a conviction of a
8. hit and run?
9. PRESIDENT:
10. Senator Simms.
11. SENATOR SIMMS:
12. Well, at the present time, the Secretary of State
13. does not have discretion to suspend.
14. PRESIDENT:
15. Senator Marovitz.
16. SENATOR MAROVITZ:
17. Does this give him discretion or does this make it
18. mandatory?
19. PRESIDENT:
20. Senator Simms.
21. SENATOR SIMMS:
22. It would be treated in the same way as drunken driving
23. or...or would be mandatory suspension...upon conviction.
24. PRESIDENT:
25. Senator Marovitz.
26. SENATOR MAROVITZ:
27. Yeah...Yeah. In the...in the adjudication in court of a
28. hit and run case, if...if the judge finds the defendant guilty
29. of a hit and run where personal...injury occurs, does he
30. not now presently automatically attach to that a suspension
31. of license? Upon a conviction?
32. PRESIDENT:
33. Senator Simms.

1. SENATOR SIMMS:

2. The Secretary of State's Office informs me, no.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Marovitz.

5. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

6. If that's the case, how did you...you know, I...I'm in
7. total sympathy about what you're saying, Tim and this is
8. a very serious problem. If we have somebody who is a hit
9. and run driver and injured somebody, perhaps killed somebody,
10. and is convicted of same, how did you pick one year as...as
11. opposed to a longer period of time or maybe a permanent
12. suspension of license upon killing somebody and hitting and
13. running?

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Senator Simms.

16. SENATOR SIMMS:

17. I picked out the year, Senator Marovitz, for the simple
18. reason that it coincides with the DWI charge. The simple
19. reason is that some individuals that have been convicted of
20. ...of hitting and run, striking someone, are put on probation
21. but they continue on driving their...their automobile. And I
22. feel that the offense of...of striking and hitting someone, and
23. leaving the scene of an accident is a serious or more serious
24. than a DWI charge.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Senator Marovitz.

27. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

28. Are we not...

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Please conclude your remarks.

31. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

32. Okay. Are we not now if...if a conviction comes from a court
33. action and the court puts the...the defendant on probation, are

1. we not then putting...placing the Secretary of State in the
2. position of being the trier of fact and...position of being
3. a...a part of the Judicial Branch...in actually sentencing
4. the individual?

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Senator Simms.

7. SENATOR SIMMS:

8. In responding to that, Senator, not any more so than they
9. are on the DWI charge. The Secretary of State is bound for
10. suspension, there is a procedure that a person can obtain a
11. ...a Hardship Permit, but I think the same law should be
12. applicable to a hit and run driver as a DWI driver.

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Further discussion? Senator Berman.

15. SENATOR BERMAN:

16. Will the sponsor yield?

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Indicates he'll yield, Senator Berman.

19. SENATOR BERMAN:

20. You've been talking about hit and run driver, I have
21. no problem with that. The Digest talks about leaving a
22. scene of the accident. Now, you can be charged with leaving
23. the scene of the accident without having been the hit and
24. run driver. Does the bill apply to just the charge of leaving
25. the scene of an accident?

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Simms.

28. SENATOR SIMMS:

29. Yes, it does.

30. PRESIDENT:

31. Senator Berman.

32. SENATOR BERMAN:

33. I...I...would suggest that this bill goes much farther.

1. Leaving the scene of the accident, as you've answered, my
2. impression is you don't have to have been the person involved
3. and causing the injury. Now, I'm not going to support a
4. bill that's going to result in a one year mandatory revocation,
5. if you're charged with leaving the scene and you didn't cause
6. the accident. Now, is that what the bill is doing?

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Senator Simms.

9. SENATOR SIMMS:

10. It has to be upon...upon conviction...

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Senator Simms.

13. SENATOR SIMMS:

14. ...upon the conviction of...violation of being the
15. driver of the automobile that struck the individual, Art.
16. I'm sorry, I should have made it more clear.

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Further discussion? Senator Simms, you wish to close?

19. SENATOR SIMMS:

20. I'd ask for a favorable vote.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. The question is shall Senate Bill 625 pass. Those
23. in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
24. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
25. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
26. that question the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, none Voting
27. Present. Senate Bill 625, having received the required
28. constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order
29. of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 629. Read the
30. bill, Mr. Secretary.

