69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "The House will come to order and the Members will be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer today by Reverend John Worten from the Winnetka Bible Church in Winnetka, Illinois."

Reverend Worten: "This morning I'm going to pray on behalf of the people for you and you may indicate your affirmation of my prayer by your Amen. Let us pray. Almighty God, the final and perfect lawgiver, we bow in Your presence this morning and praise You that Your will for mankind is good, Your law is just and righteous and You have communicated Your laws to man for our good. And we praise You as the scripture says that righteousness You have loved, that lawlessness You hate. And I pray this morning for these to whom You have invested the divine prerogative of lawmaking. I pray for them, Oh God, as they do their work, that they would do it well to their satisfaction. I would pray that as they pursue their objectives by their Bills, their positions and their votes that You would allow them to accomplish the true objectives that they have in their minds. I pray that they would act in a deeply principled way. I would pray that during the discussion this day and throughout the end of this Session that there would be not so much compromise that no merit survives and not so much contension that no progress is made. I pray, Oh Lord, that they would provide leadership for their constituency while remaining responsive to the desires of their constituents. for this Session I ask for wisdom, for courage for them, for a spirit of statesmanship, and we pray it in the name of the one who is the perfect lawgiver and the judge, the sovereign God. Amen."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. Representative Hannig will lead the pledge this morning."

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- Hannig: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of
 America and to the Republic for which it stands. One
 nation, under God, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice
 for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. We'll have a report from Representative Kulas on the golf game this morning. Representative Kulas, would you... glad to have you back with us this morning on time. Did you... What did you shoot?"
- Kulas: "Didn't quite make it this morning, Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "I didn't hear you."
- Kulas: "I didn't quite make it to the golf course this morning because I didn't want to be late."
- Speaker Ryan: "Tried to be a big Greek last night, I'll bet.

 Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 171 Members answering the

 Roll. A quorum of the House is present. Representative

 Telcser, do you have any excused absences?"
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Margalus is absent because of illness."
- Speaker Ryan: "Record will so indicate. Representative Getty, do you have any excused absences?"
- Getty: "Representative Redmond, due to illness in the family,
 please."
- Speaker Ryan: "Record will so indicate. On the Calendar on page three under the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Appropriation Bills appears Senate Bill 308, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 308, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf (J. J.): "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 The Senate Bill 308, which is the OCE for the Department of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Agriculture has a total of 39... pardon me, 41,485,590 dollars. That is a 1.2% increase over fiscal year '81. I believe it was thoroughly discussed before on Second Reading and I would move for its passage."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Kulas: "Is there a line item in this appropriation for the weather modification program?"

Wolf: "For what, a weather modification program did you say?"

Kulas: "The weather modification."

Wolf: "No. Not for mushrooms either, Myron."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "I'd just ask for a favorable vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 308 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 309, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 309, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Health Finance Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the budget for the health finance authority and it also includes the appropriation for the Department of Aging. The 568,400 dollars for the Health Finance Authority and the Department of Aging has 9,450,300 dollars. Pardon me. I'm looking at the wrong column. That was a change. 61,130,100 dollars. That was the Department of Aging.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

That is an increase of 3/10 of a percent in general revenue funds and 21.4% in other funds. There is no change on the Health Finance Authority in GRF and an increase in other funds of 40.2%. I would ask a favorable vote of the Members of the House."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 309 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 119 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 311, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 311, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the Dangerous Drug Commission's OCE for FY '82. The Bill. amended, total dollars in GRF is 10,445,600 dollars and in federal 6,510,500 for a total of 16,956,100 dollars. was one Amendment added in the House sponsored Representatives Matijevich and Davis which added money for a residential treatment line for clients under the program which is a treatment alternative to street crime. That was 675,000 dollars. The head count Department is lower than it was last year. It was 109 employees last year. This year it's 103 and I would ask the favorable votes of the Members of the House."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 311 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 312, Representative Wolf."

clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veteran Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, this is the budget appropriating 20,508,700 dollars for the OCE for the Department of Veteran Affairs. That is the same as it passed the Senate. There has been no change. That is a total amount and I would ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 312 pass?'. All those favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present''. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 314, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 314, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Guardianship Advocacy Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, the Senate Bill 314 is the ordinary and contingent expenses appropriation for the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission for FY '82. The total amount is 3,146,300 dollars. That is 372,500 less than the fiscal year '81 appropriation. The number of employees, the head count has

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- dropped 20. There's a total of 113 which is 20 less than last year. I would ask the favorable support of the Members of this House."
- any discussion? Speaker Ryan: "Is there Ouestion is. 'Shall Senate Bill 314 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present''' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 315, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This is the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention. Their FY '82 appropriation is 3,557,300 dollars. That is 72,200 dollars less than they had last year in their FY '81 appropriation. Their head count has been reduced by 12. Last year there were 97 employees. This year there are 85. I would ask your support again."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, there may be some little problem with that.

 Could we take that Bill out of the record...315."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 319, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 319, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to have this

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- Bill brought back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. I think Mr. Matijevich has a technical Amendment and there's on other."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 319 to
 the Order of Second Reading. Are there objections?
 Hearing none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 319 is now on
 Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Matijevich, amends Senate Bill 319 as amended."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich on Amendment #5."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is an agreed Amendment.

 There's no dollar change. It's a technical Amendment requested by the Office of the Comptroller to ensure funds reappropriated in Section 1A are accurately identified. I move for the adoption of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 319."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Giglio.

 Any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of

 Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 319. All in favor will signify

 by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and

 the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Stanley, amends Senate Bill 319 as amended."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Stanley asked me if I would handle this Amendment for him, and, with leave of the House, I would proceed. This Amendment adds 12,100 dollars to the Department of Nuclear Safety for proper disposal of some radioactive wastes that are in west Chicago. I would move the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 319. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Further

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "I was going to ask, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 35C, the Bill has been read a third time. I was wondering if we could just handle it right now."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to have Senate Bill 319 heard immediately. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 319."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The total dollars on this appropriation for the Department of Nuclear Safety is approximately 4,332,400 dollars. That is a total change of 9.1%. It's 1/3 general revenue funds and 2/3 are the earmarked funds and the total, again, is 4,332,400 dollars. There is a decrease in the head count over previous years. It was 67 last year. It's decreased to 51 this year and I would ask the House's support on on this Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 319 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present''. Representative Bower aye. 156 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present''' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 319, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill. 328, Representative : Wolf. Representative Wolf, out of the record. 329, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 329, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Third Reading of the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 329."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loan. The total amount of this Bill is 1,050,800 dollars which is a decrease of 2.5%. The money... There's no change in the head count. They remain at 33 and most of this money, of course, is generated by the fees charged to the savings and loans and the financial institutions. I would ask the favorable support of the House on this Senate Bill 329."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 329 pass?'. All in favor will signify voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 330, Representative Wolf."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 330, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. The total amount is 13,892,200 dollars. The head count on this Department is a reduction of five. They had 63 last year. They have 58 this year. There's a total decrease in their appropriation of 2.9% as introduced and I would ask the favorable support of this House."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Leverenz, on Senate Bill 330."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "The Director, he has got his main office located in where?"

Wolf: "In Marion. A fine city in southern Illinois, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Where is his secretary located?"

Wolf: "We believe it's in Marion."

Leverenz: "I got you there. It's in Springfield."

Wolf: "I said I believed it was. If you knew the answer, why did you ask me?"

Leverenz: "I just wanted to make sure you knew. Was there more money put in for a couple of people to be floating coordinators? I just want to make sure that's not in there."

Wolf: "To be what?"

Leverenz: "They were to be floating coordinators."

Wolf: "No."

Leverenz: "Oh, that Amendment was withdrawn?"

Wolf: "Yes, I believe the shot from southern Illinois withdrew that Amendment."

Leverenz: "The Committeeman from southern Illinois withdrew that one. Do you think there will ever be a resolution to Mr.

Jones moving to Springfield where the rest of his staff is?"

Wolf: "Only if you introduce one, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Does he have a computer terminal in Marion, Illinois as the Court of Claims has one?"

Wolf: "Not yet."

Leverenz: "It's only a matter of time. Thank you, Sponsor."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "I would just ask the favorable votes of this House, Mr. Speaker."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 330 pass?'.

 All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'''. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 331, Representative Wolf. Senate Bill 331, yes, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 331, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This is the Department of Registration and Education. The total amount contained in this budget 8,253,500 dollars. That is an increase of 6% over last years budget. The head count in this agency is 255 which nine employees less than they had in PY '81. Most all of this money is, of course, in GRF, but there is money that comes from the Medical Disciplinary Fund and the Dental Disciplinary Fund and I would ask the favorable support of the Members of this House."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 331 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 139 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no' and none voting 'present''. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 330, Representative Wolf. Senate Bill 332, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 332."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary contingent expenses for the Department of Personnel for 1982. The total amount now is 128,168,200 dollars. That's a little increase which was added by Amendment yesterday as this House saw fit to increase the insurance line by 8.6 million dollars in order to keep the same insurance contract for the state employees as we had in the previous year. The number of employees, I believe, is projected to be some 25 less than last year. projected to be 510 this year. It was at 535 last year and I would ask the support of this House."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 332 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I only wanted the record to show that in the Committee I posed a question to the Director of the Department of Personnel relative to the group insurance and if the contract had been signed and he said, 'No, we're waiting to determine legislative intent'. And that's when I had said to him that I intended to introduce the Amendment which Ed McBroom had spoken on the floor about. We have adopted that Amendment and I'd like the record to show that, by the passage of this Bill, that this House feels strongly that we ought to upgrade the insurance, group insurance, so that we retain the present level of benefits. We feel that as employers we ought to do that and we are so doing by the passage of this Bill with the Amendment offered by myself, Ed McBroom and Ellis Levin. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Have all voted

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Record me as 'aye', would you please? On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'''. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 340, Representative Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Environmental Protection Agency. the As Bi 11 left the House Appropriations Committee, it was 240,587,400 dollars. We added some 200...We added some 250,000 here on the floor with House Amendments. Most of it GRF money that was added, of course, is matching dollars which will be matched by some federal dollars. So the total amount would be about 240,800,000 dollars approximately."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Wolf, was there any discussion in Committee as to EPA's ability to purchase the building they are now in? I understand that their rent is skyrocketing and that they could possibly purchase it and save some money for the state."

Wolf: "Not that I recall."

Darrow: "According to our staff analysis, that would have been a possibility. Perhaps we should look into it sometime in the future. Thank you."

Wolf: "If there are any further questions, Mr. Bower is the Subcommittee Chairman on that particular area. If I can't

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

answer them, maybe Mr. Bower could."

Darrow: "Then I'll direct the question to Mr. Bower."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bower."

Darrow: "Was the... During the Committee proceedings, was there any discussion as to EPA purchasing the building in which they now are residing? It's my understanding from our staff analysis that they're paying quite a bit of rent and that that will be going up each year, and that they could possibly save the state some money by purchasing the building."

Bower: "To the best of my recollection, there was absolutely no discussion of that on the part of any person."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The head count, by the way, on this particular Department is down by 18 employees over last fiscal year and I would ask the favorable support and votes of the Members of this House."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 340 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. CLerk. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 343, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 343, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Capital

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Development Board. They were introduced at 7.060.900 The Senate made some reduction bringing that figure down to 6,971,600 dollars. The House concurred with that action so there were no changes made and that's the way the Bill stands now. That was in GRF. There is school construction money, of course, of 13.2 thousand dollars. So that's a total of 6,984,800 dollars. They have an increase in head count of three over the previous year. The Bill, like most of these others, did pass out of the Appropriation Committee by a unanimous vote of 20 nothing and I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion. Representative Robbins."

 Robbins: "On the Capital Development Board thing, Jake. At the

 present time, why do we have a Board which sets up bids

 which only one party can bid on?"
- Wolf: "Representative, it's my understanding it's been open bidding and I..."
- Robbins: "They set the specifications so that only one company can qualify."
- Wolf: "That may be in the specific instance which sometimes happen where the specs for a particular contra... I have no idea which contract you're referring to, but many times specifications are set forth by an agency or by anyone and sometimes only one or two particular bidders can meet those qualifications."
- Robbins: "In the meeting with staff that I had, and another Representative attended, they said it was their intent to set them so that only one company could bid on some specific items. And drawing the... and requiring them to be drawn in their blueprints. Now, I feel like the business of the state should be open and competitive bidding which is required by law. And if they're going to circumvent this bidding by the specification requirements,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

then I think we should take a close look at this agency and their budget."

Wolf: "I would concur that all bidding should be open to anyone who cares to bid. I know Representative Winchester is our Subcommittee Chairman of that particular area. I'm not sure if he is aware of anything like that and I'm certain that, if that is the case, I would strongly urge the Members, of course, of the Appropriation Committee to take a very strong look at that in the future."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "No further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 343 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Celeste Stiehl in the Chair."

Speaker Stiehl: "Senate Bill 344. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 344, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State and Southern Illinois University for permanent improvements, grants and related purposes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madame Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent of the House, leave of the House, to have this Bill returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of some technical Amendments."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Is leave granted? Leave granted. Second Reading. Are there any

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, Winchester, amends Senate Bill 344 as amended."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Madame Chairman.. or Madame Speaker.

Amendment #8 makes technical corrections in the Department of Transportations reappropriation regarding Section references that were inadvertently ommitted in the original Amendment and I would move 'do adopt'."

Speaker Stiehl: "Is there any discussion on this Amendment?

Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rule 55B so that while you are in the Chair, we may address you as Madame Speaker."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the appropriate rule while I am in the Chair. Does he have leave? Leave granted. Thank you. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Could the Sponsor restate his explanation of the Amendment?"

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, Madame Speaker, Amendment #8 makes technical corrections in the Department of Transportation reappropriation regarding Section references that were inadvertently ommitted in the original Amendment."

Leverenz: "If we ... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Winchester: "Yes, he would."

Leverenz: "Thank you. If we did not adopt this Amendment, what would the impact or what would not get done?"

Winchester: "Okay. My staff has informed me that the Department of Transportation would not receive its reappropriations."

Leverenz: "For how much?"

Winchester: "It would be 1,576,962,000."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Leverenz: "And what projects would not be completed or even started?"

Winchester: "I don't know about projects, but it would be 1,294,000,000 that the Road Fund would lose, 249,000,000 transportation Series A Bonds, 19,336,000 CDF and 13,800,000 out of the grade crossing protection fund."

Leverenz: "Was there an agreement worked out with the leadership on this side of the aisle on this Amendment?"

Winchester: "I ... repeat that question?"

Leverenz: "Did anyone work out an agreement on this Amendment on this side of the aisle with the leaders on this side of the aisle?"

Winchester: "I can't answer that."

Leverenz: "You didn't discuss it with anyone?"

Winchester: "It's my understanding that your staff was given the Amendment ahead of time and we've had no one express any objections to it. I'm sure that really no one on the other side of the aisle would object to it because I'm sure that there are things in there that would be of importance to each and every one of us."

Leverenz: "I just thought that maybe we could use this to find some compromise in terms of mass transportation."

Winchester: "It's a reappropriation."

Leverenz: "There's nothing like reconsidering what we did a few years ago to find the agreement. Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. (sic, Madame) Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Stiehl: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Yes."

Ewell: "We're throwing around some pretty big figures and I really don't count that high, but what was that top amount of money you were going to lose? One what? Billion."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Winchester: "Okay. If we do not adopt this Amendment, which it was a technical error in the drafting of the appropriation Bill for the Department of Transportation, and what we're talking about here is a reappropriation of last fiscal year and fiscal year before of 1,576,962,000 dollars. Much of this money is already owed two contractors. Work is already in the process and this is the money to pay them for various types of rail, grade crossing, road, bridge, whatever construction work they've been doing."

Ewell: "Alright. I follow that pretty good, but could you give me just a little basic idea as to how much of this 1,576,962,000 dollars is being spent in the Chicago area. What portion?"

Winchester: "I really don't know, but it's my guess-ti-mate that about 60% of it."

Ewell: "How much?"

Winchester: "I really don't know or my staff doesn't know and DOT doesn't know right now, but my own guess-ti-mate is at about 60% of it."

Ewell: "Your staff Member was trying to hit you and tell you something. Listen to him first. We might know the answer."

Winchester: "He said I was right. Approximately 60%."

Ewell: "Does that include suburban Cook?"

Winchester: "That is the six county area."

Ewell: "Oh. The six county area. Is that the area where approximately 75... what is it? Seventy-five percent of the people live? I'm sort of unfamiliar with those... up there."

Winchester: "More live there that live in Hardin County, but I don't know what the total is."

Ewell: "I'm just simply trying to find out who's getting and who's giving."

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981 -

Winchester: "It looks like downstate's getting it again. We're getting it from Chicago and you're going to get 60% of this money or, if this Amendment's not adopted, your contractors aren't going to get any of it."

Ewell: "And yours won't either."

Winchester: "I don't have any."

Ewell: "Mr. (sic, Madame) Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Stiehl: "Proceed."

Ewell: "I'm a little confused. I really think they ought to take this thing out of the record until they can get it straightened out and everybody can get everything they want put on the Bill because I hate to see you fellows going home empty handed. It grieves me to know that you're not getting all the roads, bridges and dams, creeks, sloughs taken care of and I think that if you work on it a little harder, you can put a few more Amendments in and get a little more money. And I want you to know that I've never been opposed to you getting it, getting most of it, in fact, almost all of it because we, in Chicago, are accustomed to taking the reaming that gets passed out."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Madame Speaker, I appreciate Representative Ewell's concern and his concern for his area of the state, but you can't put more money in a reappropriation Bill. And I think that, you know, I don't want to take this Amendment out of the record. I do want to run with it because this is contracts that we have already entered into agreement with. It's projects that are anywhere from 20% to 75% completed. It's money that's used to pay those contractors for the work that they've already done. It affects four main areas in the Department of Transportation. It hits all of us. It hits those in the city. It hits those in the suburbs. It hits us in the rural areas and I would

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- just simply renew my Motion of 'do adopt' to Amendment #8."

 Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I move the previous question."

 Speaker Stiehl: "Representative, there's no other discussion.

 Representative Winchester, to close."
- Winchester: "I think my last statement was my concluding remarks.

 I would just ask a favorable vote on this 'do adopt'

 Amendment #8."
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption ٥f Amendment #8. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Take the record... Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. those in support indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this there are 82 voting 'aye', 44 'no' and 3 'present''. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Winchester, amends Senate Bill 344 as amended."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Amendment \$9 makes technical corrections for the Department of Conservations reappropriation for FY '82. As amended, the reappropriation for the Morrison Rockwood State Park shows an appropriation of 115,728. The correct balance of the account should be 188,669 and this Amendment would correct that error. I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Is there any discussion? Do you care to close, Representative Winchester?"
- Winchester: "Only to reiterate that it is a reappropriation,

 Madame Speaker and that the money had been committed

 contracts. The work is being done. It was just an error

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- that we had made. It should have reflected a higher amount than what we did in the Bill. We knew that it should have been a higher amount. It was just an error in the typing part of it."
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #9. All of those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #10, Winchester, amends Senate Bill 344 as amended."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "I've been informed, Madame Chairman(sic, Speaker),
 that Amendment #10 is very important to Senate Bill 344,
 but there are some errors in Amendment #10 that we just
 noticed and I would ask that the Sponsor of Senate Bill 344
 take this Bill out of the record so that we have time to
 make the necessary corrections in Amendment #10. They're
 just drafting errors. If the Sponsor would just hold it on
 Second Reading until we can get..."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester, do you care to withdraw Amendment #10 and hold it on Second."
- Winchester: "Yes, I would withdraw Amendment #10 and ask that the Sponsor hold Senate Bill 344 on Second Reading."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Amendment #10 is withdrawn. Senate Bill 344
 will remain on Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second
 Reading, Appropriation Bills on page eight, Senate Bill
 313, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 313, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the Department of Corrections.

 Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendment #2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Stiehl: "Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Ropp, amends Senate Bill 313 as amended."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madame Speaker and Members of the House. This is another good Amendment that is placed in this position because last Session we passed a Bill that says people who are inmates in the correctional institutions can assist in building programs of 25,000 dollars or less. This is a small building on the fair grounds that is scheduled for something under 20,000 dollars and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf (Sam): "Thank you, Madame Speaker. For purposes of an introduction, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce two long time friends of mine, Mr. Walter Simmons, Clerk of the Appellate Court of the Fifth Judicial District and Appellate Court Judge, Moses Harrison, also of the Fifth Judicial District. Would you welcome them please."
- Speaker Stiehl: "For the purposes of an introduction, we also have another distinguished visitor in our midst, former Mayor Bilandic. Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, visiting with us today as part of the unveiling of the statue of former Mayor Daley of Chicago we have another former Mayor of the City of Chicago, Mayor Michael Bilandic and his wife, Heather, and their son, Michael Morgan."
- Mayor Bilandic: "Thank you. Thank you, very much. Thank you.

 Thank you, very much. Thank you. Well, Heather, Michael

 and I are indeed grateful to each and every one of you for

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

all of the kindness, courtesy and cooperation that you have extended to us and to the citizens of the City of Chicago while we were in office. I came here many times private citizen, as an alderman with Mayor Daley and on many occasions I heard him say just as you heard deliver the message on this very chamber and from this very podium. He used to paraphrase the words of Speaker Rayburn and he said that when he went to visit Speaker Rayburn for the first time he saw a sign in his office. There is north. There is no south. There is no east. west. There is only one America. And he would paraphrase that and say, 'There is no upstate. There is no downstate. There is no Chicago. There is no suburb. There is one Illinois'. And if there's any message I could leave you now on a day that we honor Mayor Daley here in a special ceremony, is to remember we're all together. are one people. I am a Chicagoan by birth, an Illinoisian by birth and I am proud of both of them. Thank you, very much."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Vitek."

Madigan, Madame Speaker, I, too, join in welcoming our former Mayor, Michael Bilandic, from our Ward and my neighbor on Union Avenue and I sincerely hope that after four years as Chairman of the Daley Statue Committee, welcome all of the Representatives. I'm sure you're all invited to the unveiling between 1:30 and 2:30 and I. want to thank our Speaker, George Ryan, the former Speaker Redmond for giving me the opportunity to be Chairman of this Committee and I hope and pray to see you all there attending today between 1:30 and 2:30. Again, thanks for all your cooperation that you gave me. It took me four years to get this thing finally settled and the help of all you good Legislators down here we were able

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

to, on this day, had the Mayor lived, he would have been celebrating his 45th Anniversary and I just regret that he couldn't have lived long enough to celebrate with me because I celebrated my 50th in February and hopefully that you'll all join us today on this glorious occasion. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Stiehl: "On the Amendment, Representative Wolf. Excuse me. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Madame Speaker, on this particular Amendment, I have gone out and researched the blacksmith shop today and I've even picked up a horseshoe for good luck on this Amendment. However, I understand that technically it is improperly drawn and I understand there may be one more chance before this Session adjourns we'll try it again. I will withdraw it because it is improperly drafted. And I know the Parliamentarian was going to rule in that manner anyway. So, I will withdraw it."

Speaker Stiehl: "Gentleman asks permission to withdraw the Amendment. The Amendment is withdrawn. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$5, Matijevich-J.J. Wolf, amends
Senate Bill 313 as amended."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Matijevich."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. (sic, Madame) Speaker and Members of the House, Representative J. J. Wolf, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and myself are Cosponsors of Amendment #5. During the Committee hearing, we had the opportunity to hear from Father Hays, who provided us with an alternative program regarding a residential-industrial medium security correctional center concept and we felt that it ought to have some study. It was a very innovative

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

approach and we, by this Amendment, are authorizing 25,000 dollars to the Department of Corrections for a House Correctional Advisory Committee which we will create by Resolution to study this very innovative concept. If it works, we think it has some merit as an alternative approach to corrections and rehabilitation. I; therefore, move for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 313."

- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there any discussion? Representative Matijevich, do you care to close?"
- Matijevich: "No, I think the voice vote will do it. We're all for this. We think it has some merit."
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in support signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 326, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Any Motions filed with respect to the Committee
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Notions filed."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #13, Leverenz, amends Senate Bill 326 on page nine, line 31 and so forth."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the House. Amendment 13..."

Speaker Stiehl: "Excuse me, Representative Leverenz. For what purpose do you rise. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Hr. (sic) Speaker. Is it my understanding that there were 11 Amendments and now we're on 13 or was there an Amendment #12?"

Speaker Stiehl: "The Clerk is checking."

Darrow: "We don't have an Amendment #12. That's why I raised that."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf (J. J.): "I believe Amendment #12 failed in Committee."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Clerk is checking his records.

Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Has this Amendment been distributed?"

Speaker Stiehl: "We'll check."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Amendment has been printed and distributed.

The Clerk has informed us that Amendment #12 failed in

Committee. Amendment #13. Proceed, Representative

Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen House. Amendment #13 on the Bill to fund the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs eliminate an operation in the Chicago office called the Office of Development and Retention that is funded for five positions, and what this group of five supposedly or allegedly performs is to go out to local communities to do an industry retention program. And let me explain that the group of two and Mr. Don Pealman, leading the charge, to the village of Maywood and did the retention program. They came to Maywood in September of 1980 and performed a walk-through of 21 different businesses. The report from

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the Retention Program that was performed in September of was finally given to me June 17, 1981. Nine months after the retention crew came to town, they finally did a The report is a sterling picture of what I've seen time and time and time again eliminated through appropriations process. The report was nine pages Only two of the pages go beyond the middle of the sheet. Any person, any high school graduate could probably have taken five or six articles that appeared in the local newspaper and provided the same report. It just staggers the imagination that an operation like this could be housed in any agency. Again, the Amendment would eliminate positions for an operation in the state government that takes nine months to provide a report of nine pages in length, and the people in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs laughed when they reviewed the report. would ask for your favorable support on Amendment #13."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I rise in opposition t.o Amendment #13. I think that Representative Leverenz has an isolated situation in his case in the community in which he This is a... It is an office of the Department of lives. Commerce and Community Affairs. Ιt has responsibilities for developing business in the State of Illinois, in the City of Chicago and in retaining the industry that we have in the City of Chicago and the other offices throughout the State of Illinois. I specifically note that he's only interested in the Chicago office, but I would feel that most all of the Chicago Legislators would be concerned about losing an organization who is dedicated to developing business and retaining business in the City of Chicago. It does reflect a five position cut, but those positions are important in doing the work of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

business and retaining present business that we have in the state, and I would ask you to very carefully, particularly those from the Chicago area, to consider very carefully what this Amendment would do. And I do believe that it's an isolated situation. I do believe that the report that Representative Leverenz talks about is overly exaggerated. I think that my information shows that the report was prepared along the lines that the community requested to be reported. So I would ask that this Amendment not be adopted and a 'no' vote cast."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madame Speaker and Members of the House. The Gentleman who offered the Amendment, I can understand his concern if there is an individual case, but it would me that if you have, in fact, an employee particular agency or department that isn't performing, that is not performing satisfactorily then probably the better solution would be to remove that employee and maintain the This is 151,100 dollars in GRF. There's almost 70,000 dollars federal matching funds involved here. don't think I have to dwell on the importance of keeping industry and jobs in the State of Illinois, particularly in the Chicagoland, Cook County suburban area. I think this is a program that is a worthy program, one that should retained and I would ask the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Stiehl: "He indicates he will."

Ewell: "This report that I see, do I understand it took five people nine months in order to produce it?"

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. The report was completed after nine months by the five people in the Chicago office. That's correct."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Ewell: "I'd like to speak on this."

Speaker Stiehl: "Proceed."

Ewell: "I think that waste, ineffeciency and irresponsibility have to be rooted out wherever we find it. If we are to heed the words of the President and return the government to the people, we must, of necessity, eliminate all possible sources of waste, ineffeciency, and I think that this is a classic example. You cannot ask us to be conservative and root out just the waste and inneffeciency we find in someone elses! agency. Here is a classic example of one years worth of work. Two people or people producing approximately one page apiece or two pages Some of the pages simply consist of a list of the people who worked on the projects and a couple of contacts might have made. I think that if you take your that they President's program seriously, if you look at the state budget line for yesterday which had a balance of 37 million dollars in the Treasury, you understand that we must uproot the waste in the State of Illinois and also save the 70,000 dollars matching federa1 funds. This, Ladies and Gentlemen, is what we call a small test of our sincerity and our dedication to the proposition that the government must work for the people and not idle and loaf. This is an acid test and I ask you to put your vote where your mouths have consistently been."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Birkinbine. Representative Birkinbine, did you wish to speak on the Amendment?"

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Stiehl: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "You said there were 21 companies called on? Mr.
Leverenz."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Leverenz: "Thank you. Under the program highlights, it says total number of firms in the community, 35. Total firms participating, 21. Yes."

Birkinbine: "I wasn't quite sure from what you were saying whether you were upset because they called on 21 or because it took nine months for the report to come out or because they have five people in the office or because the report was not longer or shorter, or what is it, exactly, that upsets you about these ... And, by the way, are those... are those 21 companies still there?"

Leverenz: "Yes. Here, let me try to draw for you a very vivid example of what happened. Time and time again, for the seven years that I've been in Springfield, I have seen people from the Department of Community Affairs or the old Business and Economic Development, something that everyone They come to town. is asking for. They pass their business cards out and they say, 'We are from the government. We're here to help you.' You've heard that a number of times. In September of 1980, Mr. Don Pealman and Richard Durkin came to Maywood and said, 'We will survey all of the industry in town and tell you which ones want to expand. They returned at a Chamber of Commerce meeting in January to say, 'In about 30 days we will have the report complete'. That was four months old at that particular The last page of the report says, Firms with identified problems and follow-up responsibility. 17th I received the first copy of the report on my desk on the House floor. Item #10 says, 'Sallsman Printers' and the problem is the paving of Madison Street, and the person has the responsibility to follow it up is referred to Representative Ted Leverenz. Nine months later I find out there's a business firm in the town that I live in interested in getting the street in front of their business

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

paved. I was further told that the report was held up until after the April elections so that they knew who to turn the nine page report over to because they wanted to turn it over to the new Mayor."

Birkinbine: "In other words, it's the delay in time that bothers you the most."

Leverenz: "When you have 221,000 dollars spent for five people.

I have no problem if they perform a function critical to keeping industry, but when they do nothing and sit on their hands and generate a report that a high school student could do, they do not deserve to exist and; therefore, I offer the Amendment to delete them."

Birkinbine: "Well, Madame Speaker, if I could speak to the Amendment itself."

Speaker Stiehl: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "I would suggest that at issue here is not whether or not these people issued a report or how long it took, in fact, that if the report is short, they're heading in the right direction. What we need are shorter reports, not longer reports. If they took a long time in delivering their reports, we're also headed in the right direction. Perhaps, eventually, they'll take long enough so that they don't bother to issue them at all and we'll have less waste paper to throw away. The important part is whether or not those 21 companies are there. But lastly, there's also philosophical question as to whether or not the government, any government, should be involved in something like this which could be done by a local group of businesses along the lines of a Manufacturer's Association or a Chamber of Commerce. That's what people should be rolling around in their minds, not how long the report was or how long it took to get it out. Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Do you wish to close, Representative Leverenz?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Leverenz: "Madame Speaker, the previous speaker is entirely correct. That which was identified by the employees of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs that came town to provide this information, we all knew that long ago except for a couple of things and who they thought they referred to for answers. We can settle our own problems and we certainly do not need the people that sit in state government and do absolutely nothing. The Gentleman said that we can solve our local problems. Yes, in fact, we can. For nine months the people have been waiting for response. They are still there. They didn't go away. probably will never go away. We need only that government that works and I ask for your support in deleting what does not work so that we can use the General Revenue Funds for a better deserving purpose."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #13. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Motion there are 60 voting 'aye', 76 'no', and 3 'present''. This Motion has been defeated, it is lost Further Amendments? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of an introduction. We have with us today the former Senator from the 30th District my good friend, Sam Maragos, and Sam...Sam wants to say hello and he also would like everyone to know that he is now the owner of a night club known as Denny's Den on North Clark Street in Chicago and he wants us all to come up and have a drink on him."

Speaker Stiehl: "Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Stiehl: "Third Reading. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Yes, I was curious. There's a state debt impact note filed on this Bill. Has it been amended since that note was filed?"

Speaker Stiehl: "No it hasn't, Representative."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Senate Bill 345, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board and Southern Illinois University for permanent improvement grants and related purposes. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Stiehl: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion: 'I move to table Amendment #3 to Senate
Bill 345'. Representative Matijevich."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Matijevich, on the Motion."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Committee Amendment #3 appropriated 6,700,000 dollars to the Department of Corrections in CDB funds for more planning in construction of correctional facilities. the Committee I failed to mention to the Committee that the General Assembly appropriated 100,000 dollars to Department of Corrections for engineering and technical studies and for planning for the development of correctional facilities in the last fiscal year, yet none of that 100,000 dollars was expended by Public Act 81-1449 and, in fact, this year, under the appropriations for this fiscal year, we have reappropriated that 100,000 dollars to the Department of Corrections for the same purpose. really feel that it is needless and, in fact, I think it is the wrong thing to appropriate the amount of 6.7 million

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

dollars to the Department of Corrections for planning and construction of new facilities. The fact of the matter is, I believe the Department of Corrections has not adequately In the whole matter of corrections, it really does not have a policy. I pointed out to the Committee that, for about three weeks, evidently from what I can gather from my staff, the Department, CDB, the Bureau of the Budget and people from the Governor's Office have been meeting and nobody in the Legislature has been part of those meetings. The word is that there is contemplation of two new facilities probably in Vienna and probably in Lincoln. One of the Republican Members of the Committee came to me as an aside and said, 'You know, I kind of look stupid. I get a call from my constituent and says are they planning a facility in Lincoln?', and he said. 'I'll darned if I know!. It puts the General Assembly in an awkward position when these plans are made behind the scenes and we are not part of the process. But I think the crux of the matter is that, for example, the rea1 Department of Corrections has made no studies from what gather, and I did approach the Director, Mike Lane, on this issue of any alternatives, any alternatives to the quote, 'warehousing and new large facilities'. We have not funded the three new facilities that we have constructed, funded them to capacity. And really the truth of the matter is, why should we approve an additional 6.7 million dollars on two facilities that could end up costing us million dollars apiece, 100 million dollars apiece when the plans are not on the table? In other words, what I'm saying from a legislative appropriations process, this Amendment is too premature. It is not one that we are, as a Legislator, a part of the process and all we are if we approve Committee Amendment #3 are, 'Here.

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981

is, Department of Corrections. Here it is, CDB. Do what you want with it'. When we have found in the past that Corrections has bungled in its planning of correctional facilities and I really think that Committee Amendment #3 is a result of bungling the Manteno situation doesn't mean by bungling one that we ought to give authority to bungle... in the future. So I think that Amendm... my Motion to table Committee Amendment #3 is a responsive one. It's a responsible one and until we find something that is planned and planned in a proper manner, then we can proceed. There's no urgency. We all know that nothing is going to be constructed within this fiscal year. That we can come back if the plans are what we feel We can come back in the Fall. We can come ought to be. back in January and we can appropriate this amount. whatever is need be. But the fact is, that 100,000 dollars in planning money is there. It's in the Department of Corrections. They haven't utilized it vet. but we reappropriated it. That's the amount that ought to be there for them for planning until they show us what they have and; therefore, I would urge the Members to support my Notion to table Committee Amendment #3."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would rise in opposition to the Motion to table Committee Amendment #3. This vote This Amendment was adopted in Committee. I might add, not by a voice vote. It was bipartisan in support. There were 17 affirmative votes for the adoption of this and only 3 against and 1 voting 'present''. This changes million dollars to 6.7 million for planning of new correctional facility expansions and still leaves 3.3 million dollars for the skilled nursing care facility at Manteno which is the veterans program there, and I

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

ask for the defeat of the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank Madame Speaker. you, I, too, rise opposition to the distinguished Gentleman's Motion from North Chicago. Ι think he's wrong when he talks about secret meetings being held between the administration and Department of Corrections and CDB. For three years now most all the Members in this General Assembly have known that we're going to have to have an additional institution or two around the State of Illinois because of increased amount of sentencing being done to correctional institutions. And I think one of the things kind of fired up the Gentleman from North Chicago is when I mentioned in Committee that I had attended a meeting in which location in my district was under consideration for a new correctional institution. That was a bipartisan meeting that was asked for by Representative McCormick and Representative Rea and myself and I think other Legislators in this Body have also asked for meetings with the Governor's Office to discuss possible locations in their You know, the money is needed now because we started today, it would be about three years before a new correctional institution, you know, could be built. think the Gentleman is wrong. I think, like Representative Wolf said, it was approved on a 17-3 vote. We need the money to start planning. No secret meetings have been conducted. It is important, I believe, that to the people in Manteno that the 3.3 million be set aside for the skilled nursing care facility. I think that's what the people in that area decided they wanted, not a correctional institution. There are places in the State of Illinois who would like to have correctional institutions, others who do not want it. I would ask that all the Members vote 'no' on

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

this Motion to table."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor of the 345... he'd answer

a question in relation to this Amendment."

Speaker Stiehl: "Did you have a question of the Sponsor?"

Schraeder: "Yes of Representative Wolf on the Bill."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Schraeder: "Representative Wolf, we're now in the phase of opening two penal institutions right now and, as I understand it, the Governor hasn't even asked for an appropriation to open those two institutions. Why proceed with this kind of a planning and funding mechanism when we still have facilities that are understaffed and under populated. It seems to me that this is a little bit ridiculous to follow that kind of an approach."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes. There is money in Senate Bill 313 for that purpose."

Schraeder: "For full staffing of the new institutions?"

Wolf: "Yes, it was not introduced by the Governor. It was done

by the Senate in Senate Bill 313."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Matijevich, to close."

Matijevich: "Representative Schraeder was absolutely correct.

The Governor had appropriated only for funding for half of the beds in the new correctional facilities that we have. In other words, out of a capacity of 1700 beds, he had only funded for 850 of those beds. But the real reason why you ought to support a Motion to table Committee Amendment #3 is that there are no specific plans. I don't think anybody here in the Legislature likes to buy a pig in a poke. That's really why you outhg to support it and because there are the 100,000 dollars for planning. That's already in the reappropriated to the Department. No more is needed.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

I don't care if we're talking about CDB funds, General Revenue Funds or what. I hear so many here saying we can't afford this and we can't afford this. We cannot afford to go ahead and plan when the plans are not specific. We can plan, but we cannot appropriate funds farther than that planning stage. The monies are there for planning. That's all we ought to have and I would urge the Members to table Committee Amendment \$3."

- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved to table Committee
 Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
 those opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,
 Mr. Clerk. On this Motion there are 78 voting 'aye', 81
 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present''. The Motion is lost.
 Are there further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion: 'I move to table Amendment #5 to Senate
 Bill 345'. Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz, on your Motion."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to table Amendment #5. One, I don't think the 250,000 dollars in necessary. I understand it is in another Bill and there is no reason to have two of them."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf (J. J.): "Yes, Madame Speaker, I would like to defer this to
 Representative Koehler at this time. I believe it was her
 Amendment. Representative Koehler. There is a Motion to
 table Amendment #5."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Koehler. Representative Koehler."
- Koehler: "I would oppose that Motion to table. Mrs. Speaker, may

 I speak to the Motion or to the Amendment please?"
- Speaker Stiehl: "Proceed. It's to the Motion, Representative Koehler. Proceed."

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981

Koehler: "Thank you. I would oppose the Motion to table Amendment #5. Amendment #5 is a very important Bill for my It has to do with an appropriation legislative district. for planning money for a veterans facility. The City of LaSalle has offered to donate the building and grounds of the old St. Mary's Hospital for conversion into a veterans This is a very reasonable facility. The total cost would be 2.5 million dollars and would be. with the land and grounds that would be donated. However, knowing the crisis and the budget crunch that we are in right now, I have asked for a very reasonable amount, ten percent that amount or 250,000 dollars that would be used for planning for the conversion of this facility into a veterans facility. Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "How much money is this, Representative Koehler?"

Koehler: "250,000 dollars."

Johnson: "Is this in the Governor's budget?"

Koehler: "No, it is not in the Governor's budget, but I would be very hopeful that it would.. that since this is a reasonable amount for a 60 bed facility that it would be considered by our Governor because the veterans in the State of Illinois. There are 660,000 World War II veterans, average age 62 at this time and they are..."

Johnson: "I appreciate the long explanation but this is not in the Governor's budget. It that right?"

Koehler: "No, you are correct. It is not in the Governor's budget."

Johnson: "You see, where do you propose we cut 250,000 other dollars to compensate for this additional expenditure that you're asking us to vote on?"

Koehler: "I would be very hopeful that by starting with this small amount of money and not asking for the entire amount

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

that we might start planning on this facility, and when the economy does improve, which we are very hopeful that it will be doing in the next couple of years, that we will already have set the ground work for an important facility for our veterans here in the State of Illinois."

Johnson: "If each one of us were to give, let's say, 8,000 dollars to the State, that would probably compensate for this wouldn't it?"

Koehler: "I find that immaterial to this particular appropriation."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf (J. J.): "Madame Speaker, Members of the House, as as most of you know there is a long list of unbudgeted Amendments that were adopted on this. Wе have Hennipen Canal, or a Horseshoe for the Lake conservation, Rend Lake sewage veterans home in Quincy, number of things that are not in the Governor's budget. suppose we should have a custom meat inspector kind of look over some of these things. There's so much pork in here. but, in all fairness, I don't know why we should single out this Lady's particular Amendment. It was.. the Bill was moved out on a single Roll Call. All these Amendments were adopted. If we're going to start picking on these, suppose we ought to go after a lot of other Amendments that happen to appear on this one too, and I would oppose the Motion."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz, to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you. Certainly, I did not know who the original maker of the Amendment was. The Amendment does say Representative Hoxsey on the top. I had no idea that Representative Koehler was involved. The fact of the matter is, one, it is not in the Governor's budget. And number two, they're doing the same thing at Manteno now and

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

we've got planning funds in there and its construction next year as I understand it. Further, there is no need to start any new projects. There are more things that are deserving of 250,000 dollars and I would reluctantly stand to support the Governor on this one. I certainly ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved to table Motion #5. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madame Speaker, I supported this in Committee and I support it now. In Committee, Representative Koehler presented a group of veterans who presented us with petitions signed by 8,000 people. As I thought about that, I said to myself, I'm sure all of those 8,000 also voted for the cut back Amendment. And I might remind them what you see is not always what you get. In other words, this will pass and the Governor, I'm sure, will not approve it so they won't get it. And I might remind them too, when they voted for the cut back, I'm sure they thought they were going to save some money. What they saw, they will not get. So, I'm supporting this, but I think those 8,000 people ought to be aware of that."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Braun, to explain her vote."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker (sic, Madame), Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Without specific regard to the merits of this Amendment, the fact of the matter is it came through Committee. There were witnesses in Committee. It passed out of Committee with bi-partisan support and I, frankly, have some difficulty with attacking Amendments that were adopted in Committee and attacking, collaterally, thereby the Committee process. I; therefore, encourage a 'no' vote on this Motion to table."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative McClain, to explain your vote.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. I think we can just take the Roll and take it out early."

Speaker Stiehl: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 79 voting 'yes', 69... Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ewing: "Madame Speaker, I very definitely should have been 'no' on that. I'm sorry, I wish to have my vote changed.

Somebody else pushed my button."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ewing 'no'. Representative Meyer 'no'. Representative McCormick 'no'. Representative DiPrima 'aye' ... 'no', 'no'. Record Representative DiPrima 'no'. Are there any other changes? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. Grossi 'no'. On this question there are 77 and 74 voting 'no'. Okay. This Motion... Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Stiehl: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Winchester: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Stiehl: "Record the Gentleman 'no'. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Will you change my vote from 'present' to 'no'?"

Speaker Stiehl: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'. Representative

McAuliffe."
McAuliffe: "Yote me 'no'."

Speaker Stiehl: "'No'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?

Representative Steele. Record Representative E. G. Steele
as 'no'. Representative Bartulis 'no'. Representative
Reed 'no'. Representative Van Duyne 'aye'. Representative
Christensen 'aye'. Representative Cullerton 'aye'.

Representative Friedrich 'no'. Representative Neff 'no'.

Representative Hastert 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Representative Topinka 'no'. Let's dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk and take a fresh one. Everybody vote their own buttons. Those in support of the Motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Koehler, for what purpose do you rise?"

- Koehler: "Madame Speaker, may I poll the absentees, please?"
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Boucek.
 Bradley."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Record Representative Boucek as 'aye'."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Davis.

 Ewell. Garmisa. Hoxsey. Huskey. Margalus. Rea...."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Hoxsey 'no'. Representative

 Davis 'no'. Representative Mays. Record Representative

 Mays as voting 'aye'."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees.

 Redmond. Rigney. e. G. Steele. Telcser and Wikoff."
- Speaker Stiehl: "There are now 84 voting 'aye', 81 voting 'no'.

 The Motion having failed to receive the necessary votes is
 lost. Excuse... the Motion to table prevails. Further

 Amendments, Mr. Clerk. Purther Motions."
- Clerk Leone: "Motion: 'I move to table Amendment #9 to Senate
 Bill 345', Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #9.

 Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. I have moved to table Amendment #9. I understand it is not in the Governor's budget. It was put in and vetoed last year. The press release is already out.

 Now we can remove the Amendment and I would ask for your favorable vote."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Stiehl: "Is there any discussion? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Stiehl: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Why... Did you... Maybe you explained this and I didn't hear it. Why are you offering this Motion to table Amendment #9, Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "The press releases are already out. I understand there's not enough allocation there to get the job done, and it is not in the Governor's budget. It's been put in there last year and, again, it was vetoed so I guess we can take it off now."

Winchester: "On these Amendments to the CDB Bill, Representative

Leverenz, as long as you've been around, how many of these

Amendments are generally in the Governor's budget that we

offer to these Bills?"

Leverenz: "I don't know."

Winchester: "Not too many. I think it's a gesture that we allow each Legislator to offer and then work it out with the Governor at a later date."

Leverenz: "I see."

Winchester: "I'm convinced by the arguments that Representative
Hoxsey gave in Committee and I think it was adopted by a
pretty large vote that this is a legitimate request,
legitimate Amendment that she offered in the Appropriations
Committee. We believe her arguments and we supported it.
I would sincerely ask you to withdraw your Notion to table
Amendment #9."

Leverenz: "Madame Speaker?"

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Withdraw the Motion."

Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman has withdrawn the Motion. Further Amendments?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Clerk Leone: "No further Motions. Amendment #19, Bradley, amends
 Senate Bill 345 as amended."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Schneider, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Schneider: "Is this ... sorry. Thank you."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Amendment #19, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Amendment \$19 to Senate Bill 345 appropriates 1.5 million dollars to go along with House Bill 1126 of which we passed out of here almost six weeks ago. It was the substantive Bill, and, at that time, I promised the Assembly that I would come along with the appropriation to fund House Bill 1126. The money will be used for installing a decentralized heating system and, as those who were here last year recall, that one of the reasons for closing the ISSCS buildings in Normal was the fact that the old decentralized heating system was often cited by DCFS as both being inefficient and expensive. The... What 1126 did, just to brief you very quickly, it will..."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Excuse me, Representative Bradley.

 Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Wolf(J. J.): "Yes, Madame Speaker, in the interest of time, we have no problem with the Amendment. Why don't we just adopt it?"
- Speaker Stiehl: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #19. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #20, Ropp, amends Senate Bill 345 as amended."
- Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ropp. Has that been printed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madame Chairman (sic, Speaker), Members of the House. This is the charm Amendment since this is the third

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

time you've had the pleasure to consider this. As I mentioned before, I did take a tour of that particular facility out on the fair ground. It is in bad repair and actually needs a considerable amount of work in providing for a number..."

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

Wolf: "Yes, I admire the Gentleman's tenacity. The third time is a charm they say. Let's accept the Amendment and it will probably disappear at Conference Committee."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. (sic. Madame) Speaker and Members the House,... Madame Speaker. This is the Amendment that has nine lives. This is the blacksmith shop Amendment that on the Department of Agriculture defeated yesterday appropriation. The Sponsor attempted to put it on Corrections and he knew that that couldn't be done so now he's trying to put it on the CDB appropriation. I think it was discussed adequately yesterday when we defeated it the Department of Agriculture Bill. I would urge the Members to defeat it again. I think Representative Cullerton made the case against it and I'd yield the rest of my time to Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "We are discussing the Bill. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Stiehl: "We're discussing the Amendment, Representative."
Cullerton: "Yes, okay"

Speaker Stiehl: "Indicates he will."

Cullerton: "I deeply regret that I was unable to make the tour this morning of the miserable but that the blacksmith lives in. I notice that you have continued in spite of Representative Bullock's request. You still have to refer

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

to this person as a blacksmith."

Ropp: "Yes, Representative Cullerton, as I mentioned today, as we had made arrangements for you and I to both go out at 9:00 and when I called you I aroused you and..."

Cullerton: "My horse was missing a shoe."

Ropp: "That's right. He, on visual inspection, was a whitesmith working in a blacksmith shop."

Cullerton: "I see. Why does it have to be a cement block shop?

Why couldn't it be a solar-powered blacksmith shop?"

Ropp: "It could be but I'm of a conservative nature and would not want to spend millions of dollars investing in a solar system when the current system would work very well."

Cullerton: "Would you like to tell everybody here how much this blacksmith pays in rent per month for the current facility?"

Ropp: "I'd be more than happy to. In Chicago at the racetracks in a similar situation, it's free. Here he pays 20 dollars a month."

Cullerton: "Twenty dollars a month in rent? That's all he pays?

How much does he get to put four shoes on a horse?"

Ropp: "It depends on the horse, but it averages about 34 dollars.

As you'll understand..."

Cullerton: "For a whole horse for shoes?"

Ropp: "One on each foot, yes."

Cullerton: "If he shoed one horse, he's pay the rent for the whole month wouldn't he?"

Ropp: "That's incorrect because the expense in purchasing the shoe and his labor and his other investments are rather high too."

Cullerton: "What's the mark up on these horse shoes?"

Ropp: "I have no idea, but it's not very much."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Ropp, to close."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Ropp: "This is a super good Amendment and I would just invite all of you to attend this particular building because it is a building of total disrepair and needs replacing in order so we can have good, healthy, strong feet on our horses that run in the tracks throughout the State of Illinois. So that we can generate more dollars for the Ag-Premium Fund and the General Revenue Fund."

Speaker Stiehl: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "... Take the Bill out of the record, please."

Stiehl: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Telcser in the Chair."