31. SECRETARY:

32. Senate Bill 629.

33. (Secretary reads title of bill)

1. 3rd reading of the bill.

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Senator Carroll.

4. SENATOR CARROLL:

5. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
6. Senate. As most of you know, we allow for departments to
7. transfer certain monies in their appropriations between
8. accounts. This deletes from that the item of refunds, which
9. only certain agencies have and which has given them an over-
10. large ability to transfer, I think beyond anybody's under-
11. standing of what, in fact, we want to lose control over.
12. I would think this would want to have unanimous support
13. of the members of the General Assembly. I would ask for
14. a favorable roll call and answer any questions.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. Is there any discussion? Senator Grotberg.

17. SENATOR GROTBORG:

18. Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. He indicates he'll yield, Senator Grotberg.

21. SENATOR GROTBORG:

22. Senator Carroll, has this bill ever been amended or
23. is it just as it says...in the original bill?

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Senator Carroll.

26. SENATOR CARROLL:

27. It is as it says in the original bill drafted by some
28. people from your side at one time. Standing pretty near.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Senator...

31. SENATOR GROTBORG:

32. Very good, I...I understand that. One of the missing
33. links, Senator Carroll is, there's no effective date on this

1. bill, which means that all through this month of summer
2. and August and everything that the...the year we're trying
3. to address and get this kind of a thing going, they get
4. home free. So maybe you just want to take it from the
5. record and...and fix it up in a manner in which it should
6. become accustomed.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Senator Carroll.

9. SENATOR CARROLL:

10. I think just for saving time, Senator Grotberg, this, of
11. course shall become effective January 1, which is better than
12. nothing at all. But we should probably better amend it in the
13. House and have it come back for concurrence to make sure
14. it moves along, because pulling things out of the record
15. right now, isn't the greatest of ideas.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Senator Grotberg.

18. SENATOR GROTBORG:

19. Well, thank you, again...I happen to disagree with you.
20. No, if it were on the Agreed Bill List, I'd pull your's off
21. too, like you did with mine so that we could have gotten
22. at the same problem. If...if you won't cooperate, why
23. I would just suggest that we all vote No and then...maybe...
24. maybe we'll get it amended.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Further discussion? Senator Carroll may close.

27. SENATOR CARROLL:

28. I think, Senator Grotberg, the fact that we are trying
29. to delimit that which is not under your scrutiny and mine,
30. is not a good idea and I think we should, in fact, pass this
31. legislation. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

32. PRESIDENT:

33. The question is shall Senate Bill 629 pass. Those in

633
3rd Reading

1. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting
2. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
3. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question
4. the Ayes are 33, the Nays are 18, 3 Voting Present. Senate
5. Bill 629, having received the required constitutional majority
6. is declared passed. Senator Berman on 632, on the Order of
7. Senate Bills 3rd reading. Senate Bill 632. Read the bill,
8. Mr. Secretary.

9. SECRETARY:

10. Senate Bill 632.

11. (Secretary reads title of bill)

12. 2nd...3rd reading of the bill.

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Senator Berman.

15. SENATOR BERMAN:

16. Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
17. Senate. This bill merely extends the repealer date of
18. the Adult Education Provisions of the School Code and the...
19. and the Community College Act from July 1, '81 to October 1, 1982.
20. Solicit your Aye vote.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Any discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate
23. Bill 632 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
24. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
25. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have
26. all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question the
27. Ayes are 29, the Nays are 21, none Voting Present. Senate
28. Bill 632 having failed to receive...sponsor requests that
29. further consideration be postponed. So ordered. On the
30. Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 633. Read
31. the bill, Mr. Secretary.

32. SECRETARY:

33. Senate Bill 633.

1. (Secretary reads title of bill)

2. 3rd reading of the bill.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Senator Berman.

5. SENATOR BERMAN:

6. This bill amends the Revenue Act and...and inserts a
7. two year statute of limitations for the actions against
8. the shareholders or...or directors of corporations that
9. fail to pay their sales tax. The bill is endorsed by the
10. Department of Revenue. I solicit your Aye vote.