Telcser: "I'd like to take this opportunity to, first of all, introduce a few quests we have today. Alderman Marduli who served with us as a distinguished Member of this Body is with us today. Where you at, Mike? Our good friend, former Secretary of..., Nike Howlett is with us today down there by the well. Commissioner Biezczat is here, a member of the County Board of Commissioners up in Cook County. A great Democratic leader. And we also have today Gentleman who is respected by all of us. He's a great American, a great citizen of Chicago, someone who I think has really lived the American Dream. He is known as the Dean of the City Council. He's someone who I feel very, very grateful to call a friend of mine. A great Gentleman, a great public official, a great humanitarian, our good friend, Alderman Vito Marzulo. Alderman, could you come up here, please?"

Alderman Vito Marzulo: "Good morning everybody. It's always a great pleasure to come in this beautiful building, not only because I served here for 14 years, but because of the many public official, Democrats, Republican and Independent from the Governor down to each and everyone of us. I also like to come over and pay my respect to each and every one of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

you, and let's do everything what's good for the State of Illinois and God bless you all. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, while we are on the order of introductions, I'd like to introduce to the Members of the House my first Committeeman, the man who started me in politics who is Democratic Committeeman of the 26th Ward and now County Commissioner, the Honorable Matt Biezczat. Matt?"

Speaker Telcser: "Let's hear from... Mike Howlett wants to say a few words to us."

Mike Howlett: "You know, the last time I was at this microphone, it took a 90 to 5 hallot to settle the issue. I'm going to get out of here a lot earlier today. You know, I heard a story on the way down. Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel, went to visit Reagan and he saw that Reagan had two phones, a gold phone and a red phone. He said, 'What's the He said, 'I can talk to any one of my gold phone for?'. cabinets or any Ambassador direct from that phone. He said, 'What's the red one for?'. He said, 'On that one I talk to God, but it costs a 100,000 dollars a call'. Reagan went to see Begin and he had two phones and he said, 'What's the gold phone for?'. 'Why', he said, 'that's one I can talk to all my cabinet heads and Ambassadors on'. said, 'What's the red one for?'. He said, 'On that one, 1 talk to God'. He said, 'How can a poor nation like Israel charge 100,000 dollars a call?'. He said, 'Here it's a local call'. And I told that story because I wanted to tell you I'm glad to see we have so many people left in Springfield who aren't under the impression they have a direct line to God."

Matt Biezczat: "Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is my first opportunity to be on a rostrum here in Springfield in the Capitol of the State of Illinois. I would like to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

thank Peter 'Patrouvich' Peters. You see, he was in my Ward, but because we have such a strong Democratic Ward, Peter never could get anywhere so he had to move out of the Ward. That's where is and that's where he's making it very good. I just want to thank you Peter and you fine Ladies and Gentlemen to continue on your fine work. And from what

I read in newspapers, you really fight among yourselves."

Speaker Telcser: "Also today we have Dick Friedman who was a Republican candidate for Mayor with us today. ... back there. Dick Friedman, a great Republican and a great friend. Go to the Order of House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 1902. Would the Clerk please read the Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1902, a Bill for an Act to apportion the State of Illinois into twenty-two Congressional Districts and establish the same. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Ryan."

Ryan: "From where?"

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kankakee."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "I think of you as my neighbor, George."

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

Speaker Telcser: "One moment. Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Greiman: "A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. This is

Third Reading. I wonder if you're planning on giving us a

Roll Call vote on this one? Is that the intention of the

Chair?"

Speaker Telcser: "Not only a Roll Call, but an Oral Verified Roll Call."

Greiman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Speaker Ryan."

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

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

House Bill 1902 provides for the required House. reapportionment of Illinois into twenty-two Congressional Due to population shifts across the country, it Districts. was necessary that Illinois reduce the number of its Congressional seats from twenty-four to twenty-two. Redistricting is not an easy task, but it's one which, fortunately, only falls to the Legislature once decade. We believe that House Bill 1902 fulfills all legal and constitutional requirements which govern the reapportionment process. Each of the twenty-two districts are as nearly equal in population as is practical. The .0351 percent. That's average deviation is only three-hundredths of one percent. The maximum or total deviation is only sixteen- hundredths of one percent. That translates roughly into plus or minus 400 people out of a total per district population of 519,021. In my judgement, not only have we achieved incredible precision population equality. we have also preserved fair and full representation of minorities. There remain three districts in the City of Chicago with black majorities. geographic areas of the state are likewise treated fairly. Questions were raised in Committee as to why both seats, which were eliminated, were from the Chicago area. The answer is quite simple. It was a loss of population. Each Congressional District is to consist of approximately 519,021 people. The population of the City of Chicago is slightly over three million people; therefore, by simple arithmetic, one can see that the City is entitled to only six Congressional seats. The criticism in Committee was a fair map to fulfill unwarranted. This is our constitutional mandate for congressional reapportionment, and, Mr. Speaker, I would move for the passage of House Bill 1902."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? None? We will have an Oral Verified Roll Call. I'm sorry. Representative ...The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Members of the House. Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and characterized this map proposal as Representative Ryan legal and constitutional. I think probably, when it comes to population equity in those legal issues, he's right. But when it comes to the question of constitutionality, would beg to differ. The procedure by which this Bill was moved through the legislative process to Third Reading can hardly be characterized as constitutional. The rights of individual Members, constitutional rights, to Roll Call votes on Amendments were absolutely ignored by the Chair. rights of each of us, thereby, were trounced upon in a that the 1970 Constitution says is absolutely way impermissible. In addition to that constitutional problem, that this Rouse the procedures and practices has established for its own governance and that the Chair has tried to maintain throughout the Session were totally ignored and trampled upon as well. It seems to me that any map, any proposal, any Bill that comes to the House at with Third Reading the kinds ο£ problems of constitutionality, with the kinds of problems of inadequate and unfair procedures, with Members sent here by their districts to represent their people unable to do so in a fair and adequate manner is a Bill that has serious constitutional questions about it. I don't think that anybody who respects the people who sent him or her here: I don't think anybody who respects the principles of the 1970 Constitution or respects the principles of fair governance and orderly governance of this House could possibly vote for this proposal. I urge everyone who is concerned about the constitutionality of this proposal to vote 'no'. It's

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

a power grab by the Republican Party, not only to ensure Republican representation and deny Democratic representation in Congress, but more importantly, it's a power grab against the Members of this House and the people that we represent."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as far as reapportionment by the Legislature, it's two minutes till midnight. If we're going to accomplish it at all, this is the only game in town. Now, I think anyone knows when this Bill goes to the Senate it's going to have some changes made. But if we're going to accomplish reapportionment, which is the responsibility of the Legislature according to the Constitution, then this is the thing to do. Now, if you want it to go to a commission and play lottery with the future of this state, then go ahead. But if you want the Legislature to do it, this is the only game in town and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain." McClain: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies Gentlemen of the House, there are some points that I'd like to present to the Membership so that we exactly know how partisan this map is so that, if, per chance, it would pass, as the courts look over the record of this Assembly's action that they know that this is a very partisan piece of legislation and should be looked upon as such. Right now, in the Republican Congressional map, there Democratic incumbents in each of three districts uew Congressional District #1, 7, and 9; however, district, pro-Republican district, are there any Republican run against another Republican to incumbents going in Democratic areas, congressional incumbent. However,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

areas of 1. 7. and 9. two Democratic incumbents will face other in those three Congressional Secondly. Illinois has been blessed with a fair distribution of Congressional Legislators. Right now there are 14 Republicans and 10 Democrats. If this would most likely in the 1980's there would be 14 Republicans and 8 Democrats which is very unfortunate. There are other items such as splitting the City of Joliet which is Ogle County is split in two. Northeastern unfortunate. townships are split in one district. I think that if look at this piece of legislation, you know exactly that it pure Republican grab in order to get a majority of Congressmen in the State of Illinois without consideration to population basis or natural community of interest. ask the Membership to put aside partisan politics here and look at the great history of Illinois. You don't just have a situation here where this is round one in a Congressional The courts look at what we do in each chamber as map. they look at how they reapportion. If they look at the testimony that we now give on this floor, violently, this is a partisan map and should be looked at as such, is not the will of this Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because the court does look at what we do even if it's in one chamber regarding reapportionment, I would hope that the court will take everything that's said on the floor of the House because I recall ten years ago when a Bill sailed out of here, a Congressional map, and we were sold on the theory that this Bill was going to be amended. It was a vehicle only that it would be amended, yet that Bill was the one taken by the, that Bill and that map was the one

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

that was taken by the court. And I would say to the court that if this Bill does come out of this House that a Member of this House was not given the opportunity, according to the rules, to have this Bill amended. This Bill. today how Gordon Ropp had a Bill that was filed in about ten minutes later. That Amendment floated on desk and he was allowed to proceed, yet Barb Plinn Currie had an Amendment filed. That's all she could do individual Member was to file that Amendment. The rest was up to the Chair and up to the Clerk's Office to have that Amendment reproduced as quickly as possible and have it distributed on our desks. It was not done. So, I would like the court to know that minority rights were not followed through in the legislative process on this Bill. This was not the process on a most important issue Everybody knows that the Republicans are reapportionment. in the majority and that Amendment could have been offered and I'm sure the votes were there to adopt this Amendment. But because those rights were violated, we have not followed legislative procedure. This is not a map that was given the proper legislative scrutiny by the Amendment process that all of us live up to. Also, by the Constitution, I would like the court to know that we have a a right under Constitution. Five Members, whether right. they be Democrats or Republicans, have a right under the Constitution, a right under our rules to ask for record That right was not accorded us under Roll Call votes. Second Reading, and much has been said about the lack of civility that happened on Second Reading. I would remind all of those who would say that there was a lack of civility on Second Reading that there is a civility that be followed on the podium. A civility not only in treating the Members respectfully, but also a civility as

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

to following the rules so that we, as Members, each one of us, whether we be Democrats or Republicans, can offer Amendments according to the legislative process, so that all of us have a right to ask for a Roll Call vote because of the Constitution and the Roll Call. None of us like to disobey and act in what some might characterize as uncivil manner, but if we are treated with a lack of civility, there's only one thing we can do to demand that our rights be accorded. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, based on what happened on Second Reading, which I think was a disgrace, based on the fact that a Member of this House was not accorded the right to have her Amendment to be introduced and to be voted on, based on the fact that none of us were accorded the under the Constitution and the House rules to have record Roll Call votes, based on all of that and if we now look at what happened in the attempted take over of the Senate, we now know what that was all about. Based on all of those, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge the Membership to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Just a question of the Sponsor, if I might. Would he
yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He..."

Greiman: "Has he flown the coop?"

Speaker Telcser: "No, can you...Let me get to you in a couple minutes, Representative. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I have filed with the Clerk House Joint Resolution 43 and I have filed with that Resolution a Motion to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of that Resolution. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you at this time in light of the fact that this Resolution deals with the

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- question of legislative intent..."
- Speaker Telcser: "Wait a minute. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Johnson: "Well, Representative Madigan's an old hand at knowing the rules of the House, but I would make the point of order that we're in the consideration of Third Reading, House Bill 1902 and that his comments in respect to the Resolution before us are out of order."
- Speaker Telcser: "Well, that may be. Let's let him finish his thought so we can determine that. Continue, Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 43 deals with the question of legislative intent as that intent would affect a subsequent court ordered and court drafted Congressional There are many Members of this Body who are concerned the evidentiary impact that the Roll Call on House with Bill 1902 might have upon a later court action. House Joint Resolution 43 deals with that possibility. It speaks to the question of legislative intent. It deals with the question of congressional reapportionment and, time. I would ask you, as I have seen the Chair do on several occasions this Session to declare a subject matter Special Order of Business so that House Joint Resolution 43 be considered at the same time as House Bill 1902 or immediately thereafter the consideration of House Bill 1902."
- Speaker Telcser: "Representative, the Chair will take your request under advisement. At the present time, we're on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading on House Bill 1902.

 Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "In furtherance of my request, let me point out to you that at one point previous in this Session the Chair did declare a subject matter Special Order of Business which

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

included both a Bill and a Resolution. At this time, I forget the exact Bill numbers and the subject matter of the Bill. I am told that it was the RTA and that there was a subject matter Special Order of Business for a Bill and a Resolution. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Bill 1902, a Bill that would propose a congressional reapportionment plan for the State of Illinois and for the decade of the I rise in opposition to this Bill because it is a purely and highly partisan Bill drafted by the Republican staff for the Republican Party in the It maximizes the election of Republican Representatives. Members to the United States Congress without due constituencies consideration for Democratic located throughout the state. Because of its maximization of the election of Republican Members, it will, in effect, dilute the representation given to Democratic voters throughout this state and, in a sense, will disenfranchise those Democratic voters who are living throughout the State of As part of my argument in opposition to this Illinois. Bill, I wish to state at this time and I wish to state for any later use of the record of these purpose of proceedings that I, as the Democratic Leader, have filed House Joint Resolution 43 which calls... excuse me, which resolves that it is the sense of this Body that in the congressional reapportionment which will be done in this year and which will be in effect for the next ten years that it is the will of this Body that today there are three black congressional districts located within Cook County and, principlely, within the City of Chicago, and it is my opinion that the next reapportionment should contain,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

again, three black districts located in Cook County and, principlely, in the City of Chicago. So that as I stand in opposition to this Bill, I wish the record to show quite clearly that it is my legislative intent that the three black congressional districts located in Cook County today should be preserved as part of the preparation of the next Congressional map. "

Speaker Telcser: "Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this Bill. There is a cloud over it that can only be cleared up by returning it to Second Reading and providing an opportunity for the Members of this House to cast record votes, and I would like to call again to the attention of this House and of any court that subsequently may look at this legislation that the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article IV Section 8, paragraph 2 clearly states and I quote, 'No Bill shall become a law without the concurrence of a majority of the Members elected to each House. Final passage of a Bill shall be by record vote. In the Senate at the request of two Members and in the House at the request of five Members. A record vote may be taken on any other occasion. A record vote is a vote by 'yeas' and 'nays' entered on the Journal.' At the time that this Bill was on Second Reading and we voted on Amendments, there were clearly requests for Roll Call votes. These requests were unconstitutionally disregarded by the Chair. The action taken on this Bill at Second Reading was unquestionably not in conformity with the Constitution of the State of Illinois. We will making a dreadful mistake if we send a Bill with this cloud hanging over it to the other House. I urge the Members of this Body to vote 'no' on House Bill 1902."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Jones: "Thank Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I stand in opposition to this partisan When I listened to the Sponsor, the Speaker of the 1902. address this Body concerning this House. he indicated in there in his remarks that he legislation, was concerned about the retention of the three black Congressional Districts which are located in the City of Chicago. I, as a minority, am concerned about the three black Congressional Districts and will fight like hell to see that they are retained and they will be retained, but I don't want the Speaker of this House of the Gentleman the other side of the aisle to think that they could hoodwink the black community in presenting a Bill to them that's going to guarantee that three blacks be retained but, at the same time, send them out on a ship with oars, with no support. Sure, you'll go to Congress but all the issues that concern my people, they will have no help in Congress. The budget cuts by the Reagan administration which hit the poor, which hit the disadvantaged, would hit the hundreds of thousands of minorities across this country you sit up here and talk about Yes. we are for three black Congressional Districts. Congressional Districts, but I know when they αo to need some help. Congress, they're going They are not going to get the help from Members on your side of the You*ve already demonstrated that with the aisle. Governor's budget. When he slashes it, it hit the poor, it hit the elderly, it hit the crippled, it hit the blind and you talk about looking out for the minorities. No, you showed no concern about that. Currently, right Congress of the United States we are debating the repeal of Rights Act which, under the Voting Reagan administration and the new right of the so-called moral

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

majority, are trying to take away the rights of black people. Sure, you came on this side of the aisle and tried to entice some of our Members but we are not going to hoodwinked along those lines. Maybe some individuals will be misquided, but you're not going to send three black Congressmen from Illinois to Washington and not have those individuals have some support. They need support and we are opposed to this partisan Bill. Don't try to fool my people, and to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have been tempted. who have been tempted to vote for a map because it contains three black Congressional Districts, I to my colleagues, 'Don't be a fool'. You've got hundreds of thousands of black people in this state, across this nation that will need the support for the various programs to benefit my people. If you're shortsighted, if you are shortsighted and think about voting for legislation, you will be selling them out for the next ten to twenty years. So don't let the Speaker tell you he's so Don't concerned for the minorities in this legislation. send those black Congressmen out there on an island all by themselves. Give us a map that will ensure equity in the political arena in the State of Illinois. This map shows no equity. It quarantees for the next ten years that will have 14 Republicans and maybe even 15 Republican Congressmen from the State of Illinois. So. you, yes, you're going to send them there but they will have no help. They'll be out there on the ocean with a ship, no oars, no rudder, out there all by themselves and all they'll be able But when you scream and to do is scream and holler. holler, it doesn't pay the rent, it doesn't put food on the it doesn't help hundreds of thousands of blacks who table. look to government for help when they are in need. Bill should be resoundly defeated by this House and I wish

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

all my colleagues on this side of the aisle reject that notion and all the minorities reject this hoodwink attempt to fool the black people in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Telcser: "Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Breslin: "Speaker Ryan, on page seven, I note that District 7 shall be composed of the following census tracts in the County of Cook: 807 to 819, 2301 to 2318, 2402 to 2436, 2506 to 2524, 2601 to 2610, 2701 to 2719, 2801 to 2843, 2901 to 2925, 3001 to 32.. strike that, 3001 to 3004, 3201 to 3206. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us where this legislative district is?"

Ryan: "Yes, Representative. That's in Cook County."

Breslin: "Can you tell us where it is in Cook County?"

Ryan: "West side of the City of Chicago."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if you were running for office from that legislative district you'd need to know a little bit more about it before you could successfully succeed in winning that office. I..."

Ryan: "Representative, I would suggest if I were going to be a candidate in that district I would, and if you were going to be a candidate I'd hope you would

Breslin: "I note also on page 12, Mr. Speaker, District #15th,
which is my legislative district, is not quite as
complicated but it still uses census tracts in the County
of Kane and the County of Will, and on the copy that I
have, it completely leaves out my County of LaSalle."

Ryan: "Representative, those are all provided by the Census

Bureau in the Census Bureau maps and it doesn't take much

time to check them out if you're interested in where they

are. That's the way they come to us from the Census

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Bureau."

- Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that in previous legislation when we have drawn district maps, they have all been by metes and bounds and by geographical boundaries. Isn't that correct?"
- Ryan: "That's what I understand, yes."
- Breslin: "In this case, you have choosen to use census tracts.

 How does the average citizen who wants to know where his
 legislative district is have access to those census tracts
 and thus determine where his legislative district is?"
- Ryan: "Representative, it was ten years ago that they used the metes and bounds. The Bill provides that the districts be drawn by metes and bounds by an independent agency at a later time."
- Breslin: "But while we sit here and pass it, we really don't know what those metes and bounds are. I..."
- Ryan: "But, Representative, as I pointed out, the Census Bureau provides maps by census block and that's the way these maps were drawn and if you want to check it out, it's really very simple. Probably a lot easier than metes and bounds."
- Breslin: "And, Mr. Speaker, do you know how much those maps cost from the Census Bureau? I understand they cost 2500 dollars. Is that correct?"
- Ryan: "I didn't understand you."
- Breslin: "Do you know how much those maps cost from the Census

 Bureau? My information is that they cost 2,500 dollars."
- Ryan: "I have no idea, Representative. But in comparison your side of the aisle was provided and spent some 80,000 dollars to come up with a map that I've yet to see."
- Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, could I speak to the Amendment or to the Bill, please?"
- Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."
- Breslin: "Thank you. I think that this Bill has a fatal flaw in

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

that it does not use geographical boundaries. Number one. it makes it impossible for us to know geographical districts actually lie. As a matter of fact, when they originally drew the Bill using census tracts, they left out a whole county, my county in the 15th Congressional District. That's how complicated this is addition to which we have let, by using census tracts, we have let the Federal Government determine what OHT than boundaries are rather using the geographical boundaries that we are all familiar with. I would suggest that this is an improper way to draft this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock." Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Member of the Illinois House. I'm privileged to be a I'm equally privileged to be sent here General Assembly. after holding out my candidacy as a Democrat. I'm equally proud to come from a Ward in the City of Chicago that is Legendary in that it sent the first black to legendary. Congress since Reconstruction, Louis В. Legendary in the sense that it sent one of the stalwarts in modern history to the Congress, the Honorable late lamented William L. It has subsequent to that time sent great leaders to this Legislature and the presence of our former Representative Corneal A. Davis and our former Senator Fred J. Smith. Ιt is equally noteworthy that during that time there has been a natural alliance and a natural marriage between blacks and the Democratic Party. That marriage been That marriage has sometimes been strained, but at no time has that marriage been dissolved. I took Senate Bill... House Bill 1902 and 1903 home over the weekend and I was so dumbfounded by it I took it to my physician and I

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

said, 'Good doctor, tell me, pray tell me what does this And he said, 'Representative, you are pretty knowledgeable and articulate and I'll just put it to you 1902 and 1903 are a placebo, if you want to take I says, 'Doctor, several years ago I was told it orally. support the override of sales tax because my leadership said do that and I told them no that I was not going to vote against the interest of black and poor people and override the sales tax, and I also told them that I was not going to follow Jim Jones to Guyana or follow the Mayor our leadership to Guyana and drink that 'Kool-Aid.' And I said, 'Doctor, I've had some experience in these matters. What do you suggest I do on 1902? He says. Well. Representative, I've told you it's a placebo, if you to take it orally, but if you want to take it with an injection, you can consider it an enema. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with a very serious note, I believe that this Bill, while it is intended to provide three blacks in the U. S. Congress, on balance would destroy the Democratic Party in Chicago and Cook County. Because in urban areas race and politics are inextricably related urban America. The Democratic Party is, in fact, a microcosm of America. It is a kaleidoscope of the world. We do not stand in the Democratic Party racial purity. Ιt certainly is not politically pure, but stand multi-racial. multi-ethnic and we have varied philosophies and those philosophies come together in times like this. proud that the Minority Leader in the House of Representatives did, in fact, cite for the record essence of House Joint Resolution 43 which clearly conveys to this Body and to those who read the recordings of these proceedings that the Democratic Party is committed to equal employment opportunity and full political participation for

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

black Americans. I believe that and I voluntarily associated myself with the Democratic Party and I will voluntarily disassociate myself when that time comes. The time is not now. The time will not come when the Republican Party can offer this State Representative a placebo and enema at the same time and expect that person to vote affirmatively. I shall not vote affirmatively on this Bill. I shall not vote affirmatively on 1903. I shall vote 'present''."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to insert in the record of this days proceedings the fact that on the late hours of June 18th and the early morning hours of June 19th I dissented and subsequently filed a written protest and I wish to incorporate by reference the constitutional and procedural violations attendant to the Second Reading process concerning both House Bill 1902 and 1903 which occurred in the late hours of June 18th and the early morning hours of June 19th, and I would ask that the record of those proceedings be incorporated as they will by reference in the record of these days proceedings."

Speaker Telcser: "The Clerk will note the Gentleman's request and see to it that it's complied with. The Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Stewart: "Yes, Representative, one question that's been put to me concerning this map is that should it pass the House and then should it pass the Senate it would wind up on the Governor's desk and while many of us know the Governor to be a fine man, some people think that he's a rather tricky fellow. So they suspect that should this Bill make its way

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

through the legislative process that the Governor would do away with the legislative process by using his amendatory veto and I wonder if you would comment on that kind of situation."

Ryan: "Certainly, Representative. I'm glad you asked the The Governor may be a tricky fellow, although question. I've never found him to be that way. He's also a very smart fellow. And he understands that this is a legislative matter and I've discussed it with him just this week and he has assured me that he will not amendatorily veto, or any other kind of veto, on either of these matters. If they pass the General Assembly, the legislative intent and he will live with that."

Stewart: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."