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Any discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate
13. Bill 633 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
14. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
15. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
16. record. On that question the Ayes are 53, the Nays are none,
17. none Voting Present. Senate Bill 633, having received the
18. required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the
19. Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading...on the Order of Senate
20. Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 634. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

21. SECRETARY:

22. Senate Bill 634.

23. (Secretary reads title of bill)

24. 3rd reading of the bill.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Senator Berman.

27. SENATOR BERMAN:

28. Thank you. This bill was introduced earlier this
29. year, you recall, we had to pass emergency legislation because
30. of the Iranian Hostage Holiday that was declared and where
31. it caused a problem with a number of school districts because
32. of their school calendars. That bill we passed and in a very
33. short time. This bill is a follow-up to that, to delete from

1. the prerogative of the Governor the requirement of...of...of
2. declaring other school holidays that are otherwise those
3. that are specified in the School Code at the present time.
4. I believe the Governor's Office is in support of this. It
5. just deletes the requirement of him to...to declare school
6. ...additional school holidays.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Any discussion? Senator Davidson.

9. SENATOR DAVIDSON:

10. Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise in
11. support of this bill. This is a good bill and it still
12. leaves those of you who want a local option, if the local
13. school board wanted to create a special holiday, they could.
14. I urge a Yes vote.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. The question is shall Senate Bill 634 pass. Those in
17. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
18. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
19. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that
20. question the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting Present.
21. Senate Bill 634, having received the required constitutional
22. majority is declared passed. 639, Senator Bruce, on the Order
23. of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate Bill 639. Read the bill,
24. Mr. Secretary.

25. SECRETARY:

26. Senate Bill 639.

27. (Secretary reads title of bill)

28. 3rd reading of the bill.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. Senator Bruce.

31. SENATOR BRUCE:

32. Thank you, Mr. President. This bill makes four minor
33. changes. It changes the time a lease might be filed with
34. the Comptroller from five to fifteen days, removes four

1. classifications and places in the Finance Act from the
2. Bureau of the Budget. Clears up the definition of debt
3. retirement and makes the Office of Governor appointive.

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Any discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate
6. Bill 639 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those
7. opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Who's
8. the appointing power? Have all voted who wish? Have
9. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
10. record. On that question the Ayes are 53, the Nays are
11. 1, none Voting Present. Senate Bill 639, having received
12. the required constitutional majority is declared passed.
13. Senator Weaver, for what purpose do you arise?

14. SENATOR WEAVER:

15. Well is the President of the Senate the appointing
16. power?

17. PRESIDENT:

18. I tried to...I tried to find that out. 641, Senator
19. Degnan. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, the
20. middle of Page 19, Senate Bill 641. Read the bill please,
21. Mr. Secretary.

22. SECRETARY:

23. Senate Bill 641.

24. (Secretary reads title of bill)

25. 3rd reading of the bill.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Senator Degnan.

28. SENATOR DEGNAN:

29. Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 641
30. does exactly as the Calendar says, it changes the due date
31. for regional superintendents' annual reports from August 15th
32. to November 15th, there's no opposition. I move its passage.

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

2. SENATOR NETSCH:

3. Senator Degnan, is this a vehicle bill?

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Senator Degnan.

6. SENATOR DEGNAN:

7. NO ma'am.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. The question is shall Senate Bill 641 pass. Those
10. in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
11. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
12. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
13. that question the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none Voting
14. Present. Senate Bill 641, having received the required
15. constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Nimrod
16. on 642. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading. Senate
17. Bill 642. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

End of Reel

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

1. SECRETARY:

2. Senate Bill 642.

3. (Secretary reads title of bill)

4. 3rd reading of the bill.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Senator Nimrod.

7. SENATOR NIMROD:

8. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
9. Senate. This bill came about as a necessity in order to
10. clarify...the status of the merit grants and the other
11. scholarship grants...that have been awarded to students,
12. so that the net result is that...some of these grants were
13. not included in determining the eligibility or the financial
14. ...ability of the individuals. So, what's happened is this bill
15. then says...directs the scholarship to include that, so, in
16. fact, no students will, in fact, be making money on scholar-
17. ship funds. That...they will be limited by that amount so
18. that all...all scholarships will be considered in determining
19. their eligibility for additional financial assistance.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Any discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

22. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

23. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senator
24. Nimrod, I do not disagree with your bill, but I do have a
25. question for you. How are you going to be able to implement
26. this if the academic scholarships are awarded after the
27. financial awards are made?

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Nimrod.

30. SENATOR NIMROD:

31. Well, the...I talked about that to the Scholarship Com-
32. mission and since we have set up the deadlines, I understand
33. that they are taking that into consideration and they will

1. be implemented and included...before that period.

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Senator DeAngelis.

4. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

5. I do not think that's possible. The only way that it
6. could possibly be implemented is that you make the...academic
7. awards prospective that they be notified in the early part
8. of their senior year rather than after graduation. And the
9. monies are not funded on that basis. It would require a
10. change in the appropriation in order to do it.

11. PRESIDENT:

12. Senator Nimrod.

13. SENATOR NIMROD:

14. I...I don't think it...it has anything to do, Senator
15. DeAngelis, with the appropriation itself. What it's doing,
16. in this case, is saying that the students, themselves, will
17. not be receiving...when those awards are being made in...in
18. finances, if they received a...received a...merit scholar-
19. ship afterwards, they will not be getting that in addition
20. ...their monies when they are awarded will be reduced by
21. that amount of that scholarship award, so that they will be
22. covered for their expenses, but they will not be getting more
23. than what they were allowed at the time.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Senator DeAngelis.

26. SENATOR DEANGELIS:

27. Okay, I have no opposition, but what you're really
28. saying is that they don't know whether they're going to
29. get it or not, but if they get it, then you're going to
30. reduce the award by that amount and then are you going to
31. redistribute all that money in the event that they had
32. received financial...a monetary award to begin with?

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Senator Nimrod.

2. SENATOR NIMROD:

3. Yeah. Senator DeAngelis, there's...there's no reduction
4. in the amount of money they're going to get, because, in fact,
5. if they're awarded a scholarship that awards them the full
6. tuition,...then they get a merit scholarship they would not
7. be getting any additional monies at all. So, it wouldn't
8. be any money that's being returned. So, that the individuals
9. ...all we're doing is including in the financial...accounta-
10. bility that amount...or that merit scholarship so that they
11. do not exceed the maximum amount. So, that they...let's
12. say they were getting...eighteen hundred dollars was the
13. full tuition and they were getting twelve hundred, they
14. would get that additional six hundred dollars to the eighteen
15. hundred, which would be less than the thousand dollars of the
16. merit scholarship. So, in no way would there be addi-
17. tional monies to distribute. The only thing is that this
18. would prevent the individual student from receiving any
19. more than the maximum of the tuition.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall
22. Senate Bill...I beg your pardon, Senator Bruce.

23. SENATOR BRUCE:

24. Well, I...I think Senator DeAngelis has a good point and
25. ...we ought to send this out of here and send it over to
26. the House, but I...I think both of you ought to just take a
27. look about...leaving the stricken language in the bill and
28. adding the word, "non-State financial assistance" and then
29. saying that when they give an ISSC grant, then they should
30. use that State financial aid in determining eligibility for
31. a scholarship. I think if you leave in both sentences
32. you do what all of us, I think, want to do.

33. PRESIDENT:

1. Further discussion? Senator Nimrod, do you wish to
2. close?

3. SENATOR NIMROD:

4. Yeah. Senator Bruce, if that should be necessary, we
5. can do that in the House and I'd be glad to do it. Other-
6. wise, I ask for a favorable roll call.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. The question is, shall Senate Bill 642 pass. Those in
9. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
10. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
11. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
12. that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, 2 Voting
13. Present. Senate Bill 642 having received the required
14. constitutional majority is declared passed. 643, Senator
15. Marovitz. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate
16. Bill 643. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

17. SECRETARY:

18. Senate Bill 643.

19. (Secretary reads title of bill)

20. 3rd reading of the bill.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Senator Marovitz.

23. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

24. Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and
25. Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a bill which was drafted
26. by the Chicago Title and Trust Company and amends the section
27. relating to the condominium plat and simply changes the
28. reference to the building in that section to read, "any
29. building on the parcel." The bill would allow the submission
30. to the Act of recreational vehicle parks, motor home parks,
31. modular home developments, marine and open parking lots,
32. to mention just a few that would create cubes of air so
33. that they would come under the Condominium Property Act.