Stewart: "I rise in support of this Bill, 1902. I rise in support because I believe in Majority Rule and I believe in Majority Rule even when it goes against perhaps individual interests. I happen to abide by principles. I've been down here representing my constituency to the best of my ability. I'm voting 'yes' on this Bill because it is in the interests of my people. One Representative has described the relationship of the Democratic party and the Majority of that party, the blacks in the City of He's likened that relationship to a marriage. I Chicago. would liken that relationship to slavery. Because you see, slavery is a condition where there is automatic submission to another influence. However, there are some of us down here who, for the record, want to indicate that no, we are not slaves, that yes, we are thinking people and that yes, we will stand up, even when we are threatened with Commission, that yes, we will stand up, regardless of what the threats may be. Because, until we stand up, there

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

no point of saying that yes, we are not slaves. And so some of us from the City of Chicago are pleased and proud to stand up and say that 1902 is a bipartisan effort. Because, in the City of Chicago, which is, after of the Democratic party of the foundation State of Illinois, in the City of Chicago that map provides for And the majority of people in the City of Majority Rule. Chicago who stay with the Democrat party happen not to be the people that that party has choosen to respect. When you talk about being alone, I know what it means to be..to be alone because to say that I got elected as a Democrat from the city of Chicago, is the same thing as saying I got as a Communist in the USSR. Because politically speaking, are one party states. I do not agree with the philosophy of buying into party 'party-ticks'. believe in the two party system. And I believe in Majority Rule. If the majority of the Members of this House feel that 1902 is a Bill that adequately covers the subject of reapportionment, if it provides for the one-man, one vote rule, if it does not purposely gerrymander the black community, that's all the Supreme Court has held. ጥክፉ Supreme Court has also held...or..the court law has also held that the reapportionment process is a political process. The City of Chicago has lost population. population of the City of Chicago is now only equivalent to roughly 5.8...5.8 Congressional Districts. All I am saying is that within that 5.8 we will have Majority Rule and at least half of those districts shall be black. I think that's a logical conclusion behind the sentiment expressed and HJR 43 would lead to an affirmative vote for 1902, particularly for those of us of color on this side of the particularly for those of us who will...who are saying at this point in time that we are not slaves. Now,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

my agitation on behalf of 1902 has only rained ridicule on my head. I've been told that I have been unprofessional. Well, in the words of one great black Republican, Frederick Douglas, he wrote a letter to his former slavemaster and he said, 'When I think of slavery my run out of control. Gentlemen, Ladies and feelings Gentlemen of this chamber, when I think of slavery, when I think of the years of political servitude that my people have provided to a party that has consistently disrespected me, my feelings run out of control. Yes, I am willing to Yes, you can take me to Commission. Because you stand. know what? I represent my constituency, Sirs, and I will represent them regardless of where you draw the lines. Thank you very much."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "My light was not on."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's kind of hard following that act. I think the message was got I just want to add a few comments and rise for my support for HB 1902. I'm sure many of you here today where I stood on this issue, some were a bit concerned, been kept up late nights telling me why and why I I view it as political education. And in the district that I serve and represent, political education is a great need. And it's for that reason that I came to this General Assembly to not only learn, but also to take that information back home so that the education would be shared many who, at this point, do not participate in the with I understand that my representation political process. here is not just that of Art Turner, not that of the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Democratic party, not that of the Republican party, but of the needs of the people in the 21st Legislative District and of those throughout the State of Illinois. In the year of 1981 the issues facing us, as Legislators, is a tough one in trying to satisfy the needs of people. we have both a Democratic and Republican party in country and state, but we also have 'poor-crats' and we also have 'middle-incomens' and many others who are suffering in these times. The issues confronting me and the Members of this district is not that of representation and not necessarily association. Being a freshman, I've been told over and over and over, 'You do not understand 'aye' vote is a vote of suicide'. Well, with fellow Legislators, let me tell you that every vote that I have cast is a suicide vote. And I tell you that as I journey this so-called suicide mission, I hope that a message is delivered to my constituency. And that being that I am here to represent them and I am sure that if bread is put on the table and that if jobs are provided to those in need and I'm sure that as life is improved for all of us, that they're not going to ask which party satisfied They're not going to ask whether the needs. Democrats or the Republicans provided those particular Their main concern is those needs being satisfied. needs. My job, as a Legislator, is here to satisfy those needs. And one of them is representation and I believe that HB 1902 reflects those needs in a very equitable fashion and I urge each and every Member of this House to vote 'aye' on that Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Speaker Ryan, to close the debate."

Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the "Thank you, fir. Ryan: House. As I said earlier, that this map is a fair map. a Constitutional map. It contains three black Districts and for the Gentleman from Cook that against the Bill, I'd like to point out that there was a coalition of black groups this morning in the Sun-Times that have endorsed this map. That's Operation PUSH, Chicago Black United Communities and the West Gate Organization and they all said, as a group, that for Legislators not to support the Bill would be tantamount to putting party interests above those of black people. think that's true. There's a lot of black input into this It's a fair..a fair map and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "All right now. We're going to have an Oral Verified Roll Call. Will the Members please be in their seats? Any unauthorized people should leave the floor. The Clerk will call your names at which time, let me remind you, you are to rise, state how you wish to vote and simultaneously push the switch however you wish to do so. Will the Clerk pleaseWould the Doorkeepers please see that the floors are cleared? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1902 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Will the Clerk please start the Oral Verified Roll Call?"

Clerk Leone: "Abramson, Abramson votes 'no'. Ackerman, Ackerman votes 'aye'. Alexander.."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Braun, for what purpose do you arise?"

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Alexander is in Chicago attending a funeral of her uncle, the last surviving member of her family and as the last surviving member of the family. So she is not here to vote on this critical issue."

- Speaker Telcser: "Okay. The Journal indicates she's absent because of a death in the family."
- Clerk Leone: "Alstat, Alstat votes 'aye'. Balanoff, Balanoff
 passes. Barkhausen, Barkhausen votes 'aye'. Barnes,
 Barnes votes 'aye'. Barr, Barr votes 'aye'. Bartulis,
 Bartulis votes 'aye'. Beatty, Beatty votes 'no'. Bell,
 Bell votes 'aye'. Bianco, Bianco votes 'aye'. Birkinbine,
 Birkinbine votes 'aye'. Bluthardt, Bluthardt votes 'aye'.
 Boucek, Boucek votes 'aye'. Bower, Bower votes 'aye'.
 Bowman, Bowman votes 'no'. Bradley, Bradley votes 'no'.
 Braun..."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had some comments for debate

but debate was closed before I had an opportunity to speak. I would, at this time, however, if..with the Chair's permission, to speak to the issue of this Bill. The progress of black Americans has been tortured our unique history. Black Americans were. country's for centuries, denied that most precious of rights, the right Since the 14th Amendment and the passage of the to vote. Voting Rights Act, black Americans have enjoyed that franchise and more and more are becoming full partners in governing this great nation. In the last election the citizens of the City of Chicago achieved a milestone in our political history and successfully elected three black Congressmen from the City of Chicago. That achievement stands as a political achievement unparalleled in this country. Reapportionment is a political process subject to the vicissitude of this Legislature's politics and the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

personalities of this General Assembly. But it is critical that we not retrogress on a milestone like the election of three black Congressmen by our failure to express clearly legislative intent that no redistricting proposal take away the gains that have been made by the people of the City of Chicago. Equity and fairness dictate that we affirm our legislative intent to preserve and protect the districts from which three black Congressmen were elected by avoided and disavowing racial gerrymandering which would do otherwise. This map is not perfect, but no map will as it is in the nature of political processes that perfection is an elusive goal. There are essentially three levels of concern in any reapportionment exercise: the interest of the polity, what is good for the people; the interest of the party, what is good for Democrats or Republicans; and the interests of the incumbents, what is good for the politicians who vote on the issue. This Bill serves two of those three interests: the public interests of the City of Chicago..of the citizens of the who elected three black Congressmen Chicago interests of those of us, who here, who were elected serve in the General Assembly. It does not serve the interests of my party and in fact, it does violence to the Democratic Congressional contingency statewide. That fact saddens me greatly for, as Representative Bullock suggests, as Democrats, we are part of a greater whole. But I am reminded, Ladies and Gentlemen, of a comment made by 'Solya Menjakov', my professor in law school, when she told me as a freshman law student that I was first a University of Chicago law student, second a woman and third a black. told her at the time that her priorities were reversed, that I was first a black, second a woman and lastly a TofC law student, not so much because that is the way I wanted

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

it to be, but because that was how the world perceived me and because that was the reality that I was bound I say to you today, I am a Member of this Assembly and care about how this map affects my colleagues in this House and in the Congress. I'm a Democrat and care about how this map affects other Democrats. But I am also black and it is in the interests of black people that we establish, by the passage of this Bill, legislative intent that the preservation of three black Congressional Districts is of paramount importance. have made no deals. I have succumbed to no external pressure from either side on this matter. I do what I do in full regard of the consequences and with the strength of my convictions I vote 'aye'." behind me.

Clerk Leone: "Braun votes 'aye'. Breslin, Breslin votes 'no'.

Brummer, Brummer votes 'no'. Bullock, Bullock votes
'present''. Capparelli, Capparelli votes 'no'. Carey,

Carey votes 'no'. Catania..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania." Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. have not made any deals either, but I have lived on the south side of Chicago all my life and I have lived through this Legislative Session which began January 14th, full well how many problems it had to solve and many of those problems are in Cook County. Many of those problems are in the City of Chicago. I, too, represent a black district and I have been very proud to be able to be elected from a district that is more than 90% black. And I feel very deeply as I think everyone on this House floor recognizes about my district's problems. And I also think it's important to establish a record that this General Assembly intends that we will continue to have three black Members of Congress from the City of Chicago. But I

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

say to you and I also understand the ramifications of what I'm about to say, that I don't think that it will help my city, which I love very deeply, to take away the representation of the party that I think has worked a little harder to help my city, not always the right way and I found it easy to run as a Republican from the City of Chicago because of the wrong things that I've seen the Democrats do to it. But I think that the Republicans in this Session have done far more damage to my city and I vote 'no'."

Leone: "Catania votes 'no'. Chapman, Chapman votes 'no'. Clerk Christensen, Christensen votes 'no'. Collins, Collins 'aye'. Conti, Conti votes 'aye'. Cullerton, Cullerton votes 'no'. Currie, Currie votes 'no'. Daniels. Daniels votes 'aye'. Darrow, Darrow votes 'no'. Davis. 'aye'. Deuchler, Deuchler votes 'aye'. Davis votes Deuster, Deuster votes 'aye'. DiPrima, DiPrima votes 'no'. Domico, Domico votes 'no'. Donovan, Donovan votes 'no'. Doyle, Doyle votes 'no'. Jack Dunn, Jack Dunn votes 'aye'. John Dunn, John Dunn votes 'no'. Ralph Dunn, Ralph Dunn votes 'aye'. Ebbesen, Ebbesen votes 'aye'. Epton, Epton votes 'aye'. Ewell, Ewell passes. Ewing, Ewing votes 'aye'. Farley, Farley votes 'no'. Favell, Favell votes Findley, Findley votes 'aye'. Flinn, Flinn votes 'aye'. 'no'. Virginia Frederick, Virginia Frederick votes 'aye'. Dwight Friedrich, Dwight Friedrich votes 'aye'. Garmisa is recorded as absent. Getty, Getty votes 'no'. Giglio votes 'no'. Giorgi, Giorgi votes 'no'. Greiman votes 'no'. Griffin, Griffin votes 'aye'. Grossi, Hallock, Hallock votes Grossi votes 'aye'. Hallstrom, Hallstrom votes 'aye'. Hanahan, Hanahan passes. Hannig, Hannig votes 'no'. Hastert, Hastert votes 'aye'. passes. Hoffman, Hoffman votes 'aye'. Henry Henry,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Hoxsey, Hoxsey votes 'aye'. Hudson, Hudson votes 'aye'. Huff votes 'no'. Huskey, Huskey votes Jackson, Jackson votes 'no'. Jaffe, Jaffe votes Jones, Jones votes 'no'. Johnson, Johnson votes 'aye'. 'no'. Karpiel, Karpiel votes Kane, Kane votes 'ave'. Katz..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ratz." "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, Katz: too, believe that there are some important principles involved in the Roll Call that we're taking today. those principles is the sanctity of the right of Legislators to be able to speak on the floor of this House and the right of Legislators to be able to obtain a Call on matters that appear before this Body. I have been Assembly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the in this General years and I have never seen anything House, for 17 approaching the events that took place in Second Reading on this Bill as it relates to the protection of constitutional rights. I do not believe that anyone could justify the flagrant way in which the Chair, the Speaker declined to recognize Democrats for the right to speak on the issues that were involved in Second Reading. My good colleague here, Representative Greiman, told the Chair, as I recall Roll Calls on all of the issues. wanted Every he Member of this House wanted a Roll Call and yet, the Speaker declined to permit the simple right of having a Roll Call to decide the issues before the House, the simple right to be able to record your constituents' view in the And I do not believe that we Journals of this House. should dignify such an abuse of Democratic procedures, such a trampling of the simple rights of constitutional democracy by passing this Bill. Further, I would like to say that I have heard a good deal of comment today with

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

regard to some of the racial implications of the Bill and I would like to reiterate that those of us on this side of the aisle really have no reason to be anything but proud of the way in which we have attempted to recognize the rights of black people and I have noted with interest that some of hands that have applauded some of my colleagues who have spoken on this side of the aisle, those hands rarely are to be found on the side of the poor, the oppressed and the downtrodden on Roll Calls that come before this Now, do believe that the interest of black Assembly. I people is a legitimate basis on which one may vote. would wonder if the interest of black people would really be served by doing in a number of very excellent Illinois Congressmen who are always to be found on the side of the interest of black people in the nation's Congress. Is the purpose of black representation only to be ...to have a person whose skin is a certain color to represent the State of Illinois in the Congress or is it to produce legislation that on issues of day care, on issues of minority rights, on issues of civil rights, are always to be found in support of the minority, the black minority in this And I would submit to you that this map will in country? fact result in a Congress...an Illinois delegation that will always be found predominately against the interests of black community on all of the serious issues that come before the Congress that affect the black community. accordingly, Mr. Speaker, both from the point of view of not wanting to dignify the really abominable trampling of the rights of the Member's of this House that occurred on Second Reading and because I truly believe that the interest of the black people of Illinois will be better served by this map not being adopted, I am very pleased and proud to vote 'no' on this matter."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Katz votes 'no'. Keane, Keane votes 'no'. Jim Kelley, Jim Kelley votes 'aye'. Dick Kelly, Dick Kelly votes 'no'. Klemm, Klemm votes 'aye'. Kociolko, Koehler votes 'aye'. Kornowicz, votes 'ave'. Koehler, Kornowicz votes 'no'. Kosinski, Kosinski votes Krska, Krska votes 'no'. Kucharski, Kucharski votes 'no'. Kulas, Kulas votes 'no'. Kustra, Kustra votes 'aye'. Laurino, Laurino passes. Lechowicz."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the In House Bill 1902 is a Congressional map drawn on flouse. partisan lines creating 22 Congressional Districts. Presently, the State of Illinois has 24 Congressional Districts: 12 Republican Districts, 12 Democratic This map calls for the loss of two Democratic Districts. Districts. Basically, what it intends to do is to pit probably the most capable Democratic Congressmen against one another, between Frank Annunzio and Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, Rostenkowski, the Chairman of Ways and Means and I don't have to tell this House exactly what that means to Illinois and this nation and also, Frank Annunzio, who has a number of years in Congress, 18 or 20, to my memory, also, a Chairman of a Committee and Sid Yates, having more seniority than Danny or Frank. But everyone of the people that I mentioned would have to be running either against an incumbent, against themselves, and as Harold pointed out, everyone of those people have been a champion for Illinois and a champion for the Democratic party in more ways than one. And the other person they want to eliminate in 1902, is Marty Russo, a bright young star from the south suburban area, a ranking member of the Ways and Means, now, and in eradication by the Republican party.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

This map is a totally unjust map. It should not be supported by either party. I can see if the shoe was on the other foot, the Republicans would feel exactly the way we do. It's not an issue as far as the number of colored areas with any geographical state. It's the issue as far as the ... an equal balance. The people have spoken. They have selected 12 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The census calls for a reduction. Is it just to reduce Congressmen from the City of Chicago? Is it just to encompass areas of cross reference, of cross purpose? don't think so. This Bill deserves a 'no' vote and I vote * no * . "

- Clerk Leone: "Lechowicz votes 'no'. Leinenweber, Leinenweber Leon, Leon votes 'no'. Leverenz, Leverenz votes 'aye'. votes 'no'. Levin, Levin passes. Macdonald, Macdonald votes 'aye'. Madigan, Madigan votes 'no'. Margalus is recorded as absent. Martire. Martire votes 'no'. Matijevich, Matijevich votes 'no'. Mautino, Mautino votes Mays, Mays votes 'aye'. McAuliffe, McAuliffe votes McBroom, McBroom votes 'aye'. McClain, McClain votes 'no'. McCormick, McCormick votes 'aye'. 'no'. McMaster. McMaster votes 'aye'. votes Roland Meyer, McPike, McPike votes 'no'. Roland Meyer Ted Meyer, Ted Meyer votes 'aye'. Miller, votes 'aye'. Miller votes 'aye'. Mulcahey."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahev."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's very close up there and I'm sure it's going to be close like that when we get to the end. But I knew it was going to be a day like this right off the bat this morning when Mayor Balandic arrived in Springfield. And 15 minutes after he got here, I looked out the window and it was

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

snowing, but I'm going to vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Mulcahey votes 'no'. Murphy, Murphy votes 'no'.

Neff, Neff votes 'aye'. Nelson, Nelson votes 'aye'.

Oblinger, Oblinger votes 'aye'. O'Brien."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I rise to explain my vote on this very crucial gerrymander Republican map.

The word 'gerrymander' as described by the dictionary means, 'to divide into electoral districts to give one political party an electoral majority in a large number of districts while concentrating the voting strength of the opposition in as few districts..."

Speaker Telcser: "One minute. Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leinenweber: "The word is 'gerrymander' after Elbridge Gerry."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you very much, Representative Leinenweber. T secede to you and stand corrected and I would like to point out to you that Mr. Gerry, who this word was coined after, lost his very next election. It also means to divide into political units to give special advantages to one group and that is exactly what this map does. This map is not a black issue. This is a party issue. It is the Republican party versus the Democratic party and our Democratic party appears to have more diverse groups in it and sometimes we differ. This map will do nothing for the Democratic party but provide a majority of Republican Congressmen in the State of Illinois for the next decade. I echo some of the comments Representative Katz made earlier and I vote 'no' on this map."

Clerk Leone: "O'Brien votes 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "One moment. Representative Catania, for what

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- purpose do you rise?"
- Catania: "According to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, it's 'gerrymander' after which Elbridge Gerry."
- Clerk Leone: "O'Connell, O'Connell votes 'no'. Ozella, Ozella votes 'no'. Pechous."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous."
- Pechous: "Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, hypocrisy is surely no stranger to the Illinois House It's taken on a real characterization. We have today. heard some speakers talk about political peonage, voluntary servitude, slavery. We've heard many such 'buzz' What we have before us here in House Bill 1902 is a carefully crafted Republican Bill aimed and dedicated to the momentary loyalty of some black Democratic obtaining defectors. In that map there is an absolute absence of speaking out to another minority group, the Hispanics. We have forgotten those hundreds of thousands loyal, There has been an effort here to cut them out of the action. The pie doesn't say anything about Hispanic Americans, Latinos, and for that reason, Ι vote 'present''."
- "Pechous votes 'present''. Clerk Leone: Peters, Peters votes Piel, Piel votes 'aye'. Pierce, Pierce votes 'no'. 'ave'. Polk, Polk votes 'aye'. Pouncey, Pouncey votes 'no'. Preston, Preston votes 'no'. Pullen, Pullen votes 'aye'. Rea, Rea votes 'no'. Redmond is recorded as absent. Reed votes 'aye'. Reilly, Reilly votes 'aye'. Rhem, votes 'no'. Richmond, Richmond votes 'no'. Rigney, Rigney votes 'ave'. Robbins, Robbins votes 'aye'. Ronan, Ronan votes 'no'. Ropp, Ropp votes 'aye'. Saltsman, Saltsman 'no'. Sandquist Sandquist, votes votes Satterthwaite, Satterthwaite votes 'no'. Schneider.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Schneider votes 'no'. Schraeder, Schraeder votes 'no'. Schuneman, Schuneman votes 'aye'. Slape, Slape votes 'no'. Irv Smith, Irv Smith votes 'aye'. Margaret Smith."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to my literate colleagues here of the House. As a rule, I never have very much to say. But I feel as though that this is an opportune time to let my friends know where I stand. I'm very proud and very happy to have the privilege to come and to be elected as a Democrat, to come into these great halls and chambers and to serve people. I have friends on both sides of the aisle my husband has always taught me that it takes two to tango. And I have tried to cultivate friendships on either side of the aisle. But when I was elected to serve in this Eighty-First (sic, Eighty-Second) Legislative Body, I was elected as a Democrat and I see all people and I have represented in the 22nd Legislative District, all classes of people, of all nationalities. But I come here through the Democratic process to try to work within the framework of our Legislative Body in order to represent our people. And what is wrong with our people today is that they are confused with their leaders. They never know from one day to the next where their leaders stand and for that particular reason our young people, as well as our adults, are confused. I was privileged to serve as Ward Committee Woman under the late Congressman, William L. Dawson, and I used to remember him saying that he had no control over his race. God made him what he was and that's what he is and I say the same thing about myself. I have no control over my color. But he said that if you are willing to honors then you must be willing to assume responsibilities that go along with the honors. The Democratic party has been very good to us and I think all of you who know and

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

knew Senator Fred J. Smith, you knew he was a man of principle. He is a man of principle and I would stand here and be less than a Representative of the 22nd Legislative District if I did not stand and say that I'm proud of the Democratic party, for the Democratic party has helped my people, lo these many years and many of us who are sitting here today would not be here had it not been for the kind works of the Democratic party, regardless of all of our faults. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, and to those of you who are assembled here today, that I cast my vote with the Democratic party here on House Bill 1902 and proud to say that I vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Margaret Smith votes 'no'. Stanley, Stanley votes 'aye'. Stearney, Stearney votes 'aye'. Steczo, Steczo votes 'no'. E.G. Steele, E. G. Steele votes 'aye'. Stewart, Stewart votes 'aye'. C. M. Stiehl, C. M. Stiehl votes 'aye'. Stuffle, Stuffle votes 'no'. Swanstrom, Swanstrom votes 'aye'. Tate, Tate votes 'aye'. Telcser votes 'aye'. Terzich, Terzich votes Topinka, Topinka votes 'aye'. Tuerk, Tuerk votes 'aye'. Turner votes 'a ve'. Van Duyne, Van Duyne votes Turner. no. Vinson, Vinson votes 'aye'. Vitek, Vitek votes 'no'. Watson, Watson votes 'aye'. White, White votes Wikoff, Wikoff votes 'aye'. Winchester, Winchester 'no'aye. Wolf, J. J. Wolf votes 'aye'. Sam votes J. J. Woodyard, Woodyard votes 'aye'. Wolf, Sam Wolf votes 'no'. Younge, Younge votes 'no'. Yourell, Yourell votes 'no'. Zito, Zito votes 'no'. Zwick, Zwick votes 'aye'. Speaker, Mr. Speaker votes 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, are there any Members who wish to get on the Roll Call now or change of vote or...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I vote 'aye'."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. You hit your switch? Hit your switch. Would you hit your switch? Representative Henry, for what purpose do you arise?"

Clerk Leone: "Ewell votes 'aye'."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a vote that I consider to place, not only black Illinoisans, but the poor, the Latinos, the aged, the handicapped and those who are living on fixed incomes, if this map goes out today and goes to the Senate and is placed on the Governor's desk, I've been informed by the Honorable Speaker, Ryan, that the map would not be vetoed amendatorily or will not be damaged at all. That means that I would have to trust the Governor to say ... to do what he says he will not do. I'd like to remind some of my real dear friends that it was a black who sold slaves to the market. I'd like to remind you, slave some of Republican colleagues, that when you speak of trust, it was trust that did not make the Honorable Speaker the Secretary of State. It was the trust that did not make Daniels the Attorney General. So, I question if you cannot trust in your own party, how can my colleagues on this side of the aisle trust a man that they are not even a part of his party? I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker. How can this side of the aisle and some on the other side, trust a man that has cut the day care centers, reduced the medicaid and the medicare, has dealt with the handicapped and the disabilities and says, 'I am for the How can you be for the poor and the needy and poor. '? you're asking for a three billion dollar transportation package for roads and bridges? And I want to remind those dear friends of mine, that have been dealt a deal, protect themselves. When you return to your districts, the people are going to ask you, 'Are you supporting the party

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

that have cut CETA'?; 'Are you supporting the party that have dealt and hurt this age'?; 'Are you supporting the party that have dealt with the handicapped'?; 'Are you supporting the party that have dealt with the Republican, the party in Cook County in Chicago and the administration in the US Congress that have damaged, Ladies and Gentlemen, that have damaged the poor'? You will have to answer to that. I will not because, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else?"

Clerk Leone: "Henry votes 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Levin: House. I guess this is very much of an anti-climax since this decision has already been made. But this was a difficult decision for me to make. I have heard from some of my constituents on this issue and they are committed to seeing three black Legislative Congressional Districts in the County of Cook, primarily in the City of Chicago. I wanted to make clear for the record and for the court that I am committed to that goal as well. I don't think though, that this Bill accomplishes fairly and equitably I think there has been a lot of discussion of the fact that even if you go to Congress if the Majority is Republican and the Majority is for the Reagan budget cuts, it's not going to help the black community. But let me raise a different issue, an issue that nobody has raised thus far. In looking at the map, the Second Congressional District is drawn in a very interesting way. We've seen on the south side of Chicago, a tremendous growth in the black independent movement. The way see this Second Congressional District, it would stifle and hinder the development of that black independent movement in

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

and it would make more difficult the election from that district of a black independent Democrat. Accordingly, I'm going to vote 'no' but again I would like the record to reflect that the goal of three black Congressional Districts is one that I share and the one that I intend to push for in every way I can."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk Leone: "Levin 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no', 2 answering 'present''. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority....Let me finish this and I'll call on you....is hereby declared passed. Representative Balanoff. Did you want to change your vote, Representative? One second, let's back up. Let's just back up. Representative Balanoff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Balanoff: "I'd like to be recorded as 'present'. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Balanoff as voting
'present'''. Now, this Bill having received the
Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House
Bill 1903."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1903, a Bill for an Act...."