1. This is just a technical...amendment to the legislation. I
2. would ask for an affirmative roll call.

3. PRESIDENT:

4. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate
5. Bill 643 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed
6. will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
7. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the
8. record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none,
9. 1 Voting Present. Senate Bill 643 having received the required
10. constitutional majority is declared passed. 644, Senator
11. Marovitz. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, Senate
12. Bill 644. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

13. SECRETARY:

14. Senate Bill 644.
15. (Secretary reads title of bill)
16. 3rd reading of the bill.

17. PRESIDENT:

18. Senator Marovitz.

19. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

20. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
21. Senate. This...the digest or.the...or the Calendar is
22. probably totally incorrect regarding this bill. It has
23. nothing to do with cannabis whatsoever. This bill...just
24. raises the amount for...criminal damage to property for a
25. felony from a hundred and fifty to three hundred dollars to
26. be consistent with what we did a little bit earlier regarding
27. ...the amount for a felony, which hasn't been changed in a
28. long time and I would ask for an affirmative vote on this
29. bill.

30. PRESIDENT:

31. Senator Geo-Karis, for...any discussion? Senator Geo-
32. Karis.

33. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

1. Will the...sponsor yield to a question?

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Indicates he will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

4. SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

5. Then, if I understand you correctly, Senator Marovitz,
6. there is absolutely no reference to cannabis or marijuana
7. or anything else in your bill at the present time?

8. PRESIDENT:

9. Senator Marovitz.

10. SENATOR MAROVITZ:

11. That is correct. Everything after the enacting clause
12. was struck in that portion of the bill.

13. PRESIDENT:

14. The question is, shall Senate Bill 644 pass. Those in
15. favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The
16. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
17. who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On
18. that question, the Ayes are 45, the Nays are 5, 3 Voting
19. Present. Senate Bill 644 having received the required
20. constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator
21. Shapiro, the Chair would observe we've gone through about
22. seventy bills and the next one is collective bargaining.
23. I don't, frankly, feel like getting into collective bargaining
24. at a quarter to six. We have a...an...an emergency bill,
25. if I can have the attention of the Body,...we have an
26. emergency appropriation bill, which we should send over
27. ...on page 30 of the Calendar...page 30 on the Calendar.
28. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd reading, there is an
29. emergency appropriation, Senate Bill 870...870. Senator
30. Grotberg, are we ready? On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd
31. reading, the middle of page 30, Senate Bill 870. Read the
32. bill, Mr. Secretary.

33. SECRETARY:

1. Senate Bill 870.

2. (Secretary reads title of bill)

3. 3rd reading of the bill.

4. PRESIDENT:

5. Senator Grotberg.

6. SENATOR GROTEBERG:

7. Thank you, Mr. President and fellow Senators. Senate
8. Bill 870..has become a tiny Christmas tree of emergency
9. appropriations, all of which have like a June 30th...June
10. 1st deadline. First of all, in the Dangerous Drugs Com-
11. mission it transfers five hundred thousand from among
12. various grants to complete the FY '81, all Federal funds
13. so...the new State fund...no new State funding. And
14. Amendment No. 2 we did yesterday for DOT to convert and
15. ...shift funds from General Revenue to B Bonds and advancing
16. B Bonds from '82 of...to FY '81 to capture thirty-eight
17. millions in Federal Capital Assistance Funds for transit.
18. Amendment No. 3 was asked by the Treasurer to increase
19. debt service by eight hundred thousand dollars to maintain
20. our Triple A Bond Rating and No. 4 was banks and trusts
21. for a transfer of twenty-one thousand dollars. If there
22. are no questions, I'd move...for a favorable roll call
23. on the Senate Bill.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Any discussion? Senator Buzbee.

26. SENATOR BUZBEE:

27. Thank you, Mr. President. We rise in support of this
28. bill. It is an emergency situation that we need to get...
29. onto the Governor's Desk as soon as possible. And I
30. would ask for a favorable vote.