Speaker Telcser: "One moment. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this would be a timely point for you to rule on my request for a subject matter, special order of business, in order to consider House Joint Resolution 43."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative, as I said earlier, the Chair will take that under advisement. I've now called House Bill 1903. The Clerk is in the middle of reading it a third time and then we'll consider your request. Will the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Clerk please read House Bill 1903?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1903, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to redistrict the State of Illinois into Legislative Districts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative
Ryan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Ryan: House Bill 1903 provides for the constitutionally House. required redistricting of Illinois Legislative Districts. As a result of the Constitutional Amendment approved by the voters last fall, we must not only reapportion our 59 Legislative or Senatorial Districts, but we must further single Member Representative them into 118 Districts. This reduction in the size of our Representatives by one-third requires that we make some very painful decisions but they are decisions that we We cannot simply refuse to address this cannot ignore. issue and leave the task for a Commission to resolve. Reapportionment is a legislative function and it should be resolved here, not in a Commission and not in the courts. The redistricting plan proposed in House Bill 1903 is It provides for 118 Representative balanced and fair. Districts that are substantially equal in population. total maximum deviation is only 4.6% from the ideal 96,767. total deviation from The district size ο£ Senatorial Districts is even closer, only 3.8% from highest to lowest. This plan provides fair and full representation of minorities. Fifteen of the 118 districts are majority black and for you, Representative Pechous, three of the 118 have a majority Hispanic population. All geographic areas of the state are fairly represented. The seats were evenly apportioned on the basis of population distribution; Chicago with 26.5% of the state's population is entitled to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

31 seats: Suburban Cook and the collar counties with 36% of the state's population are entitled to and receives 43 seats and downstate with 37.5% of the state's population is entitled to and receives 44 seats. The House Select Committee on Reapportionment he1d unprecedented series of six public hearings around the state to gain public input into the process. We listened to the public's concerns and while our emphasis was on population equality, we did attempt to preserve the integrity of political subdivisions. We divided cities and townships only where absolutely necessary. This map isn't perfect and it isn't everything each of us might want. I believe that this is a map that both Republicans Democrats, alike, can live with. There really is no such thing anymore as a safe seat. Party balance and future Assemblies will be determined by the quality of the candidate. This is a fair map, fair to the City of Chicago, fair to the suburbs and fair to downstate. fair to minority groups and it enables them to achieve full representation. We should approve this map and Speaker, I would move for the passage of House Bill 1903." "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Speaker Telcser: Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this map is no different than the last map that was considered. This is, just as the last map, a partisan power grab to gain control of the Illinois Legislature. This is one of the steps in a process that began last year when the Governor of this state appointed two personal friends to statewide office and then in January the Governor of this state attempted to engineer the election of a Republican President to the Senate, despite the fact that the Democratic party holds a majority

in that Body. Today we see another chapter in this story,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

a chapter where, if this map is adopted, where it will require 60 votes to organize the next There are 63 safe Republican Districts. Representatives. So, that even in an overwhelmingly Democratic national election there would be 63 Republican House Members elected to this Body and that the Republicans would then organize and control the House. This pattern would be established in the next election and it would continue for the following ten years. This is an effort by a party which is not concerned with those in our society that need the of government in order to survive or in order to move ahead and to achieve what they feel is their right under the American Constitution. This is an effort by a political party which feels that there should be less government, which felt many years ago that there should be today, government and which certainly feels that individuals in this society should help themselves and if they can't, then that's too bad. That's what this map would do. It's a partisan, political effort, partisan power grab and it should be thoroughly rejected."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, if I may, could I ask you a question?"

Telcser: "Sure."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, why are we handling this issue now when we could handle it at 3:00? That way we could honor the Daley Family and the Governor by being at the unveiling. Why are you holding us captive here?"

Speaker Telcser: "Because the Speaker called House Bill 1903."

McClain: "Don't you think it's kind of odd that that's being called now? Couldn't it be called at 3:00 and we could...?

Funny."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McClain, did you want to debate the Bill?"

McClain: "Okay. I just think that it's very unfortunate and it doesn't really serve the Speaker very well, I don't think, House. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1903, as Mr. Madigan pointed out, is unfortunate for both It's also unfortunate, I think, for political parties. this House to be in Session now while Mayor Daley and the family is being honored by this State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, as Mr. Madigan pointed out, during a solid Democratic year this map would ensure the Republicans have majority of the Illinois House Representatives. I think one of things that we ought to be charged with whenever we deal with any map, here in this Assembly, be it now or in a Commission or in the courts, is that there should be some marginal districts so that at the will of the people, since we're elected every two years, at the will of the people, this House can go with their will, be it Republican, landslide ones term or a Democratic landslide the following term. I think that's why we have bi-cameralism, is so that this House. which is elected every two years and not every four like the Senate, can flow with the peoples! will and match that. This does not This basically places in the hands of almost that. uni-cameralism so that this House for sure will always be a Likewise, I think it is also very Republican House. important that we funnel our views toward a community of interest, not only on a population basis and a percentage basis, but a community of interest. This Bill splits cities like Rockford, Rock Island-Moline, Joliet. Peoria-Pekin, Bloomington-Normal, Champaign-Urbana, Kankakee and East St. Louis and Springfield, Decatur, These communities have a right to have a Waukegan.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

community of interest served by this Body and by whatever map we have. A community of interest is very important to the people back home. Back home, in this Assembly we care about whether it's Democrat or Republican House. But back home they don't care. What they want is that their community of interest is shared and is supported by this House and by this Assembly and by the Governor. community of interest is very important to them. What we have in essence done through this map, is we have severed community of interests for all those communities and more. That community of interest means that those communities will not have the opportunity to be strong in this Assembly. They will be split and most probably rural Legislators will control their wills. So, Kankakee will not have the benefit of a good solid Legislator from the city of Kankakee because their community of interest will be severed and split. I think this map is unfortunate, not only from a partisan stand, but also very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because the community of interest of those communities are not well served by this map."

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

Johnson: "Before I address the Bill, I'd just inquire of Representative McClain, just how one would propose to make the city of Rockford into one Legislative District, since each district, ideally, should have 96,000 people, since almost twice that many people. It's Rockford has interesting to know how Representative McClain. would for example, put Rockford into one Legislative District. you can do that with your map, but we can't with ours because we're trying to be constitutional with our Addressing the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for years before I was a Member of this House, and for that

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

matter for the first four or five years of my service here, I'd always thought that reapportionment, probably more than. any other issue, is an issue that would be decided in the back rooms. For the first time in the history of the State of Illinois, first time in the history of any state that I know of, Speaker Ryan, of his own initiative and taking time from an incredible schedule, had scheduled six hearings throughout the State of Illinois, for the first time to allow public input on the question of reapportionment to take it out of the back rooms. The interest of the Minority party in any kind of a map was well demonstrated in those hearings. They had five members of the Reapportionment Committee and six hearings. that meant they could have attended 30 different hearings. They attended a total of three out of those 30 withstanding the crush of time, the Republican Members of the Committee attended 19 of those hearings with Members. thought that because of the nature of also reapportionment, the Minority party apparently believes that it ought to be something decided by eight men and women in a back room. I don't think that's the way it ought to be decided. I've heard many, many people over the last three years in anticipation of reapportionment say, something we ought to do ourselves; 'This is This is something that the Legislature, elected by the people, responsibility of doing'. ought to take the But apparently, the theory of at least certain portions of the Minority party is, it ought not to be done by the elected Representatives of the people. It ought to be back room. I don't believe that. eight people in a think it's our responsibility to do. This map meets every criterion possible. It meets the criterion of compactness and contiguity. It's as equal in population as you could

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

possibly draw a map. I saw a news releases today, looking to the racial situation in the City of Chicago, that again indicate that the Senate Democrat map, which is apparently the map that the Majority Leadership, at least the Chicago Leadership of the Democratic Party you want to go with, absolutely dilutes the black and minority representation in the State Legislature, in the State Senate, in the State House, and I think that's unfortunate. We've tried, in every respect to be fair in this map. We've tried to take the responsibility on ourselves. We've made a Commission. We've made а Committee process that's had Committee...public input and it's come up with a workable product that's fair to very, very, very many people and if you want to turn the process over to the back rooms, if you want to turn it over to downstate Democrats, to a Chicago Democrat and his appointee in the House and a Chicago Democrat and his appointee in the Senate who have as much concern for downstate, very little concern for downstate, I would suggest to you, rather than turning down a map that in very many respects is very fair, and in every respect is constitutional. then you ought to do it. Take the responsibility yourself. It is a good map. It's fair map and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1903, like House Bill 1902, reached Third Reading only by denying Members of this House their Constitutional rights. Throughout this country, whenever violence erupts in a Legislative Body, it makes the headlines. When violence erupts in Spain, when the armed guards appear on the floor of the Legislature in Spain, it makes the headlines in the Washington Post. When violence

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

erupts in England, it makes the headlines in the Washington Post and last week when violence erupted in the Illinois General Assembly, it made the headlines in the Washington Post. The Washington Post Newspaper carried this headline, 'Armed Police Calm Legislators in Illinois House'. police enforced order today on the floor of the Illinois After about ten minutes of name calling, and finger jabbing, Speaker Ryan returned to the podium shouting, "Order, order, calm down." When he finally attracted some attention, he granted Madigan's request for a 45 minute party caucus. When the Members returned to the chamber, they found the pages had been ordered off the floor and armed policemen from the Secretary of State's Office were stationed beside the podium. "Get the out of here". yelled Representative Beatty, a Chicago Democrat, "This isn't a police state. This is Legislative Body." Ryan finally relented, stationing the police outside the floor and allowing the Democratic Pages back on the floor. Telcser returned to the podium and he and Ryan pushed the reapportionment plans for both Congress and the General Assembly to passage stage, again, over the shouted objections of Democrats. The House adjourned in turmoil. The reason that happened is because Constitutional rights of the Members of this House were violated. That makes the headlines, as I said, when Constitutional denied Spain, rights are in when Constitutional rights are denied in Poland and England and when they are denied on the Illinois House floor. since I have been here, have I seen Constitutional rights When tough questions on Worker's of Members denied. Compensation were voted on last year, a Roll Call vote was taken on every Amendment and whether we lost or whether we won, individual Members had that right to vote. When we

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

fought over the replacement tax two years ago, at Amendment stage, every Amendment was voted on. Yes or no. Members had the Constitutional right to vote constituents. Never have I seen those rights denied as they have been this year. And as on House Bill 1902, should read into the record that the Illinois Constitution, Section 8C says that, 'Any Member at the request of five Members, a record vote may be taken on any occasion. That request was made on this Bill. That Constitutional right denied to everyone on this House floor. denying the Members their Constitutional rights, we have found three types of errors in House Bill 1903. Number one, areas which are entirely omitted. That is, there are the state in which people are reported by the census and included in the total Illinois population which are not contained in any Legislative District. Number two, there are census tracts, or parts of census tracts, which have been misallocated among districts. This appears to be negligence on the part of the draftsman, but the effect distortion in the population equality of the districts and finally, the worst flaw is that there are at least two districts whose boundaries do not close and consequently, there is no way of identifying either the border between districts involved or the respective populations. So. to conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this Bill, House Bill 1903, is fatally flawed because of the three reasons I have just identified and it should not be voted It should not be on Third Reading because in order to on. get here, you, you, on the podium now and the Speaker this House have denied the rights of the Members, the Constitutional rights of Members to be heard, to recorded on record Roll Calls and for those reasons, I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note that the Gentleman from Greiman: Champaign is growing a beard and I suppose that's to disquise as to whether he can say those things with straight face. Had I known that I could not have...had a right to speak on the floor of this House on House Bill 1903 or 1902, I would have gone to the Speaker's open hearings up in...Circle Campus and I would have gone over I probably would have gone up to North Field to Wheaton. and all over the state. Because apparently, that's how we citizens have a right to speak to this issue. I would have to have exercised my Constitutional right, Constitutional duty, by the way, and perhaps had right here in this little room, rather than go and speak elsewhere. So, while I thank the Speaker for industry, to suggest that he took this out of the back rooms is just patently absurd. Everybody was in this room. We know what happened last week. We saw it. It's a shame on each one of us, but it's a shame on the manager's of House most of all and when they take their rolling their road show, they should have brought it home, right here for Springfield, so we could've had some kind of input, some kind of thought, maybe even a right to vote the Amendments. I'm going to vote 'no'. And I think my vote 'no' will maybe, a little ways, erase the shame we should all feel."

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

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

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, I believe, if you will recall that I had the privilege of sitting beside you at one of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the hearings that you mentioned where we had public input to the map making process. At that meeting, as I recall, we had testimony that Waukegan should be kept intact as one unit. Does this map keep Waukegan intact as one unit?"

- Ryan: "Well, Representative, we had divided testimony on the city of Waukegan. I think at the Northbrook hearing, there was a request that it be split. So..."
- Satterthwaite: "But the answer is that this does not keep Waukegan as one unit, right?"

Ryan: "Well, that's correct."

- Satterthwaite: "At the hearing in Champaign, we also had testimony from the Republican County Chairman and father of one of the Members of the Reapportionment Committee that he would like to have Champaign County unified as it has not been for the past ten years and kept, as much as possible, intact for the various districts that were to be drawn.

 What does this map do to Champaign County?"
- Speaker Ryan: "It takes away the western tier of townships from the Senatorial District."
- Satterthwaite: "We also had testimony at that hearing from the Mayor of the city of Rantoul, the village of Rantoul, excuse me, asking and I remember following up his comments, and asking very specifically whether he meant for all of the districts that we were making and he indicated, he did. He said very specifically that he wanted to have Rantoul kept in one district, for House District, for Senatorial District and for Congressional District. Can you tell me what happens to the city ..er..to the village of Rantoul for the House map?"

Ryan: "It's in one district, Representative."

Satterthwaite: "No, Sir, it is not. Rantoul Township is in one district and Ludlow Township, which has the northern part of the city, of the village of Rantoul, is in the other

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

district."

- Ryan: "Representative, I thought your question was on the city of Rantoul. The city of Rantoul is in one district."
- Satterthwaite: "The village of Rantoul is split between two
 Legislative Districts, part of it in one House District,
 part in the other House District. At that hearing in
 Champaign, did anybody indicate to you or to the other
 Members of that hearing, that Orbana should be split in
 some way?"

Ryan: "What was the question, Representative?"

Satterthwaite: "Did anyone at the hearing indicate that Urbana should be split in any way for any districting?"

Ryan: "Well, Representative, weren't you at that meeting?"

- Satterthwaite: "There is no record on this House floor of what happened at that meeting. I'm asking you because it seems to me from everything that I see in the maps that no one was listening to what went on at that hearing."
- Ryan: "That...all the testimony from all of the hearings,

 Representative, was distributed on the House floor and if

 you haven't got a copy, I would be glad to see that you get

 one."
- Satterthwaite: "I do have a copy of that and I also remember what remember quite clearly that there was was said and I testimony from several people indicating Champaign-Urbana was a unified community and ought to be kept intact. I do not recall, however, that there was any testimony that indicated that should the communities be split that we should, in fact, gerrymander, gerrymander or whatever you want to call it, the central business district part of the residential district out of the heart of Urbana and put it in with the city of Champaign. That, fact, Ladies and Gentlemen, is exactly what happened. I have not had time to study at length what happens in most

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

of the other Legislative Districts of the state. because I was at that meeting in Champaign, I took special notice of what had been said at the hearing and while the Leadership on the other side of the aisle talks at about the hearing process, it is apparent to me that no one from that side of the aisle was really listening when this map was drawn up. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the State of Illinois, if you think you had an opportunity participate in the map making process by going to those And, hearings, you are indeed quite wrong. Ladies and Gentlemen of the State of Illinois, if you think by your elected Membership here, on the House floor, that you are participation into the map making process, you are still wrong. When I tried to negate two of those Ι mentioned, where the people from Champaign County came and testified as to their desires, I was not permitted the opportunity to have that Amendment discussed that would have united Rantoul, that would have taken the gerrymander gerrymander out of the city of Urbana. Instead that Amendment was tabled. Only on the following day did learn that the Amendment had been prepared, that the Republican pages had brought the Amendment to the floor and that the Republican Leadership had denied them opportunity to distribute that Amendment. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, not only of this House, but Ladies and Gentlemen of the State of Illinois, that is the open process for this map making and if anyone in this House can vote for that map in good conscience, saying that it came from the people, they are mistaken and they are misleading their constituents."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart.

The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, much has been

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981

made of the fact that six public hearings occurred relation to reapportionment. What needs to be pointed out is that these six public hearings were on the subject matter of reapportionment, not on the specific proposal we have before us today. At no time has a single member of the public been heard from in a meeting called by the Committee on Reapportionment on this proposal. As a matter of fact, at the one meeting at which the Amendment, some of the Amendments were adopted in Committee, the Bill was pushed right out and when questions were asked by the Democrats it was clear that many, if not all of Republicans were just as much in the dark as the Democrats were on the map. So, not only was there not input in actual drafting of the map, I'd suggest that not only was this Bill drafted in a back room but possibly drafted in a closet in the complete...in complete darkness the form faulty. Right it's hecause 15 now Constitutionality is clouded and it seems that those public hearings on subject matter only were simply held in order for the suggestions from the public to be disregarded. only do we see districts that are in the shape salamanders, but there are ones which resemble snakes and lizards and you might think that you had been visiting the local bakery when you see the districts that look as if they are shaped like doughnuts or longjohns or elongated twisted doughnuts. You might also think that you'd been at the fruit store, where districts are drawn that look like bananas. I'd suggest the only thing to do with a map like this is to vote it down. So, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Kane: "Mr. Speaker, you evidenced a great deal of concern for the black population in this reapportionment. Could you tell me what you did to the black population in Springfield?"
- Speaker Telcser: "Well, they're in a district, Representative, that you'll have a chance to run it, I'm sure."
- Kane: "How many districts did you split the black population in Springfield into?"
- Ryan: "If you'll give me a minute, I'll tell you....you know
 what the percentage of blacks are in the city of
 Springfield? What the percentages of blacks are?"
- Kane: "The black percentage in the County of Sangamon is about 10 to 12%."
- Ryan: "How about the city, do you know what that is?"
- Kane: "About the same. Isn't it true that you drew a line right
 through the center of the balck populsaton and split it
 into two different districts, so that they wouldn't have
 much voice in either Representative District?"
- Ryan: "Well, Representative, there was no attempt to divide the black population of the city of Springfield, if that's what you are trying to imply."
- Kane: "It happened by accident?"
- Ryan: "Well, it happened the way the map was drawn, by population numbers, if in fact, what you're concerned about is true.

 I'm not sure I know what you are asking me. It was no intent to split the black district, the black population in the city of Springfield."
- Kane: "You have...how many counties out of the 102 counties are split by this map?"
- Ryan: "I haven't counted them. I don't know. My own is, I know."
- Kane: "The county of Christian has a population of about 35,000.

 Could you tell me how many different Representative

 Districts the County of Christian is split into?"

69th Legislative Day June 23, 1981

Ryan: "Three, four, four, Representative."

Kane: "Four. Four?"

Ryan: "Yes, four, f-o-u-r. Four."

Kane: "A county of only 35,000 got split into four different districts?"

Ryan: "That's right."

Kane: "It's amazing. How about a county like..."

Ryan: "Representative, I'd like to point out that the deviation on the map is within the Congressional guidelines or the Constitutional guidelines. I'm not sure. What other county do you want to know about?"

Kane: "Isn't the special...Isn't the ideal district size about
97,000?"

Ryan: "That's pretty close."

Kane: "And you still had to take a county with a population of 35,000 and split it into four different districts?"

"Well, that's the way it worked out, Representative. Ryan: The numbers come from the Census Bureau by census tracts, not by counties, necessarily, but by tracts and that's the way the districts were apportioned and Ι might Representative, I have waited to see where the \$80,000 that you folks spent for a map on your side has gone because I haven't seen a map yet, neither a Legislative I would think if you were Congressional that map. concerned you would we had a map of your own."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to address myself to this map."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Kane: "The only answer that the Sponsor of this proposal has, is, 'Well, that's the way the lines happened to fall'. Well, everybody in this room knows that lines on a reapportionment map do not just happen to fall anywhere. They're drawn by people, that they are drawn by hands that

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

move pens and pencils. And what we have here is out of 96 downstate counties, 36 of them are split into more than one Legislative District. There are examples in which one or two townships are taken out of a small county and sent into oblivion or into the next Representative District. Probably the worst example is the County of Christian. small county of only 35,000 population is split into four Representative Districts. What different kind of representation, what kind of influence do you think the people in that county are going to have on the legislative process? Most people have trouble finding out which districts they live in now and in order to split that kind of county into four different districts is absolutely unnecessary. It's a blatant attempt to control political effect of this particular map. You look at other counties. Menard County with a population of only 12,000 is split into two different districts. The counties of Hamilton and White, both counties with less than 15,000 population and next to each other are split in half, not only into separate Representative Districts, but also into separate Senatorial Districts. And so, I would say this map has no benefit to the people, no benefit to the voter. The only interest that is taken into account by the people who drew this map, was not the interest of the voters that they went around in some kind of a sham deal and saying, 'Look, we're going to let you have input. We're going to have six public hearings. What was the message that came through in most of those hearings? our counties together. Keep our cities together. villages together, our townships together. And what did the drawers of this map do? They split it everywhere they Thirty-six out of the 96 downstate counties are could. split into one or more Representative Districts and some

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

counties are butchered into three and four separate sections. I'd urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 1903."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Stewart."

- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I've given one-half of this speech, but now I'm going to respond to some of the charges that were levied out during the debate on 1902 but my remarks are towards...geared to 1903. First of all, I say, before you tell me how good things are in the Democratic party for blacks..."
- Speaker Telcser: "One moment, Representative Kulas, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, the Lady is not addressing the Bill. Will you please advise her of that?"
- Speaker Telcser: "Well, let's see what she's got to say.

 Proceed, Representative Stewart."
- Stewart: "I'd say, walk a mile in my shoes and then tell me my feet hurt. You see, when you talk about shame, you have no idea what shame means until you see a Member stand and speak on a Bill and then get a phone call and change his or her mind. You have no idea what shame is about until you see somebody act like a big shot on the south side and go down to the Bismark Hotel and see him standing there, scratching his head and carrying his hat out. You don't know what shame is, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly. But I happen to know what shame is and I'm saying I will not be ashamed. If I cannot stand up and vote for myself, the world do I expect the Democratic party to vote in I'm saying I'm voting for myself. I'm saying that when I have an opportunity to speak out and stand up. I will do so. I cannot speak on 1903, how it covers the rest But I certainly can speak about how it of the state. I saw covers the City of Chicago. You see, because when

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

map, I took the time to find out exactly how it affects my community. When we talk about rules, first everyone accepts that reapportionment is a political It has...it covers a political area and the process. decision is a political decision and I know that this is perhaps boring some of you and I'd ask you to hear me out. When it comes to map drawing in the City of Chicago and I'm only speaking about the City of Chicago because it's the foundation of the Democratic party in this state, when it comes to drawing a map for the City of Chicago, you have two boundaries. One is the icy water of Lake Michigan and the other is the icy racism. Now, for too long my people have been used, blocked off and used to make sure that we elect a Democrat. I'm saying, 'Yes, I'm a Democrat and yes, I look forward to being elected and to elect other people who stand up. However, we are going to stand up for ourselves. If that means riding a donkey, we will ride a donkey. If it means riding an elephant, we will ride an elephant, but we will be the drivers. Now, a lot of people have a lot of problems with that, but that's their problem. have no problem. Hy constituency has no problem because we know how to stand up. Respectfully, I would request every Member in here to search your heart long and strong and then, please, come up and stand up. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that the comments on 1903, basically, are about the same as they were on 1902 except on this one, Chicago presently has 20 Senatorial Districts. According to this map, we'll be cut back, possibly, 17 or 18. But more important than that, talking...relating to the House Members, may I point out that in 17 districts, there are 38

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

of 86 Democratic Members who are lumped together. And as far as a multi-Republican Legislative Districts, in six districts, 12 out of 91 Members are lumped together. You're talking about a map that supposedly complies with the guidelines of the court, but it doesn't comply with the guidelines of incumbency in this House, whether it be Democrat or Republican. For that reason alone, this map should be defeated."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise again to ask
that my dissent and protest concerning the actions which
have been previously recorded in the late hours of June
18th and the early morning hours of June 19th concerning
the unconstitutionality of certain actions by the Chair and
violations of the Rules of this House be journalized again,
with today's events."

Speaker Telcser: "Alright, the Clerk please note the Gentleman's remarks and see to it that it is journalized. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."

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

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

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan to close."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Telcser: "Wait just one second, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to take...we'll take a Roll Call. The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Well, Representative, a Member of the House has put a Motion to move the previous question. We're taking a record Roll Call. It appears as though the Gentleman's Motion is going to prevail in which case you'll have to explain your vote.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no', 1 answering 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. Speaker Ryan, to close the debate."

- Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Everybody's been over the map. They know what's in it. They know what it's about. It neets all the Constitutional requirements. It's a fair and equitable map and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Telcser: "Alright, Ladies and Gentlemen, as in House Bill 1902, 1903 will be an Oral Verified Roll Call. Members will please be in their seats. The Doorkeepers keep the floor clear of unauthorized personnel. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1903 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Will the Clerk take the Oral Roll Call?"
- Clerk Leone: "Abramson, Abramson votes 'no'. Ackerman, Ackerman votes 'aye'. Alexander is recorded as absent. Alstat, Alstat votes 'aye'. Balanoff, Balanoff votes 'no'. Barkhausen, Barkhausen votes 'aye'. Barnes. Barnes 'aye'. Barr, Barr votes 'aye'. Bartulis, Bartulis votes Beatty, Beatty votes 'no'. Bell, Bell votes 'aye'. 'aye'. Bianco, Bianco votes 'aye'. Birkinbine, Birkinbine votes 'aye'. Bluthardt, Bluthardt votes 'aye'. Boucek, Boucek votes 'aye'. Bower, Bower votes 'aye'. Bowman, Bowman votes 'no'. Bradley, Bradley votes 'no'. Braun, Braun votes 'no'. Breslin, Breslin votes 'no'. Brunner, Brunner votes 'no'. Bullock."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is most unfortunate that House Bill 1903 will probably not receive the concomitant publicity that 1902

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

will obviously receive in the media tomorrow. For I firmly believe that House Bill 1903 is far more important than one simple reason. Йe have a administration that is contending now to emphasis state's and of responsibility from Federal shifting rights Government to State Government. With that in mind. General Assembly, the House and the Senate become critical as it relates to the funding of municipal services, funding of social services and the protector of civil liberties. I think that the intent of this Bill articulated by the Sponsor, who is an honorable man, missed the mark in terms of really what reapportionment is all Reapportionment, as defined legally politically, is, in fact, apportioning population equitably This map does to reflect the constituencies of this state. does not adequately and fairly and not do that. Ιt equitably apportion populations for this state. Secondly. map, once again, emulates 1902 in many respects. I won't hore you or recite for the record my remarks on 1902, but they do apply in this particular instance. And for that reason and for the reasons I previously enunciated, I cannot support 1903 for the same reasons that I could not support 1902 and on that I vote the same way, 'present' ."

- Clerk Leone: "Bullock votes 'present' ."
- Speaker Telcser: "One moment. Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the Rules of the House call that there be no filming during explanation of votes.

 Does that not apply to a Verified Oral Roll Call?"
- Speaker Telcser: "It certainly should. The Lady's point is well taken. We hope that the film crews will not film during explanation of votes. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Capparelli, Capparelli votes 'no'. Carey, Carey

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

votes 'no'. Catania, Catania votes 'no'. Chapman, Chapman votes 'no'. Christensen, Christensen votes 'no'. Collins, Collins votes 'aye'. Conti, Conti votes 'aye'. Cullerton, Cullerton votes 'no'. Currie, Currie votes 'no'. Daniels votes 'aye'. Darrow, Darrow votes 'no'. Davis. 'aye'. Deuchler, Deuchler votes 'aye'. Davis votes Deuster, Deuster votes 'aye'. DiPrima, DiPrima votes 'no'. Domico, Domico votes 'no'. Donovan, Donovan votes Doyle, Doyle votes 'no'. Jack Dunn, Jack Dunn votes 'aye'. John Dunn."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."

John Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen House. I believe just on the mere possibility that this map might wind up in a Commission or might wind up in the courtroom, we probably ought to put a few obvious things into the record for the purpose of legislative I would like the record to show that if this Bill intent. passes, should ever pass with 177 votes and no votes against that we could be certain that there had been direct intervention by the Almighty. If the Bill were ever to pass with 3/4ths or 3/5ths or 2/3rds majority we could feel fairly certain that Utopia has been reached. Even if Bill were to pass with a liberal sprinkling of votes from each side of the aisle we might be compelled to conclude that equity and geography had actually been taken into account and input had been received from the public and the State of Illinois. But if this Bill passes with the votes supplied for passage overwhelmingly from one side of the aisle and the votes against the Bill overwhelmingly supplied from the other side of the aisle and if any shortfall in votes required for passage is made cutting deals to supply someone with a sweetheart district

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

so they can run in order to get the votes to pass this Bill out of the House, then I would like the people of the State of Illinois and any Commission or any court which takes a look at this map to know that it does not reflect the will of the people of the State of Illinois. The people of this state, as someone said earlier, may think about us at election time on a partisan basis. They may think about re-map a little bit on a partisan basis but they expect to come here and do the job of the people of the State of Illinois. When they expect the map to be drawn they expect it to be drawn on the basis of geography and population and equity and as fair as possible to take into account all factors of partisan politics and race, creed, ethnic whatever we can do. They đο not origin. gerrymandering and I want the record to show that if this Bill passes on a partisan basis it is a flagrant example of gerrymandering of the worst kind and it should be thrown It should be refused to be considered by out of court. any Commission, and it should be brought back and killed in the Senate and we should come up with a decent map for the people of this state, not this map or not any one passed with partisan votes. I vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "John Dunn votes 'no'. Ralph Dunn. Ralph Dunn
votes 'aye'. Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen passes.
Epton. Epton passes. Ewell. Epton votes 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "...Ladies and Gentlemen, the task that we set about to do
here is indeed profound, for what we are doing, at this
stage, is we are reducing the number of children that we
all love. There is no question that if each were asked to
give up one of his five children, after much soul searching
and with the urging of the Body, he might do so. If each
were asked to give up two of five, being the only way there

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

is a vague possibility that this, too, might be done. But map does not represent that kind of equity although, on the face of it, it would grant enormous black gains; but on the other hand it would also reduce many others who do deserve to be reduced. Equity must always stand in the forefront of men who seek good will. If this map only took two of the Democratic children or perhaps a fraction more to show that there is some integrity in the Bill, I might think that there is some justification for it. when you examine this map as a whole it does violence Members of the district on the Democratic side, save a few. That is unjust. That is unreal, and for that reason I cannot support the Bill. I will support my party. I will listen to their pleas of equity and fairness when this Bill perhaps gets to Commission, as I assume that will and again, we will have a yardstick by which to judge our future actions. I vote 'no' on this Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Ewell votes 'no'. Ewing. Ewing votes 'aye'.

 Farley. Farley votes 'no'. Fawell. Fawell votes 'aye'.

 Findley. Findley votes 'aye'. Flinn. Flinn passes.

 Virginia Frederick. Virginia Frederick votes 'aye'.

 Dwight Friedrich."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, reapportionment is never easy. It wouldn't be easy under normal situations, but this time we have had a real shift in population and that affects some areas pretty seriously, including the City of Chicago. We can't help that if we go by the Supreme Court rulings which are very strict as you know. Another thing which made it very difficult, I was not in favor of a reduction of the House. Some of you were, but that has made it difficult. When you have to decide that

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

59 Members are not coming back and 2 Congressmen are not coming back that makes it even more difficult. But one of the things that contributed to the problem this year was the lateness of the census information which we really have had only had a few weeks and that made it really difficult. You know and I know if this Bill passes the House going to the Senate which is in the control of the Democrats. This is not the last word, but this is the last chance you are going to have to say anything about it. some of you think that you didn't have much to say about map. You let it get in the hands of the Commission and see how much you have to say about it. I'll guarantee you may not do anything but sit in the audience. You won't be able to say anything because I went through that one So let me suggest to you, even those of you think you didn't get a very good shake on this, this is your only chance to get a map done by the Legislature, a Republican House and a Democrat Senate, and you had better think about that for a little bit because with the flip of a coin you might find yourself completely out in the cold. So let me suggest to you that just to keep this game alive, just to keep something going so that the Legislature does have something to say about what happens to its Members, then I suggest that you ought to vote for it. tell you this. There are, in this side of the aisle, there are areas where two Republicans were put together and they have to run against each other. There is no way of avoiding this if you eliminate 59 Members. So let me make an urgent plea to you. If you think the Legislature ought to reapportion the Legislature, vote for this map, vote for map, get it over in the Senate, get it in the Conference Committee if you have to where at least you can go in and talk to people who are in the House and Senate.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

If it goes to a Commission, you've had your last say right here on the floor of this House today."

Speaker Telcser: "Do you wish to vote, Representative?"

"Dwight Friedrich votes 'ave'. Garmisa is recorded Clerk Leone: as absent. Getty. Getty votes 'no'. Giglio. Giglio votes 'no'. Giorgi. Giorgi votes 'no'. Greiman. Greiman Griffin. Griffin votes votes 'no'. 'aye'. 'ave'. Hallock. **Hallock** Grossi Votes votes 'aye'. Hallstrom. Hallstrom votes 'aye'. Hanahan passes. Hastert. Hastert votes Hannig. Hanniq passes. 'aye'. Henry passes. Hoffman. Hoffman votes 'aye'. Henry. Hoxsey votes 'aye'. Hudson. Hudson votes Hoxsev. 'aye'. Huff votes 'no'. Huskey. Huskey votes 'aye'. Jackson. Jackson votes 'no'. Jaffe. Jaffe votes Johnson."

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

Johnson: "I have a conflict of interest on this, but I am going to vote my conscience and I vote "aye"."

Clerk Leone: "Johnson votes 'aye'. Jones."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 1903. I do have a conflict of interest in the reapportionment of the Legislative Districts in the State of Illinois and I feel that I am voting my conscience. I know that we worked long hours, long weeks here in Springfield, but every weekend that I get an opportunity I return back to Chicago to my Legislative District and my family. I didn't stay down here to work with the Republicans on the other side of the aisle to help concoct this map for the City of Chicago as maybe some other Democrats might have. I know the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Republicans have no vested interest in the City of Chicago because they know that every Representative that will be elected on a single Member district more than likely will be Democrats. But as I look at this particular map, and I at the Legislative District where I live and have lived all my life, it seems very strange to me that they present to the black community two single Member districts that will elect blacks. The map is so gerrymanded where I live that the district that I currently represent, there is no way possible that a minority will be elected from that 51st or 52nd proposed District. I know you, on the other side of the aisle, had nothing to do with I am well aware of that. As my seatmate sitting here next to me indicated, you know, my people years ago did not voluntarily or were not...they were sold slavery by another black. I know what happened on this map. I had the opportunity to serve in this House with a very distinguished Member who has since retired and gone on to the Board of Election Commissioners in the City of Chicago and that is Representative Corneal Davis. when he came to Springfield, and he has told us very many times, that he could not even find a place to rest his weary body in the hotels and motels in Springfield. the husband of Margaret Smith, along with Corneal Davis, worked many hard years to pass a FEPC law in the Illinois only to see all of their hard work over State of all of the years emasculated, emasculated, if you will, the Governor on the second floor and you Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle with the help, with the help of some other Democrats who have sailed them out. Rights that people have gained, took a lot of hard work and sweat and tears to get. So don't sit up here and tell you are presenting a map to us that's going to benefit my

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

constituency. We need allies as Corneal Davis did when worked on PEPC and he worked on fair housing. I know that a lot of Legislators on this side of the aisle that do not minorities in their district, such as Clyde Choate, stood by his side and supported him when he needed the passage of that legislation. But some of us are ignorant of history and when you are ignorant of history you are damned to repeat it. And if you don't think you are damned to repeat it, look at the Reagan economics and the Reagan policies and with the clock in the hands of the administration, it's constantly turning the clock back on our people, and individuals have the audacity to stay on this House floor and think about themselves as of now. forget from whence they come. They forget the individuals who sacrificed their time on their behalf. proudly vote 'no' on this Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Jones votes 'no'. Kane. Kane votes 'no'.

 Karpiel. Karpiel votes 'aye'. Katz. Katz votes 'no'.

 Keane. Keane votes 'no'. Jim Kelley. Jim Kelley votes
 'aye'. Dick Kelly."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly." Kellv: "Thank Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to give vou. Representative Ryan a word of advice and that is. Speaker, I hope you don't have any ambitions about becoming an artist like Michaelangelo or Picasso because you've got a very shaky hand, especially when you look at your map-making ability. I vote 'no'."
- Clerk Leone: "Dick Kelly votes 'no'. Klemm. Klemm votes 'aye'.

 Kociolko. Kociolko votes 'aye'. Koehler."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."
- Koehler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in considering my vote on this map, I considered two things.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Number one, the Legislature is given the Constitutional responsibility to redistrict and I believe in accepting that responsibility even though we are not entirely pleased for ourselves. And number two, I was concerned about the citizens in my district. They are the ones who would suffer by this current plan. I considered this plan and I've tried to decide what is best for my district. efforts have been toward a map that respects county boundaries, population considerations and geographic relatedness. I realize that that might have been pie in the sky, but I am voting for this map in the hope that those who eventually draw the line will really consider the needs of the people in my district."

- Clerk Leone: "Koehler votes 'aye'. Kornowicz. Kornovicz votes Kosinski. Kosinski votes 'no'. Krska. Krska votes 'no' 'no'. Kucharski. Kucharski votes 'no'. Kulas. Kulas votes 'no'. Kustra. Kustra votes 'aye'. Laurino. Laurino votes 'no'. Lechowicz. Lechowicz votes 'no'. Leinenweber votes 'aye'. Leon. Leon votes Leinenweber. 'no'. Leverenz."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "This ones for Lincoln. I vote 'no'."
- Clerk Leone: "Leverenz votes 'no'. Levin. Levin votes 'no'.

 Macdonald. Macdonald votes 'aye'. Madigan. Madigan votes
 'no'. Margalus is recorded as absent. Martire. Martire
 votes 'no'. Matijevich. Matijevich votes 'no'. Mautino."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and
 Gentlemen of the House. I stand before you with the
 dubious distinction on this side of the aisle of probably
 being the only Democratic County Chairman and State

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Representative that's had any opportunity to vote on this question today. And since the turn of the century, the county which I represent, Bureau County, has had a of that county in this General Assembly. There's been six of us in that time. This is the first map that I've had the opportunity to look at. It's also the first map that I've really drooled over. It's very difficult for a Democratic County Chairman to drool over a Republican presented map. This is Christmas in June for some of us that are from those downstate areas. But I don't think that I could do my neighbors and friends and constituents in Bureau County any good if I allowed this map to have my 'yes' vote on it. I say that because that little county has been split in three ways, the Democratic portion being moved into an excellent district and for that, I say thank But in all good consciousness for the citizens of my home county, I must cast a 'no' vote."

Clerk Leone: "Mautino votes 'no'. Mays. Mays votes 'aye'.

McAuliffe. McAuliffe votes 'aye'. McBroom. McBroom votes
'aye'. McClain. McClain votes 'no'. McCormick.

McCormick votes 'aye'. McGrew."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you rise?"

McGrew: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."

McGrew: "I, frankly, have been a little bit amazed at some of the discussion on this side in their saying that the map is gerrymandered and I don't understand that. The Legislative District that I would run in is only in four counties. I think it's really cute that we went up to Henry County and we took out one township, a nice Republican township I might add, of Galva. We certainly tried to put all areas and all counties together. That's the reason we only have

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

parts of four. In fact, we had a little bit of trouble with that huge metropolitan area in Stark County that has all of eight townships and maybe clear up to five thousand people, so we only had room enough to get six out of eight there. And I note that somehow or another that we couldn't quite get on down into Fulton County and I'm sorry. I know that you've tried hard, but I've got to vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "McGrew votes 'no'. McMaster. McMaster votes McPike votes 'no'. Roland Meyer. 'aye'. McPike. Roland votes 'aye'. Ted Meyer. Ted Meyer votes 'aye'. Miller. Miller votes 'aye'. Mulcahey. Mulcahey votes "no". Neff. Neff votes Ino! Murphy. Murphy votes 'aye'. Nelson. Nelson votes 'aye'. Oblinger. Oblinger 'a ve'. O'Brien. O'Brien votes 'no'. O'Connell. votes O'Connell votes 'no'. Ozella. Ozella 'no'. votes' Pechous."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, like other Members of the Illinois House, I read the written transcription of the various hearings held throughout the state by the Select Committee on Reapportionment. A common threat that ran through those hearings was the desire of community leaders, religious and leaders of business and all other thoroughfares and their claim and their wishes to have territorial integrity respected in the district maps. I would note that my City of Berwyn has been partitioned, lopped into a piece..into several pieces. I think it speaks poorly of the draftsmanship. It appears that some political combinations spawn such a map and for that reason I must vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Pechous votes 'no'. Peters. Peters votes 'aye'.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Piel. Piel votes 'aye'. Pierce. Pierce votes 'no'.

Polk. Polk votes 'aye'. Pouncey. Pouncey votes 'no'.

Preston. Preston votes 'no'. Pullen. Pullen votes 'aye'.

Rea."

- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Rea."
- "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Rea: in explaining my vote, it's very obvious that this is strictly a partisan map and I'm really surprised and shocked that the Reapportionment Committee would conduct hearings throughout the state at great expense to the taxpayers and not utilize the information collected in determining what these districts should be. This is strictly a partisan You've not taken into consideration map. social-economic factors in terms of how communities should certain communities, be kept together. There are neighborhoods and counties that relate and work together. This has not been done and, as a result, you have also violated our Constitutional rights of not having the involvement of the people in making this important decision. So; therefore, I have to vote 'no'."
- Clerk Leone: "Rea votes 'no'. Redmond is recorded as absent.

 Reed. Reed votes 'aye'. Reilly. Reilly votes 'aye'.

 Rhem. Representative Rhem votes 'no'. Richmond. Richmond votes 'no'. Rigney. Rigney votes 'aye'. Robbins.

 Robbins votes 'aye'. Ronan. Ronan votes 'no'. Ropp."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think for those who are voting red on this particular issue ,if ever there is a time to follow the mandate of the people of the State of Illinois, it is on this particular issue. Last November they said divide the state, Housewise, into 118

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

districts. This has been accomplished in House Bill 1903. Therefore, in order to comply with the wast wishes of the people throughout the State of Illinois, I vote 'yes'. Only time will unveil if their intent will be justified." Clerk "Ropp votes 'aye'. Saltsman. Saltsman votes 'no'. Sandquist. Sandquist votes 'aye'. Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite votes 'no'. Schneider. Schneider votes Schraeder. Schraeder votes 'no'. Ing! Schuneman. Schuneman votes 'aye'. Slape. Slape votes 'no'. Irv Smith. Irv Smith votes 'aye'. Margaret Smith. Smith votes 'no'. Stanley. Stanley votes 'aye'. Stearney. Stearney votes 'aye'. Steczo. Steczo votes Steele votes 'ave'. Stewart. E.G. Steele. E.G. Stewart votes 'ave'. C.M. Stiehl. C.M. Stiehl votes 'aye'. Stuffle. Stuffle votes 'no'. Swanstrom. Swanstrom votes 'aye'. Telcser. Telcser votes 'aye'. Tate. Tate votes 'aye'. Terzich. Terzich votes 'no'. Topinka. Topinka votes 'aye'. Tuerk. Tuerk votes 'aye'. Turner."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members, friends of Assembly. It's hard today to sit back and not speak when, for the first six months not a lot was said, but let address the issue that we have in front of us today and that being the issue of representation and how House Bill 1903 does just that. It truly represents the make-up of the City of Chicago in terms of population. It not only reflects unified voice in terms of true а more representation, but it also gives a chance for those of us who are here today to be better represented. This map not only reflects a chance for the Latino community with its population to have a voice,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

strengthens the needs of representation for the other population as the city so reflects. To my downstate Legislators and friends, my message today is to the Commission and not to you. As a party issue, and I guess I can address those needs, I'm sure that it does not...that it does some damage to my fellow downstate Legislators have been informed that not all incumbent Legislators are safe with this map. I, too, have no guarantee about the safety of my seat. But it's not my seat that I'm worried about, but the overall plan that this map reflects. It*s that plan being one that is fair and representative and not Art Turner's seat. As a lawmaker, equality is of great concern to me, and to the Commission Members I say, the cutback Amendment voted in November told me that this was going to be a tough Session. It also set the tone for this Session, the reality of reapportionment and the cutback, is that not all of us will be happy with the outcome of this Bill today. And there will be those of us who will not be happy with the outcome when it comes out of the Commission. My word to the Commission again is to take a good look at this map, not worry about Art Turner's seat, but for the residents of the City of Chicago whom this map, I'm sure, reflects a true representation, at I will vote 'aye' today on HB 1903 because I numerically. believe in happiness through equality. Yes, again, TIVE been reminded about a suicide mission and the numbers on the board reflect that truly it may be just that. Well, just as soon die here on the floor and let it be recorded in the Journals of history that I died rather than sit quietly and die in the Commission. tayet."

Clerk Leone: "Turner votes 'aye'. Van Duyne. Van Duyne votes
'no'. Vinson. Vinson votes 'aye'. Vitek. Vitek votes

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

'no'. Watson. Watson votes 'aye'. White. White votes Wikoff. Wikoff votes 'aye'. Winchester. Winchester votes 'aye'. J.J. Wolf. J.J. Wolf votes 'aye'. Sam Wolf. Sam Wolf votes 'no'. Woodyard. Woodyard votes 'aye'. Younge. Younge votes 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you. I hesitate to take the House's time, but I feel like I have to explain my vote, particularly since I was not given an opportunity to speak on my Amendment this Bill on Second Reading and I was not given an opportunity earlier to ask the Sponsor a question. have asked him why East St. Louis was divided into two different districts. I would have asked him who counseled with him on this. I would have asked him why he violated the Illinois Consitution which requires all of maintain a representative and orderly government. I would ask him why he has subjected the people of St. Clair County political lynching, why he has divided the people of East St. Louis and Centerville into separate districts. 1 would ask him why he has taken away the political representation of the people of Belleville altogether by putting them totally in a Republican district, separate and apart from the other people of St. Clair County. I would have asked him these questions, and I want to register my protest and my protest against the conduct and the way this has happened. I want it journalized because it will be my intention to get something from the courts that I have not been able to get in this chamber and that is mу representation of 188.000 people who have heen abusive way this whole matter has disenfranchised by the been handled. I think that your conduct has been arbitrary and capricious. I think it has been abusive. I think that

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

you have taken despotism and tyranny and washed him off and stood him right by you on the podium and made him your friend and your gavel. I think it is a disgrace to democracy, the whole handling of this. And it will be my intention on the part of the people of St. Clair County to take this matter to the court if this map ever becomes a reality."

- Clerk Leone: "Yourell. Yourell votes 'no'. Zito. Zito votes 'no'. Zwick. Zwick votes 'aye'. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker votes 'aye'."
- Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, are there any Members who wish to vote? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I, too, had an Amendment, Amendment #3, to this Bill last week and it received the same treatment, although it did sound like it passed to my ears. But, in any event, the reason for my Amendment, at that time, was the fact that looking at the county..looking the County of DeKalb, which, under this proposal, would give us three Senators and four people in single Member districts who are Representatives. The people of my county have been divided into three separate districts for the past ten years and quite frankly, on behalf of the people of DeKalb County, I don't like the map. However, I am very practical and to me, it is the only game in town that's been expressed here, and I'm willing to take the calculated risk if this Bill can get out of here and over to the Senate that perhaps there might be some type of accommodation in the form of an Amendment and; therefore, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Ebbesen votes 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Flina."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't go into a long dissertation in explaining my vote for fear that it may sound like an apology. I don't owe anybody an apology for any vote I take here. I have nothing to compare this map with. This has got to be the best map. It's the only one there is.

I'm disappointed that we don't have any other and so with that, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Flinn votes 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Henry." Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise to thank the Speaker for drawing such a wonderful and safe map for me and my colleagues on the west I think it's a safe seat that I could run for the side. next ten years and a number of other blacks in Chicago would be safe for ten years. But I'd like to remind the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House that we are only talking about a job of prestige, a job and position of power. While you give me a safe map to run in for the next ten you have stuck it to the poor in my district in the vears. City of Chicago by the tune of \$200,000,000. dealt with the Title 20 funds and reduced that to the poor in the community. And I'm not only thinking about Henry or a few other blacks, but I'm not going to deal my people out for a penny. I'm not going to deal my out because you take care of Bill Henry. I'm not going to deal my people out and deal with a party that have never done a thing for the poor but cut, cut and cut. you're talking about reducing funds, you don't say, 'Reduce the funds for missles'. You say, 'Reduce the funds for poor people. They are not a people of this nation those and they are not people of this State of Illinois'. when you treat me good and you reflect ill feelings on the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

poor and the uneducated, the ill, the aged, the people that are living on fixed incomes that cannot survive, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for taking care of me. But you're not taking care of my people so; therefore, in protest against that party, I have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Henry votes 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else? Anybody else wish to get on the Roll Call? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and when I look at the map that has been drawn on House Bill 1903 I see it as a winnable map in my particular district. It's a map that would at least give a Democrat downstate a chance. It's a map that I think that I could at least have a chance. But as I look over the House floor for the last two or three years and think back of the friends that I've made here, I think that at some point I have to draw the line and vote with the party that has brought me here over the last two years. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on this issue I vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Hannig votes 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Any other Member who wishes to get on the Roll Call? No one else wants to get on the Roll Call? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 83 voting 'no', 1 answering 'present''. and this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Jack Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1903 failed."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Bullock."

- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that Notion on the table."

 Speaker Telcser: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved...The Gentleman has moved that the Notion lie upon the table. The Gentleman has requested a Roll Call vote. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 82 voting 'aye', 86 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion to table fails. Now, does Representative Dunn persist in his Motion?"
- Jack Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my Motion."
- Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. Let the House stand at ease for about one minute. One minute now.

 Is Representative Madigan on the floor? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan. Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps you inappropriately recognized an individual. It is my Motion before the House and I wish to have the absentees polled."
- Speaker Telcser: "No I didn't. I announced that the..that your

 Motion had failed. Do you want to poll the absentees?

 That's all right. Poll the absentees for the Gentleman."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Alexander.

 Garmisa. Jackson. Koehler. Kucharski. Margalus, and

 Redmond."
 - Speaker Telcser: "To repeat myself, on that question there are 82 voting 'yes', 86 voting 'no', 1 answering 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion to table fails. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?"
 - Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to make sure the record clearly reflects my intent, I do not choose to withdraw my Motion to reconsider. I wish my Motion to reconsider to remain before the House."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Telcser: "Representative..The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this issue, I do wish to reduce my Motion to writing and have it appear on the Calendar."