31. PRESIDENT:

32. Further discussion? Senator Totten. Senator Totten.

33. SENATOR TOTTEN:

1. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to
2. this bill. With the amendment that was put on yesterday,
3. this bill now becomes an RTA transportation measure and
4. I'm surprised the sponsor has even called these...this bill.
5. This bill provides a subsidy, now, to the...RTA and,...as
6. amended,...this bill not...no longer is an emergency,...
7. it becomes...a giveaway and a out-and-out State subsidy...
8. to the RTA Transportation System. And I would suggest that
9. the members look carefully at this and if the sponsor wants
10. to reconsider calling it, he ought to,...because we ought
11. not to pass this measure.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Further discussion? Senator Berning. No Senator
14. Berning. Senator Bruce.

15. SENATOR BRUCE:

16. Just...what is the nature of the emergency in purchasing
17. the twenty-four busses? Senator Grotberg. What...what
18. is the nature of the emergency that we have to purchase
19. twenty-four busses in the next...couple hours? Where are
20. we on RTA busses?

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Senator Grotberg.

23. SENATOR GROTBORG:

24. Well, I appreciate that particular question, Senator.
25. I presume we could have articulated it for any kind of
26. transportation needs. This would follow whatever organization
27. comes out of RTA. The facts are that by June 1st thirty-
28. eight million dollars is going to go to forty-nine states
29. other than Illinois if we don't capture them. I don't
30. really give a darn what we use them for if we...if we can
31. get the money into Illinois. The way the DOT bought...brought
32. the amendment to us, of course, and you have the same copy
33. as I do, Senator, there's...a hundred and twenty full-sized

1. busses for the CTA, some engineering for twelve stations
2. for the RTA, and some RTA bus grants for downstate Joliet,
3. Nortran, and Wilmette. Now, they had to put something in
4. their request and I'm sure this is what they put. It's
5. equipment capital transfer...or capital funding from the
6. Feds and...I suppose they care less that we're having a
7. big debate here in Illinois over mass transit. I have
8. no quarrel with the amendment, myself. I gather that
9. some people on my side of the...aisle may take exception
10. to that. The time to do it was yesterday when we were
11. amending the bill.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Further discussion? Senator Berning.

14. SENATOR BERNING:

15. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm...I am indebted to Senator
16. Totten for having been alert enough or somehow been given
17. a copy of this amendment so at least he knew what it was
18. and could bring it to our attention. I would be the last
19. one to vote for a bill like this for more busses. If
20. there's anybody...needs busses, come up and take them out
21. of Lake County, they're running around there empty all day
22. long. We don't need them and I can't see any reason for
23. spending any money to buy any more busses.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

26. SENATOR DEMUZIO:

27. Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen
28. of the Senate. I am reliably informed that the twenty-four
29. busses are for the transportation of the troops, the...the
30. ...the Humboldt...Park Volunteers, the Englewood Rough Riders, and
31. the Uptown Regiment, the Bridgeport...Brigade, and this is
32. the part of the invasion...of...of downstate, I'm told.

33. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

1. Further discussion? Senator Philip.

2. SENATOR PHILIP:

3. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
4. Senate. I don't know about your side of the aisle, but we
5. do not have the amendment, Mr. President. In view of that,
6. I would suggest that the sponsor take it out of the record.

7. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

8. Senator Collins.

9. SENATOR COLLINS:

10. Senator Grotberg offered this amendment and explained
11. it, I think, on 2nd reading very thoroughly. Yes...yes,
12. he did. But let me...let me just say this...the whole issue
13. here is not whether or not you are for or against RTA,
14. but I think whoever drafted the amendment recognized that
15. they had to submit something to the Federal Government in
16. order to capture that money. Now, if you feel that we
17. don't need that money, then you vote against the bill.
18. But I can't see how any of you can...can sit here and
19. vote against the...the appropriation when at the same time
20. we are experiencing very serious financial difficulties and
21. a lack of financial resources to fund the RTA. Whether we
22. buy busses or not, we still need the money.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator Carroll.

25. SENATOR CARROLL:

26. Well, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen
27. of the Senate. I'm sorry we sought to accommodate Dr. Bob,
28. but it's based on his letter and Secretary Kramer's specific
29. request that this amendment was put on. It seems to me one
30. of the things Dr. Bob and the secretary were attempting to
31. do, was to change from General Revenue funds to Series B
32. Bond funds. Were we not to do this, we would be using,
33. already, General Revenue to buy these items. That's part

1. of the DOT plan, apparently. This at...at Secretary Kramer
2. and Dr. Bob's request was put onto this bill, and, I think,
3. you have the copy of the letter from Dr. Bob to Secretary
4. John, who asked us to do this and do it this way and
5. to do it by Series B Bonds. If we've made the mistake of
6. listening to the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of
7. Transportation, I apologize, but generally on these types
8. of emergencies we've attempted to accommodate the Republican
9. Administration.

10. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

11. Senator Rock.

12. SENATOR ROCK:

13. Yes, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen
14. of the Senate. I think the transportation hysteria that...
15. appears to be rampant over there, this has nothing to do
16. ...with operating subsidies for the Regional Transportation
17. Authority. These are capital expenditures, which if not
18. captured by us are going to be divvied up among other
19. states. And to lose this kind of money is...is ridiculous.
20. There is, in fact, an operating subsidy for the Downstate
21. Transit System, eight thousand dollars because of Danville's
22. bus system and twenty-nine thousand for the overall fund
23. for...audit adjustments,...they're on a one-third funding
24. basis and they adjust...based on an audit. So,...of the
25. total there's twenty-nine and eight thousand dollars. The
26. other is strictly capital money made available by the Federal
27. Government, which we can capture if we can get the job
28. done by June 1st. To hold this up just seems to be cutting
29. off our nose to spite our face and I just simply don't
30. understand it.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator Bruce.

33. SENATOR BRUCE:

1. I...Senator Rock, I guess in response to your question
2. is, when did we get the letter? I'm going to say...it's
3. April the 9th we got the letter, it's now May the 21st...
4. well...

5. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

6. Senator Rock, state your point.

7. SENATOR ROCK:

8. Well, the...the officials from the Department of Trans-
9. portation were in my office just a day and a half or so ago
10. explaining this problem and the...and the urgency of it.

11. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

12. Senator Bruce.

13. SENATOR BRUCE:

14. I guess the problem is, no one wants to lose...cap-
15. turing the Federal money. Everyone wants to know when
16. did all this scenario start. Now, what I've been reading
17. in the newspapers is, that almost all the Federal trans-
18. portation money is expired and gone away. And...and if
19. we can capture more money that's fine, but I think we are
20. owed...some sort of explanation as to when did the Secretary
21. of Transportation have knowledge of the fact that we should
22. be about this business and to have a bill put in, come in
23. by amendment and...and purchase a hundred and fifty-nine
24. busses. We are talking about, in addition to the construction,
25. a hundred and fifty-nine new busses for that facility. I
26. think we are owed a fairly detailed...explanation of when
27. did the Department of Transportation in Washington make the
28. money available, when did the Secretary of Transportation
29. in Illinois become aware of it, when did he notify the legis-
30. lative leaders and what exactly does the Governor plan to
31. do this...with this when it hits his desk? Those are not
32. unreasonable questions when we're talking about spending
33. this much money. And for those who were worried about

1. downstate, it's...it is a...it is interesting that of
2. the nine million dollars downstate is to...to go along
3. with this because we're going to suck up the grand sum of
4. thirty-four thousand. And, you know, I'm willing to play
5. peanut and elephant trick, but we always have to feed the
6. elephant. And for thirty-four thousand dollars I'm not
7. willing to swallow a 9.5 million dollar bond and expend-
8. iture. They got four million in the budget right now,
9. what other kind of things should we do to make sure they
10. find the other money? But just to say willy-nilly,
11. 9.5 million late in the day, I'd like to hear some more
12. explanation.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Senator Weaver.

15. SENATOR WEAVER:

16. Thank you, Mr. President. I think that the local
17. match, whether it's downstate or RTA-CTA, is paid by the
18. State. It's understood that this was the agreement, if
19. there's Federal monies available and they feel that we
20. need this downstate match...or this State match to...
21. garner the...the...Federal monies, why, I think we
22. probably should approve it.

23. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

24. Senator...Rhoads.

25. SENATOR RHOADS:

26. Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate.
27. Senator Bruce and others; apparently the hubbub is this
28. letter that...Secretary Kramer received on April 9th from
29. D.J. Mitchell, the Director of the Office of Transit...at
30. UMTA, in which he says that all Section III grants that have
31. been programmed in our regional program plan will be approved
32. by May 31st. Now, we do happen to have some contacts with
33. the current administration, one of our Senators over here

1. even knows the fellow who runs the whole place, and I'm sure
2. some phone calls can be made, that's number one. Number two,
3. is that the House has adjourned until next Tuesday. They
4. can't take action on this tomorrow. I just don't see what
5. the urgency is on taking action on this particular bill today.
6. It does fall within the category of overall mass transit.
7. We have a lot of other considerations to...to be made here.
8. I don't see that...this amendment came up on our blind side
9. yesterday, I don't recall that it was distributed on our
10. desks. And it was amended only yesterday. I don't see any
11. harm at all in waiting until next Tuesday to act on this
12. bill.

13. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

14. Senator Egan.

15. SENATOR EGAN:

16. Well,...let's vote on it. Let's vote it up or down.

17. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

18. Senator, we have two other speakers that wish to speak.
19. Senator Walsh, Carroll and Grotberg. Senator Walsh.

20. SENATOR WALSH:

21. Well, Mr. President and members of the Senate, it would
22. seem to me this is something on which we can...we can hold
23. off for awhile. Everyone knows that...the problem with...
24. with the RTA is the CTA and the problem with the CTA is the
25. busses. If we buy all these busses we're going to have to...
26. get some people to operate them and...get some people to
27. fix them and...all this money for capital improvements
28. isn't such a...isn't always such a good idea. As a matter
29. of fact, I'm not so sure I'd buy these busses with Senator
30. Egan's money, so I think we ought to hold off on them.

31. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

32. Senator Carroll.

33. SENATOR CARROLL:

1. Thank you, Mr. President. I believe...I've spoken once
2. if Senator Grotberg hasn't, I would await my turn.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. I thought it was Senator Grotberg's bill and he's to
5. be called in closing.

6. SENATOR CARROLL:

7. Okay. Then if I may proceed, the problem here is, again,
8. this was brought to us by the Department of Transportation
9. yesterday to add onto other emergency matters, which includes
10. not only changing...wait a minute...let me finish one more
11. thing. You know, we got hung up on this part on transportation,
12. which is using B Bonds instead of General Revenue, which
13. would otherwise be required. But let us not forget that we
14. have an interest payment to make on some bonds on June 1st.
15. The Treasurer needs the authority for three million two
16. hundred forty-five thousand four hundred dollars or else we
17. go in default on bonds of the State of Illinois on June 1st.
18. That's in this...in Amendment No. 2. I think it would be
19. a dangerous thing for us to await the President of the
20. United States to bail out our bonds from the State Treasury
21. in addition to the public transportation problem. I don't
22. know that he will loan us that money to make that interest
23. payment and I think we have to move this bill along.

24. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

25. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Grotberg
26. may close debate.

27. SENATOR GROTBORG:

28. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I've enjoyed this de-
29. bate. I think we'd been...saved time by going to...to...collective
30. bargaining, President Rock. Having voted on the prevailing
31. side, I would...move to take this thing back to the Order of
32. 2nd reading, remove the DOT amendment and...move the substance
33. of the bill out, except it was the last vehicle in town and

1. having done that, Mr. President, I'd like to take it out
2. of the record till tomorrow morning.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

4. Take it out of the record. Senator Rock.

5. SENATOR ROCK:

6. Move we adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow
7. morning.

8. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

9. You've heard the motion. All those in favor indicate
10. by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The
11. Senate stands adjourned until Friday morning, ten o'clock.
12. For what purpose does Senator Philip...

13. SENATOR PHILIP:

14. A purpose of an announcement, Mr. President. I know
15. I'm easy to overlook. We have the Senate...the great
16. Senate softball team has practice tonight at 6:30 at
17. Springfield High School, Capitol and New Street. Two
18. and a half blocks west of the Stratton Building. Hope
19. that all the baseball players would show up. Thank you.

20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

21. Senator Gitz, also, has a quick announcement.

22. SENATOR GITZ:

23. The State Government Reorganization Committee will
24. meet. We will start at 6:00. We hope to conclude our
25. business by the hour of seven o'clock. I strongly
26. suggest that everyone who is a member of that committee
27. be there, because the Governor's perspective amendments,
28. the substantive legislation will be discussed. The State
29. Government Reorganization Committee meeting will be held
30. in Room 212.

31.

32.

33.