Speaker Telcser: "Fine. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Madigan: "My point is directed to Speaker Ryan, if he could get off the phone. There's no need for you to shield him,

Speaker Telcser: "I didn't realize I was."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, today you enjoyed one legislative triumph, one legislative defeat. In both endeavors, you did excellent job of legislative work and of legislative strategizing. Mr. Speaker, my point of personal privilege and my point of complaint is simply this. You told Representative Vitek at the beginning of this day that you would break at approximately 12:00 to allow the members to attend the unveiling of a statue of former Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago. I'm sure all of us have different views of Mr. Daley in retrospect, but there are many Democrats and I'm sure many Republicans who thought of Mr. with the utmost respect, reverence and love. And there were very, very many of us who desired very much to attend that event to observe the unveiling of that statue. You had let us to believe that the House, like the Senate, would recess in order to view that ceremony. For some

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

it's involved with reason. I'm sure the legislative strategy concerning the last two Bills, you choose to revoke your earlier statement and to deny to many of us who have very fond memories of Mayor Daley the opportunity to attend that ceremony. My opinion, Mr. Speaker, you and I are engaged in a legislative conflict and the rules of conduct in that legislative conflict generally permit quite a few things to be done, me to you and you to me. think in this instance you've gone well beyond the bounds of civil conduct. This Bill could have been called right now, at this time. It could have been called yesterday. It could have been called later today. But for your own selfish reasons. as has been the hallmark administration as the Speaker of this House, you choose to deny to those who wanted to attend that ceremony the opportunity to be there. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you have committed an unforgivable act of human disrespect."

Ryan: "Thank you, Representative Madigan. I'd like to point out that it was certainly my intent and I think Representative Vitek knows that. I was scheduled Speaker today, had remarks prepared for the ceremony downstairs, but at any time that I have to adjourn the business of the House to do a social function, I don't feel that I owe any apologies to you or to anybody else. We were elected here. sent here to do the business of the House, and at the time that I called the Bills, Mr. Madigan, we had one hour 30 minutes to debate those Bills. There was plenty of time, but we didn't finish, as you can tell now. Tt s 3:30. And so it's one of those unfortunate things, but I will not apologize to you or to anybody else in this for conducting the business that we were elected to do while we are here."

Speaker Telcser: "Now go to the Order of Third Reading, Short

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Debate. Representative Laurino, for what purpose do you rise?"

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, your side of the aisle can applaud all they want on a piece of diatribe that I don't believe is accurate. But I missed that Roll Call on the congressional remap only because I was told by one of your legislative leaders that it was going to be recessed from 12:00 to 3:00. I don't appreciate it. I wouldn't have missed that Roll Call. I have never missed a very important Roll Call in my life. I don't intend on starting now and especially on something that's going to take the aspect of the lives of 11 million people in the State of Illinois for granted. I don't appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton." Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Epton: "Thank you, Mr. I know this will certainly not solve the situation make either Representative Madigan or Representative Laurino or other Gentlemen and Ladies involved feel any would corroborate the fact better. 1 simply Representative Ryan was scheduled to speak. Because of the delay in the debate here, he sent me down to speak in his behalf and during the ceremony Representative Madigan's name was mentioned prominently, which, of course, recognized fully was not his intention. But I know that the Daley family and all of the guests were well the fact that many of the individuals on the floor of the House would have liked to have been present and pay their respects to Mayor Daley and the unveiling were up here voting on reapportionments. As I say, it may not make much better except that those in attendance in the feel ceremony full well realize that you were on, perhaps, the most important business this Legislature has faced. Thank you."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz." Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the believe that the question is whether you give your word and you keep it. A word was given that this House would stand in recess for a couple of hours so people could take part in the ceremonies with the unveiling of the statue. This House, in 1977, created a Commission and they allocated, initially 60,000. It was raised to 140,000 dollars for the purpose of providing a statue and paying tribute to a gentleman who served, not only Chicago, this great state and this great nation in a very capable manner. A lot of people came from Chicago and different points of this state to participate in this ceremony. I. for one and Members on both sides of the aisle, had every intention of participating in greeting the Daley family and, many other friends who arrived in the State Capitol to participate in this ceremony. Mr. Speaker. I really believe you have, maybe in all conscience, you decided that 1902 and 1903 would not take as long as it did, but unfortunately when you give a Gentleman a commitment, President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House participating in the ceremony, the Governor of this state, but more important the Daley family and Mrs. Daley and many friends who arrived here. I thought it was a disservice to this Body and especially to many Democratic Members of not letting us at least to drop by and say hello I know we have a duty to do and we try to do it the best we possibly can, but, in all reality, I think a commitment is given as was given to John Vitek and Bill Laurino, a commitment should be kept. Or if going to go into something like that, come out and openly state that there has been a change in plans and we're going to have to hopefully reconvene at a different hour to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

address this important subject. I think it's a disservice. You do owe this House an apology and you do owe, especially this side of the aisle, an apology. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Speaker Ryan." "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm somewhat surprised at the previous speakers words about my lack of keeping my word. I think everbody's been here long enough and knows this process well enough to know that best laid plans go astray. I think sometimes the Representative Vitek knows that too. And Representative I'm sorry that you feel that way. I never made a public announcement. I said I was going to try and break from 12:00 to 3:00 today. That was my intention, was well intentioned, believe me. I didn't break my word, and I'm sorry that you feel that way."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson." Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I count myself as one person who respects. respected Mayor Daley in life and continue to respect his memory. I think the most critical thing that Mayor Daley has left us is a legacy of a city that works, of government that works and solves problems. I believe that no more fitting tribute can be done to Mayor Daley than to get with the business of this House and let the problems of government be solved. And I would suggest that when Members of the Minority Party suggest that the Speaker is a Nazi that there might be certain problems then in reciprocating personal courtesies. I would suggest they rethink that and that every Member of this House rethink what has happened in this Session to try to problems in an air of civility so that we can resolve the problems of the State of Illinois before June

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Get them solved."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yes, George did tell me that he was going to try to recess from 12:00 till 3:00 and I took that and I carried it to my leaders and I told them that this was the plan so that we could conduct this. But one thing that Mayor Daley always carried in his heart. He always forgave the sinner and he carries no grudge. And just as Mayor Daley trained me as a young man, I forgive you, George, and believe me, I know that you're a good leader for the Republican side as well as my leaders. And I hope someday that we can return the compliment to you. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Henry."

Henry: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Members of the General Assembly to applaud with me 80 students from the west side of the City of Chicago, south side that is representing the Alternative School Network. They are to my left, led by Myra Simpson and Tom Pepper."

- Speaker Telcser: "Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate,
 Senate Bill 202. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 202, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kendall, Representative
 Hastert."
- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Bill 202 allows the state's attorney from the county in which the regional superintendent has his major office, allows the state's attorney to act as a legal council for the Regional Board of School Trustees. It's a permissive Bill, and he would only act in that capacity upon request from the Regional Board. This Bill has been discussed and cleared with the Illinois State's Attorney's Assocation and

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- a very simple Bill that I see no problem with. And I urge a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 202 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

 Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Braun: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. The Senate Bills,
 Third Reading continue through pages 2, 3, 4, and 5 and...

 5 through 7 rather and the Calendar's not made clear where
 the Short Debate Calendar ends and the Regular Debate
 Calendar begins. Am I to assume that Senate Bill 59 is not
 on Short Debate?"
- Speaker Telcser: "That's what the Parliamentarian informs me."

 Braun: "It's just that the Calendar does not make that clear."

 Speaker Telcser: "Doesn't have a heading. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 158 'ayes', none voting 'no', 1 answering 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 - voting 'no', 1 answering 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 464. Representative Stuffle, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Stuffle: "I think for purposes of announcement that I think that both Republicans and Democrats would be interested in at this point in time because of the crucial nature of the issue of workman's compensation that's been before this Body for the past several years to indicate that today in Cook County Circuit Court a final judgement has been issued which stands to save the persons who carry workman's comp insurance in this state over 1 billion dollars. The Cook County Circuit Court has today ruled that the 23.8% 1979 compensation rate hike in Illinois is to be rolled back and eliminated and that the 250 workman's comp carriers in this state are to refund to approximately 150,000 Illinois

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

employers 750 million dollars in workman's compensation overcharges. This was a suit brought by the AF of L CIO some years ago, as you know and joined by business, and I think this is a first victory to show that we're on the right track together to reducing these costs and having real rates installed instead of phony ones."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? All right. Senate Bill 464.

Representative Schneider."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 464, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is an extension of last year's proposal which we adopted to allow teachers to purchase from the pension system health insurance program coverage. We placed a cap on the dollars per month that are expended from those investment earnings at \$18.00 and also included is a provision to allow certain members who have Congressional experience to buy into the General Assembly Retirement System. And I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 464."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Is there any fiscal impact to this?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Yes. The best number I saw on this was \$200,000.00,
Joe."

Ebbesen: "That's the annual....according to ours...I wanted to see if our numbers are the same. We have increase in the annual cost of \$248,000.00, but also there's an increase in the unfunded accrued liability of \$760,000.00. Is that

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

correct?"

Schneider: "In this case it just depends on how many people participate. A lot of teachers are not eligible for the Medicare benefits, for example and choose to participate through this system. So, as I said, the best number we can come up with would be \$200,000.00."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "I think it provides a good"

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. I didn't see you. Representative
Terzich?"

Terzich: "Yes. This ...Didn't we just pass a Bill that we allowed 50% to be paid on the hospitalization?..."

Schneider: "That was the previous Session."

Terzich: "The previous Session and now you want to go up to 80%?"

Schneider: "That would be 80% with a lid however, at \$18.00 per month."

Terzich: "Well, is this a pension benefit or a medical expense benefit?"

Schneider: "This occurs as a medical expense for teachers that are never...not eligible for other kinds of programs.

Obviously it's through..."

Terzich: "...But this is not a pension benefit though is it?"

Schneider: "Well, however you want to describe that,

Representative Terzich, you're welcome to describe it."

Terzich: "It's a medical expense benefit, not a pension benefit..."

Schneider: "It is something that we undertook a year ago and we have it now as law and I am dealing with the funding of it now with the concept."

Terzich: "Well, you know, on the Bill, from my understanding they have approximately 3,000 members enrolled in the system and it's costing roughly \$448,000.00 at the present time on an

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

annual cost and you want to increase it to approximately \$648,000.00 with this Bill. Is that correct?"

- Schneider: "All I can suggest to you is that it is difficult to project the numbers of members who would be involved in that and if you want to take a shot at it for that purpose, you're welcome. But, in my judgment, I can't predict how many post-retirement or pre-retirement people would be involved. Again, as I suggested to Representative Ebbesen, that's a number that's difficult to project, depending on the number of people who select to choose the program."
- Terzich: "Well, if they have approximately 3,000 now, why would it be any less?"
- Schneider: "I don't accept your...You know, those figures may stay the same. I was projecting beyond that. You're saying that the 200,000 would come as a result of something that goes on top of it. And I think you have to look at the figures that relate to the numbers who are involved. Some may or may not stay with the program. We don't know what health insurance opportunities exist for some citizens. They may choose other kinds of programs."
- Terzich: "Well, on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."
- Terzich: "...This last Session we made the unfortunate mistake of including medical expense benefits into the pension system the same way Social Security started to become a social program and what have you. I have no objections on the fact that these people do need medical care, but I certainly think it's a bad precedent and the mere fact that we even had the pension system paying for medical expense benefits which has nothing to do with their particular needs. Now, one year later, after we originally...put these people in at 50% cost, they come up now and they want

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

it 80%. And I'm sure that the next Session it will probably be 100%. There's no wind that this amount will ever decrease and right now you're going to say that it costs over \$600,000.00 that is taken out of the pension system and this will go on infinitum and certainly is going to lower the unfunded liability...er...increase unfunded liability and the pension system will never be relieved of this expense and I don't believe that even belongs into the pension system, let alone that we come back a year later, say 80% when we originally passed 50%. And I think it's a bad precedent and it has no place in our pension system. I think maybe we should have all of our retirees have their insurance paid out of our pension It's simply a bad precedent and I would...I wouldn't think that would be a good idea to vote for this type of legislation."

Schneider: "This isn't Americanization, Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "This is Short Debate, Gentlemen.

Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "Thank you. The Representative hasn't been accurate on other things. I recognize his problem with it and I point out to him on some other kinds of legislation when it's the law, it's the law. He doesn't understand that obviously. But what we're looking at here is a service for persons in the pension who choose to elect it. It is a concept that is law. He ignores the limit that we put on it at \$18.00 per month. It fluctuated up to 25, if I'm not mistaken in a prior year, so this is actually a kind of Again, I would ask for your support of 464 in restraint. order to serve those individuals as well as those persons who were involved in Congress or in service the Congress who would choose to participate in our system with the proper pay in. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

ĺ

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 464. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Schuneman to
explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we should listen to what Representative Terzich brought up on this issue. It seems to me that what we're doing here is taking Teachers! Pension Funds which are already under funded. We've all heard that from teachers throughout the state. There's not enough money in the Teacher's Retirement System now. And what we're seeking to do here is pull some of that money out and use it for a medical insurance program which I believe was just approved by the Legislature just last year. And it was approved at the level where we were going to pay 50% of the cost and now, we're seeking already to raise that to 80% of the cost. I think we should reject this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm terribly confused and I'm sorry that this was on Short Debate and I didn't get to ask the Sponsor the appropriate questions. But the analysis that I have in my Bill book indicates that Amendment #2 in the House deletes everything having to do with Teachers' Retirement System and that the Bill now only applies to certain Members who will qualify for General Assembly pensions. And without clarification on that issue, I will have to vote 'present''."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunner."

Brummer: "After this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Alexander.

 Bradley. Braun. Capparelli. Domico. John Dunn. Ralph

 Dunn. Ewell. Garmisa. Kucharski. Kustra. Lechowicz.

 Macdonald. Margalus. Martire. McBroom. Peters. Polk.

 Redmond. Robbins. Stanley. Stearney. Telcser. Topinka.

 Vitek. Winchester. And, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any additions? Representative McBroom.

 Representative McBroom votes 'aye'. Representative Kustra

 votes 'aye'. Representative Barnes votes 'aye'.

 Representative Stanley, 'aye'. Representative Domico,

 'aye'. Representative Piel, 'aye'. What's the vote, Mr.

 Clerk? Eighty-eight 'ayes'. Representative Martire?"

Martire: "I wish to be voted 'aye'."

- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Martire as 'aye'. There are 89 'ayes'. Jack? 57..56 'no', 9 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 546. Representative Brunner, excuse me."
- Brummer: "Yes, I'd just like to announce that we're privileged to have with us today a former State Representative from Effingham, Representative Chuck Keller, in the center aisle. He has something to do with the little oil company in Effingham and I think he also volunteered to help with the reapportionment problem should anyone seek that assistance."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keller, welcome back to Springfield. It's good to see you. Representative Breslin?"
- Breslin: "We also have a former State Representative from LaSalle County, Representative Joe Fennesey, in the back."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative, nice to see you again. Senate Bill 546, Representative Schuneman. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 546, a Bill for an Act in relation to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

making state agency rules and regulations flexible in their application to small businesses and small organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 546 is a Bill to help ease the impact of State Government rules on small business in Illinois. State agencies in the past have often adopted rules and regulations without giving any consideration to their impact upon big business versus small business. Big business often has available the services of lawyers, accountants and other technicians to deal with complex and burdensome rules and regulations.

Small business, on the other hand, often cannot afford..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative. Can the Gentleman have your attention please? Proceed, Sir."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Small business often cannot afford to hire such technicians on a full time basis and is thereby placed at a competitive disadvantage. Senate Bill 546 seeks to ease that burden by requiring state agencies to consider the impact on small business before adopting rules and regulations. It requires state agencies when adopting rules and regulations to reduce the impact of rule making on small business. It requires the agencies to provide smaller entities with an opportunity to participate in the rule making process. It also requires an initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis with regard to making. This legislation is the state version of the flexible regulations Bill recently passed by Congress. has bipartisan support and bipartisan Sponsorship. joint Cosponsor in the House is Representative Bus Yourell. The Bill passed out of Committee on a vote of 16 to It passed the Senate 57 to nothing. And I would nothing. urge your support."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in opposition but I have some questions that I think ought to be put into the record for purposes of legislative intent. And I would ask if the Gentleman would yield."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Getty: "Is it your intent that any regulations pursuant to this

Act would be drawn in such a way as to clearly delimit that
they apply only to small as opposed to big businesses?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes. It is our intent, Representative. And small business is defined in the Bill as being a business which is independently owned and operated, not dominant in its field and which employs fewer than 50 full time employees or which has gross annual sales of less than four million dollars."

Getty: "Is it your further intention that these regulations be carefully drawn so that big business would not come under them and it would not cause any confusion in..to the agencies so that there would no question as to applicability?"

Schuneman: "Well, yes, Representative. Our intention is that
this Bill apply only to small business and that big
business not receive a windfall from the passage of this
Act."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schuneman to close."

Schuneman: "Simply ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate

Bill 546. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Is there any

discussion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

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

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Representative Nelson and Findley 'aye'. On this Bill there are 157 voting 'aye', none 'nay', none 'present'. Senate Bill 546, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. McBroom 'aye'. 158 'aye'. Senate Bill 697, Representative J.J.Wolf. Out of the record. Senate Bill 731, Representative White? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 731, a Bill for an Act in relation to cycle rider safety training. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Daniels: "Representative White."
- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to return this Bill to Second Reading for a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests leave to return to Second Reading. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Second Reading. Senate Bill 731."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment \$2, White, amends Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative White, Amendment #2."
- White: "Okay, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Amendment #2 is a simple matter. All I'm doing is putting
 the Bill in the proper Section of the Act."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any questions? Being none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill ... The Gentleman asks leave to keep it on Short Debate. Does he have leave?

 Leave is granted. Senate Bill 853. Representative Woodyard. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 853, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the definition of gasohol. Third Reading of the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Woodyard.

 Representative Giorgi?"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement. We have Mr. Jerome Butler, the Director of Public Works of the City of Chicago with us today visiting in the back of the room. Jerome Butler."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard on Senate Bill 853."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Senate Bill 853 is a Bill that actually defines the alcohol content of gasohol. The ten percent of alcohol that is in gasohol is now defined to be at least 197 1/2 proof. This is the first time in the State of Illinois that we have attempted to define the chemical analysis of that. This Bill passed the Senate 57 to nothing. It's supported by the Illinois Alcohol Fuels Association and the Institute of Natural Resources. And I would solicit your favorable vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 853. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is Have all those voted who wish? Representative Have all those voted who wish? Bullock? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On this Bill there are 'nay', none 'present'. Senate Bill 853, 'ave'. no having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby Senate Bill 864, Representative Telcser? declared passed. Representative Barr."
- Barr: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've got an introduction I'd like to make. We have in the balcony today the City Clerk of the city of Evanston, Sandra Brost."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 864, Representative Telcser? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 889, Representative Smith, Irv Smith? Read the Bill,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 889, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Smith."

- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment to 889 would restore the benefits to dependents of state employees under the Insurance Act.

 This Amendment passed last week almost unanimously. I would recommend and suggest that we pass this Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 889. Is anyone in opposition? In opposition? Representative Matijevich?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not stand in opposition, in fact I support this although it may be outside of the rules in Short Debate, I want to insert into the record our legislative intent I want to repeat it again, relative to the Bill that we passed, that we had earlier today, the Amendment and passage of the Bill providing the funds so that the benefits on the Group Insurance Plan of the State of Illinois, public employees is not in any way diminished from the present level of benefits. I thought we ought to insert that into the record again."
- Speaker Daniels: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 889. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. Bill, having received 153 'aye', 5 Bill 889. having Senate received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 930, Representative McAuliffe? Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

McAuliffe, Senate Bill 930. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 930, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

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

Senate Bill 930 pertains to disability provisions of the

Illinois Municipal State Employees and Downstate Teachers'

Retirement System into compliance with the Federal Age

Discrimination Employment Act. I move for its passage."

Speaker Daniels: "Anyone in opposition? The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 930. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 138 voting 'aye', 11 'no', 7 'present'. Senate Bill 930, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 955, Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 955, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I'd like permission to return House
Bill..er..Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks for leave to return Senate
Bill 955 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have
leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Second

Reading, Senate Bill 955. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Hoffman..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, Amendment #3."

Hoffman: "I withdrew Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman! "I withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Hoffman..."

Speaker 'Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, Amendment #5."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Due to some technical problems Amendment #4 had to be withdrawn and replaced with Amendment #5. What Amendment #4 does it deals with the issue of the hearing in reference to teacher dismissal. At the present time it provides that there will be a hearing unless with the teacher within 20 days requests in writting that no hearing scheduled. What this Amendment does is provide that...reverses that and provides that no hearing will held unless requested by the teacher within 20 days. The purpose for the Amendment is to address the issue of requirement that a hearing be held even if the teacher can't be located. We've had eight cases where teachers just dropped out of sight. Each of these cases cost the local districts between I'm told \$300 and \$1500 to go There's a state cost involved which through the procedure. is approximately the same. And the purpose of this Amendment is to eliminate that kind of a possibility. We've had about 100 cases or 110 cases so approximately eight percent of those cases have really been for maught in the sense that we couldn't even find the party that was involved. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker 'Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. This is the cleaned up version of the Amendment that was taken out the other day.

I think that Representative Hoffman, while citing a problem

69th Legislative Day

.

June 23, 1981

in a possible eight cases, is putting an Amendment together that does indeed reverse the situation as we find it now and does indeed reverse the public policy of this state with regard to hearings on teachers covered by this particular Section of the law. I think that the public policy of the state being in place, it ought to be kept there. It does take away the onus on the board and places it on the teacher to request a hearing. In its wisdom, the General Assembly decided that the teacher ought to have the right to a hearing unless they requested otherwise. I think the 20 day procedure herein, in reversing the does place the onus now on the teacher in a hearing process that we developed. It also provides for more bureaucratic activities by the State Board of Education, if you read page three of the Amendment, that I don't think are necessary. We have voted to give the teacher the rights that are contained in the law now and I don't believe that just because of the possibility of minor problems in eight cases when we have a hundred thousand teachers in the state, we ought to consider reversing the rights now on the law and that we ought to consider imposing even more bureaucratic standards, rules regulations that I don't think are necessary and for those reasons, I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Amendment. Many of you know that I have generally been favorable with the 'N and LIO', various teacher groups. So I don't rise in any sense of opposing them. But what Representative Hoffman proposes is sheer common sense. In the Amendment in the law as it would be if this Amendment is adopted and the Bill ultimately gets signed into law, the teacher would receive full notice of his or her rights

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

this hearing. There is no problem about that. If the teacher wants a hearing, there's no problem in requesting It is just plain common sense to have the law be that way rather than have all of the parties whether any of them want a hearing or not, indeed whether the hearing may be damaging to any of the parties in the process, it is just not common sense to have all of those parties prepared, do all of the things that need to be done to prepare for a hearing when in fact there may not be hearing, there may be no need for a hearing. This is It's just a good common really not a big issue. sense clean up of the existing law. I can see in no way that it hurts teachers. If I thought it did I would oppose it. urge adoption of the Amendment. It's a good common sense clean up of the law."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The deepest cut of all is that, coming from my friend, a repeal of one of my Bills. Other than that, we have a few other things to discuss and that is that simply we've really seen no hardship worked. I think Gene figures eight Testimony in Committee, and I don't know percent. it's done that well, by some of the lobbyists who make comments to the Committee indicated a lower number that and then later on said maybe it's higher. But I think the very important point is that, should we err on the side of the group or should we err on the side of the individual? I think if you overlook the rights of individual to a hearing that is proper, to one that is not really going to work a hardship on the district and yet to preserve the rights of those individual teachers who are served a dismissal notice. I can't quite understand why we would want to put in jeopardy even one person who

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

need for a proper..proper explanation as to the reasons for dismissal. I can go through a litary of reasons of course. But we did have a hearing in the Committee on this very proposal which lost rather substantially and that is obviously why it's being offered here on the House floor. So, after appropriate deliberation, after realization by the Committee Members that we imperil a system that has been in place for a number of years and one that does justice to the individuals, especially when we're talking about their lifes work, I think it's a mistake made in haste. Over a period of years we've studied this. I think it's a good law as it stands. I don't see any need to repeal it at this point and I would ask that you vote 'no' on the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Hoffman, how is notice served upon a teacher if this Amendment were to be adopted?"

Hoffman: "Notice is served by registered mail, line one, page 22."

Getty: "Is that of the existing Act?"

Hoffman: "Yes. That's in the existing Act."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock. I'm sorry.

Representative Getty, excuse me. Where are we?"

Getty: "I'm trying to find line...You said line one, page what?"

Hoffman: "Line 22, page one, last line on the page."

Getty: "Okay. Are you referring to the Amendment, to your Amendment or the Bill?"

Hoffman: "I'm referring to the Amendment and it shows up on the Bill."

Getty: "Okay. All right. Fine. Now, there is no provision that would require that return receipt requested or that would

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

assure that the Board got back some evidence that the teacher in fact had knowledge. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "I believe that registered mail requires a receipt."

Getty: "I don't believe it does, Sir."

Hoffman "You have to, you know...it has to be signed for."

Getty: "All right. Would you... Addressing this Section that you pointed out, page one, line 22, does that apply to teachers who are being fired or does that just apply to teachers who are given leave because of a reduction in teaching force?"

Hoffman: "That covers the removal and dismissal of teachers in contractual continual service because this carries over and on the bottom of page two, it refers to Section 10-22.4 which is teacher dismissal. Look on the top of page three."

Getty: "Yes. I read on the bottom of page two, '...if a dismissal or removal is sought for any other reason...'.."

Hoffman: "... or cause..."

Getty: "...'..Or cause, including those under Section 10-22.4....
Now, 10-22.4..."

Hoffman: "...Is the Section on teacher dismissal for cause.

That's the Section for cause. I can read that for you. I fust happen to have it here."

Getty: "All right. So you would require registered mail but there would be..."

Hoffman: "That's what's required now."

Getty: "Okay. But.."

Hoffman: "I mean, I'm not changing that at all."

know for sure that notice has been given. In other words, under the old system, automatically there was scheduled a hearing and if the teacher didn't show up it was obvious either he didn't wish to show up...he or she didn't wish to show up or that they never in fact got the notice. But

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

here you're putting the onus on the teacher. Is that correct?"

- Hoffman: "The Amendment, which I..which has been added here, specifically says or requires that written has...unless the teacher within 20 days after receipt of notification of the enactment of the motion. So they've received...You know, we know that they've received that. The only thing we're doing is turning it around."
- Getty: "Well, yes, but that....The School Board would not know whether or not he had..he or she had received a notice unless there was something filed within 20 days with the School Board asking for a hearing. Is that correct?"
- Hoffman: "The teacher is going to be given notice by registered mail of the...of the dismissal and they have...they have to sign for the registered mail. If they didn't get that notice there was no way they could be discharged. That's the law now. We're not changing the law. We're only changing the request...er..the hearing."

Getty: "All right. Mr. Speaker, on the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

way that the rights of a teacher could inadvertently be trampled upon. There may be a requirement that registered mail be used and it may be that that registered mail delivery is made, but the teacher in fact never receives it. Because it's received by somebody else. Or in fact, the postal department does not deliver it. And yet, the onus is placed upon the teacher to within 20 days make that request. It seems to me that without a provision in this Amendment that would ensure unequivocally that notice was in fact served, such as is required by a deputy sheriff, such as is required that would provide for a return receipt to show actual receipt only by the individual involved, by

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the teacher himself, not somebody in his place instead. We are trampling on the rights that we have previously given to a fair due process hearing. That's all we're talking about, a fair due process hearing. The intent of the Sponsor may be good. It may be intended to clear up eight cases where they had some difficulty with the hearings but I don't think this Amendment is drawn in such a way that we're protecting the rights to due process. For that reason I would ask that you reject this Amendment at this time."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. I want to introduce to the Body. It seems like it's Democrats day when we had the unveiling of Mayor Daley's statue. For some of you that don't know this Gentleman, he's standing to my left in the corner over there. He's presently Commissioner of Chicago Board of Election Commissioners and served for 36 years in this chamber. I'd like to welcome back to Springfield as routinely is doing, a former Representative, Corneal Davis. Representative Davis, give him a hand."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis, nice to have you back in Springfield. Representative Vitek."
- Vitek: "I was going to move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

 Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Sir. The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me respond to some of the criticisms which have been made of this Amendment. Pirst, in reference to a comment made concerning additional

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

bureaucratic standards. let me indicate to the Body that other than the main issue that's been discussed included in this Amendment are two other small items, one which says that qualifications for hearing officers besides being accredited by a national arbitration organization, other qualifications that are established established by rule or regulation by the Board of Education are added to that. Also we provide that if for some reason the hearing officer choosen is unable or unvilling to serve or if both parties request it, a second list of prospective hearing officers will be provided. That is what was referred to as more bureaucratic standards. I would suggest to you that that would be an improvement to the Now, in regard to a comment made by my colleague from DuPage County suggesting that the deepest cut of all was the fact that I was attempting to improve on some previous endeavor that he had participated in and an endeavor in which I supported him. I would suggest to the Body that this is merely a clean up. experience with the legislation the way it is. I believe that this will make it easier for everyone to function this area. Third point I'd like to make is in reference to the issue of notification; I believe that registered mail, there is a record of that. I believe there is adequate notification. I believe that everyones rights will be protected and I would just conclude by saying I concur with Representative Reilly's rather succinct comment that this is common sense. And I would ask for your vote on this common sense Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman has requested a Roll Call.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Levin."

 Levin: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, while I respect the right of the Sponsor to present this Amendment, I would point out that this Amendment is Senate Bill 1151 that was thoroughly debated in Committee and it was defeated overwhelmingly in Committee. And I see this is going down, so I will stop.."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On Amendment #5, there are 55 voting 'aye', 91 voting 'nay', 2 present'.

 Amendment #5 fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Hoffman..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Darrow, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of an introduction. There's a blonde in the gallery from Auburn, Illinois who got tied up somewhere along the line with a Gentleman from Chicago who's now the acting Dean of the House, Mary Vitek, John Vitek's wife. Would you stand?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Welcome to Springfield again, Mrs. Vitek.

 Representative Kulas? Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been bombarded by Members from both sides of the aisle as to inquiries as to what the work schedule for today is and it distresses me when I can't give them an answer. So at this time I would pose my inquiry to you, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what the work schedule for today is? And please don't give me a dissertation on the biological or structural function of mushrooms because we are cognizant of that. If you know the answer, let us know. And if you don't know, let us know that you don't know and we'll take our inquiries to higher up."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kulas, my advice to you for the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

time being is stay out of the light. We will give you that when we find out ourselves. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while we're on the order of introductions, I'd like to take the opportunity to introduce three fine Ladies from the Peoria area sitting up in the Speaker's gallery. Among them is Virginia Treger who serves as the distinguished Chairwoman of the Republican party of Peoria County. She is also the widow of Clyde Treger who served in the State Senate for many years a number of years ago. And I'd like to welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huskey?"

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as long as we're on that Order, I have a very good friend, a friend of all of you in the House, Judge Romie Palmer who served with us for so many years in the House. Back here."

Speaker Daniels: "Judge Palmer, welcome back to Springfield.

It's nice to see you again. Representative Margaret

Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to our colleagues present this day, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to present to this august Body one who served most of his life here in these chambers in the House. I take great pleasure to present to you the Honorable Corneal A. Davis, who retired from this chamber as Dean of the House. The Honorable Corneal A. Davis."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "This is a distinct pleasure to have the wife of my colleague when I first came to Springfield...I was elected in 1942 and came to this chamber in 1943. And the man that I came down here to offer a tribute to his memory was the Leader in the Senate, Dick Daley, and sitting beside me right here was Tim Sullivan, the distinguished husband of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Margaret Smith, Representative Smith..Fred Smith and myself. This was in 1943. That's a long. long time. love this House. I know when .. the heat the Speaker took when he insisted that we remodel these chambers. I took it along with him and my name is on that plaque there on the Speaker's stand. The House has been a great.... The history of this House is that it has been a great liberal Body. When people tell me about the House of Representatives in Springfield, we passed as much liberal legislation as any State House in the nation. I can't say the same about the Senate, but the House was a liberal House and I always appreciated being in this House. fellowship. I enjoyed the Leadership and I enjoy being present here today. It was a distinguished honor to program to speak for a great Leader in 1955. me on the When the Democratic...as I said to them down there, when the Democratic party was considering a candidate for mayor, Congressman Dawson, who was my Leader, came back here to Chicago and he said to the three of us who were Members here- there were three of us at that time, Senator Whimby, Senator Smith and myself, 'What do you think of Dick Daley? I'm not down there with him and I'm coming back here today to vote for a mayor and tell me what you think of him'. And I said to him, 'Richard Daley was a friend in need and a friend in need is a friend indeed. I also said to them down there, 'While he was a great lawyer, but in truth, the law of the Lord was written in his heart'. Thank you very much for this opportunity. I love Margaret and my wife loves her too."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Representative Davis. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, on Amendment \$6."

Hoffman: "I feel like the Earl of Sandwich."

Speaker Daniels: "You ought to."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Hoffman: "Amendment #6 is an Amendment from the State Board of Education. It provides that building inspection for schools or school building inspection will conform with the Life Safety Code rather than any other code. We've had situations where, in some local communities around the state, over zealous building inspectors, fire inspectors have used standards which don't conform to the Life Safety Code, which is a general application across the state. And we would like to deal with this issue and adopt this Amendment. I might point out that...well, I was just going to point out that Section 2-312 of the Life Safety Code applies (sic, does not apply) to schools outside the City of Chicago. They're covered by Section 34 of the Code."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Hoffman, I've looked over Amendment #6 and
I'm unable to find any Section which would pre-empt a home
rule unit. Have I missed that somewhere or is it contained
elsewhere in the Bill or the Act so that it would not have
to be in here? Could you explain that to me?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that ... I'm uncertain about the answer to that question. Would you like... Maybe Representative Stuffle would like to comment on that. I don't know."

Getty: "Well, if you can't answer that question, I'd respectfully suggest that you either ought to table the Amendment or take this out of the record for the time being because I think that's very important."

Hoffman: "I concur with you. Representative Stuffle, was that your point?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I think that Representative Getty is absolutely

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

right. The problem is that you've got two jurisdictions in one, but you've still got the Codes involved with regard to a place like the City of Chicago that's home rule. And I think you ought to take it out and redraft the Amendment. Make it clear who this pertains to. The problem you address is an important one, but I think Representative Getty is absolutely right."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Out of the record. Take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "The Bill...Take the Bill out of the record.

The Bill will remain on Second Reading, Sir.

Representative Hoffman, do you desire the Bill to remain on

Second Reading or be moved to Third?

Hoffman: "Move it to Third."

Speaker Daniels: "Are there any further Amendments? Amendment is withdrawn. Representative Getty?"

Getty: "I have no objection if the Amendment is withdrawn."

Speaker Daniels: "The Amendment is withdrawn."

Getty: "Fine."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1111.

Representative Deuchler? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Does
the Gentleman have leave on that last Bill, Representative
Getty, to leave it on Short Debate? No objections. Leave
is granted. Short Debate. All right. Return to Senate
Bill 1111, Representative Deuchler. Read the Bill, Mr.
Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Bill provides that a downstate fireman who is forced to retire because of a sickness or injury incurred on duty shall receive a child's benefit for each of his dependent unmarried children under age 18."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Is there any opposition? Hearing none, the Bill 1111. question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1111 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Henry? all those voted who wish? Representative Horsey? Have all those voted who wish? Take .. Take the record. this Bill there are 150 'aye', 11 'no', none voting 'present'''. Senate Bill 1111. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Representative Sandquist. Out of the record. Bill 1119. Senate Bill 1146, Representative Bullock? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1146 essentially does three things. changes the reference to hearing examiner to administrative law judge. Secondly, it provides that the administrative must be an attorney licensed to practice in the State of Illinois, a grandfather clause for those hearing this officers. And thirdly, Bill in effect puts administrative law judges on par with those who presently practice in US...under the U.S. the Administrative Procedures Act. The Bill came out of the Senate 57 to zero. It came out of the House, Judiciary I Committee, ten to one. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you might

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

have. If there are no questions, I certainly would ask for an affirmative vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of 1146. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Dwight Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can see the chain of events that's going to happen here. We're going to call these fellows now administrative law judges. The next thing they're going to want is a judge's salary and the next thing, they'll want to be in the Judge's Retirement System and here we go. Now, I objection to making them lawyers because I think that's a good qualification for this job. If that's all it did, I'd be for it. But when you start calling these people judges, then you're going to have the people who have hearings for Public Aid and all these people, they're going to And you're going to have judges hanging out of your ears. And you talk about a pension problem. haven't seen anything yet. I think this is a bad Bill. We have had no shortage. I have been told that if this passes, we would be able to encourage better people. I can tell you we have no vacancies in our area and I can name you ten people that would like to have the job just as a hearing officer. So the argument is thin. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock to close."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was confused when Representative Friedrich spoke. He started out supporting the Bill and I think the more he listened to himself talk, he decided to oppose it. The fact of the matter is, this Bill does not deal with any pay increase and the fact of the matter is that I've stated clearly and simply what the Bill does. The Bill would in fact in the State of Illinois

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

under the Illinois Administrative Procedures Act allow individuals to use the same title as those persons who practice before...practice under the U.S. Administrative Procedures Act. The Bill came out of the Senate 57-0. It came out of the House Judiciary Committee ten to one. The attorneys on the Committee scrutinized the legislation, gave it an affirmative vote. And with having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would request an affirmative vote on Senate Bill 1146."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1146. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.

 Representative Schraeder to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that went to
 Judiciary I and I can see why they sent those other Bills
 to Exec. I and made it Judiciary III. This is a lawyers*
 Bill pure and simple and nothing else and ought to be woted
 down."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's some misconceptions about this legislation. All it does, it deals with a category of people working for the Department of Labor who have to make decisions concerning Unemployment Insurance. It's a very simple concept. This just gives them the function opportunity to accurately in their job classification. I move for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill there are 103 'aye', 46 'nay', 2 'present''. Senate Bill 1146....Representative Friedrich?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Friedrich: "I'm going to resist the temptation to verify, but the votes are not there."
- Speaker Daniels: "You're resisting the temptation? Okay. This
 Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
 declared passed. Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill
 169. Representative Greiman. Out of the record. Senate
 Bill 215, Representative Deuster. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Preston, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Preston: "For a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

- Preston: "I don't understand why you started with Senate Bill 169, why you didn't start at the beginning of the list on Second Readings?"
- Speaker Daniels: "That's where we left off yesterday, Sir. The Gentleman took Senate Bill 160 out of the record so we're starting with 169, which was taken out of the record.

 We're now on Senate Bill 215. Representative Deuster and somebody left this glass case on Representative DiPrima's desk. So if you are missing a glass case, it's up here at the front. Representative Currie's trying to break into the well here. All right. Representative Deuster? Committee Amendments? No Committee Amendments? Any Ploor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Getty..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty Amendment #1?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 would provide that actions for damage to person or property, but to no others, alleged to have been inflicted by the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

provisions of public transit by any public, municipal, governmental or quasi-municipal corporation, may be brought in the county where the incident giving rise to the alleged cause of action occurred. This is to clarify the jurisdictional requirements. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "It's hard for me to comment on the Amendment because I haven't seen it. I was wondering if this Amendment has been distributed or if somebody that has one..."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm advised it has been distributed and Chairman Barr has one right behind you there."

Deuster: "Oh, thank you, Chairman Barr."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Chairman Barr. Representative

Deuster."

Deuster: "... The Gentleman would yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Deuster: "The basic Bill provides that the RTA may be sued in any county in the region in which the transaction or some part occurred. Your Amendment seems to confine this to actions related to personal injury or property damage, but not to other kinds of actions. Do you have in mind by your Amendment that you would think the RTA could be sued out in McHenry County if they...if a bus ran over somebody or crashed into a car, but that no action could be brought out in McHenry County or one of the outlying areas with respect to the management of the RTA?"

Getty: "The existing Statute sets forth the jurisdictional requirements for filing an action against the RTA. What we are trying to do is to make it clear that actions for damage to the person or property could be brought where the incident giving rise to the alleged cause of action occurred. It's a simple jurisdictional thing and it would

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

be for the convenience of the parties who were injured."

Deuster: "Well, I'm wondering, Representative Getty, normally you're able to sue somebody where part of a transaction occurs. For example, if a person bought a monthly pass out in Woodstock or Joliet or someplace and somehow they..you know, they had some contractual reason to sue RTA, why should they have to go to downtown Chicago or the Cook County courts to sue for something in which they were really involved out in their home area and where the RTA might have an agent out in an outlying county?"

Getty: "Well, the simple fact is that if you were bringing an action in contract or for other reasons other than involving an individual who sustained injury, the body which has its headquarters in a certain area ought to have the right to be sued in that area. And that's what the Amendment of course would provide for."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "If I might speak to the Amendment, I don't think the..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Deuster: "..RTA should be any special character that is treated any more kindly than any other big corporation with high paid lawyers and high paid officials working for it. I think if a citizen in one of the outlying counties has some sort of a cause of action related to the RTA, they ought to sue just like any citizen sues any corporation, in the county where that transaction or a part of that transaction took place. To try to confine this simply to personal injury or property ignores the whole area of contractual law commuters who might be buying tickets and might have some cause of action or some other grief against RTA which is very much like a big corporation. There's no reason at all the RTA can't send their lawyers out to

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

McHenry, DuPage, Lake, Will or these outlying counties to defend a lawsuit if an agent of the RTA was responsible for causing an injury whether it be contractual, personal injury or property damage or anything else. And so I would urge all the Members to look at this Amendment very carefully and to reject it because this Amendment is designed to try and treat the RTA as a special privileged authority. And I think that's wrong."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join the House Sponsor of this Bill in opposing Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 215 and I hope everybody in the House is paying attention to this Amendment because this is an extremely important Amendment, particularly for those Representatives on both sides of the aisle who represent constituencies in the collar counties around the ring around Chicago. This is an RTA Amendment. This Amendment is pushed by the Chicago Members of the RTA in order to make sure that any cause of action brought by any of the six collar counties could not be brought in the Circuit Court in their county in their own Circuits. The law provides, this several times when we were talking about House Resolution 334, the law provides that the RTA can only be sued in the county in which it maintains its principle office which just happens to be the City of Chicago, the Cook County. So any type of lawsuit, if you hurt yourself or if you want to file for a ticket refund or...and this is what's important for those people from Kane, Lake and Will County who have been under funded the RTA in direct violation of the Act, if they want to bring a cause of action against the RTA to try to get the Chairman of that RTA to pay the money that's due and owing the collar counties under the Act, that cause of action can

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

only be brought in the City of Chicago in the Circuit Court of Cook County. There's no reason in the world why the RTA ought to be any different than any other municipal corporation or other corporation and not be sued in the counties in which it operates. It operates in Will County; It operates in Kane County: It operates in Lake County. But if they want redress they have to go to Cook County to get redress. This Amendment guts the Bill. Τ÷ does absolutely, totally gut the Bill. nothing more than The whole intention of the Bill is to make the RTA responsible to the five collar counties which it can now thumb its nose because it knows it will be before a friendly Judge in the City of Chicago. So I'm asking all of my friends on both sides of the aisle who want to see the RTA Act operate in the proper manner, who want to give mass transportation a chance to win the hearts of the people in the five collar counties, vote against this gutting Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 215."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. House. I would rise to support Representative Leinenweber and Representative Deuster and urge that the House reject Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 215. Amendment #1 and I say this for reemphasis, Amendment #1 does in fact gut the whole purpose of the Bill. I believe many of you noted with interest the number of times it's been necessary to go into court in connection with the RTA and the orchestrated shutdown of suburban services. Now, what the purpose of the Amendment is is to continue compelling people to go into court to fight the shutdown of suburban services in the City of Chicago, in Cook County. Everybody knows what the final outcome of those decisions will be and believe that the Membership...if the Membership cares

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

about service to the suburban areas of the RTA, then rejection of this Amendment and passage of the Bill on Third Reading is the proper course of action. This Amendment is an attempt to completely gut the purpose of the Bill which is to defend the suburban areas. I would urge rejection of the Amendment, a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this Amendment, one of the major problems that we've had with the RTA is the waste of the administration. the excess cost. the bloated bureaucracy, the limousines for the Chairman, the \$200.00 a meeting for each Member. This is an opportunity to save a few bucks in terms of the administration of the RTA by cutting down on legal expenses, sending lawyers out everywhere to every different courthouse in the six county area. This will save us some money. I think everybody wants to save money. We yet don't have a solution to mass transit and it's either going to be that it's going to be paid for locally or it's going to come through a sales tax or some other kind of tax. But whatever the solution is or the nonsolution, we need to get rid of the Whoever's going to pay for that waste, and this is one small step to elimination of a few dollars of waste. urge support for this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this does is reach, I think, an equitable compromise between the law as it is now and the Bill as it is offered by the Gentleman and as it came over from the Senate. Under current law the RTA, like many agencies, must be sued in the place where the contracts arise, be sued where its main or principle office is, if you wish to bring an action. What this

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendment would do would provide that that rule would be changed so that where there is personal injury or property damage, that the action could be brought in the place where that incident took place. RTA contracts, like contracts of other governmental agencies, are executed by them in their home office. This would keep in an orderly judicial manner all of those contracts subject to review by the county which that home office is located. That's really what the common law is anyway. This is merely an extension of that aspect of it. It would keep the present law regarding that intact. To vote against this Amendment is to vote against tax savings, as Representative Levin pointed out. going to be far more costly if the governmental agency is required to run from thither to you in order to multiple filings by various individuals who might wish to bring those actions in different counties rather than having an orderly judicial process whereby all cases on a subject could be consolidated because they are in county. That's the purpose of this Amendment, to give people who suffer individual wrongs the right to sue in the county where it occurred and at the same time, have a fair and orderly system for dealing with suits of other natures that are brought against a governmental entity. it does. Ιf you're in favor of clean and clear judicial administration and if you're in favor of tax saving, vote for this Amendment. If you're in favor of a multiplicedness sort of judicial system, if you're in favor of a loss of money to the taxpayers, vote against it. solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment \$1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

'no'. The voting is open. Henry? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Amendment there are 52 'ayes', 102 'nay'. Amendment \$1 is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 223, Representative
 Stiehl? Cissy Stiehl? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 223, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Industrial Development Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Giorgi-Hallock-Jim Kelley.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi, Amendment #3?

Representative Giorgi on the floor? Who are the other

Sponsors to that?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hallock and Jim Kelley."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jim Kelley? Representative Hallock? Representative Jim Kelley, Amendment \$3, Senate Bill 223? Representative Stiehl, your pleasure?"
- Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to table the Amendment."

 Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Madigan, amends Senate Bill 223 on page one..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan? Representative Getty,

 are you going to handle that for Representative Madigan?

 Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Wonder if you would take this out of the record so

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Representative Madigan can get back out here?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stiehl, Representative Getty has requested that you take it out of the record."
- Stiehl: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we're getting on to the end of the Session and this Bill has been on the Calendar for quite some time and I would like to proceed with it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."
- Getty: "I'm not asking that we not proceed with it. I'm just asking if you would take it out for a few minutes so Representative Madigan could get out here and with the agreement of the Chair that we would go back to it."
- Speaker Daniels: "That's agreeable if it's agreeable to the Sponsor."
- Stiehl: "All right, fine. Thank you."
- Getty: "Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right. We will temporarily take Senate
 Bill 223 out of the record. Senate Bill 236,
 Representative Stuffle? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 236, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, McPike..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McPike, Amendment #1."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Woodyard, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like a ruling from the Chair on the germaneness of this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Let me see the Bill on the Amendment, Mr.

 Clerk. Representative McPike, the ruling of the Chair is
 that Amendment #1 is not germane. Representative McPike?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- McPike: "Well, could you explain on what basis you made that ruling? This Bill clearly amends the same Act. It's an Amendment affecting community college employees, employees of higher education and the original Bill addresses itself to the Public Community College Act. Can you tell me on what basis you ruled that the Amendment was not germane?" Speaker Daniels: "The original Act amends the State Board Article of Public Community College to increase the dollar amounts of credit hour grants to college districts. The Amendment is a collective bargaining Amendment. Representative
- McPike: "It's a collective bargaining Amendment affecting community college employees. It's the same Act."

Speaker Daniels: "That is the ruling of the Chair, Sir."

McPike: "Thank you."

McPike."

Speaker Daniels: "Further Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McGrew, amends Senate
 Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew, Floor Amendment \$2.

 Representative Stuffle?"
- Stuffle: "We've taken this out of the record twice for him. He's not here. I move to table the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle has moved to table
 Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',
 opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is tabled.
 Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #3, Bullock.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, Amendment #3."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 236 essentially makes the following changes in the credit hour grant rates.

Amendment #3 increases the equalization grant rate from 6.2 cents to 6.6 cents per semester hour for each thousand

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

dollars a community college district is below the state average local tax per equivalent student. This increase in credit hour grants as provided in Senate Amendment #3 as amended in the House Committee on Higher Education, will provide for a 10.5% increase or 90% of the personal service base. And this 10.5% salary increase does not apply to the executive level administrators. I also would like to cite for the record that Senate Bill 236 with Amendment #3 for the baccalaureate degree it would be \$29.17, for business occupation and technical occupation it would be \$18.32 and \$28.37, respectively. For health general services it would be \$49.29 and \$5.25 respectively and for development and the GED program it would be \$24.09 and \$10.01 respectively. I'd be glad to answer any questions, Speaker, on Amendment #3. It does in fact increase the equalization grant as provided in Amendment #3. And I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Bullock, you've discussed the changes in the rates. Could you tell us how the appropriation would be affected by the changes in the rates that you propose and at what level the appropriation would have to be adjusted to reflect the higher levels in your Amendment?"

Bullock: "Well, Representative Stuffle, the Amendment would necessitate an adjustment, and I'm sure you're aware of that, and the rates that I cited for this Assembly would in fact equal about 6.2 million."

Stuffle: "Is that the amount of money that the Governor's allocation reduction totals? I think it's a 4.8% cut from the initial request?"

Bullock: "Yes, Sir, for credit hour grants."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Stuffle: "Well, to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker and Members..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Stuffle: "I've always supported appropriating as much money as we could feasibly come up with for the needs and the ends of the Community College Board and the 37 odd community colleges under its jurisdiction. I find myself position of not exactly knowing how to vote on this because I favor the increased funding. But on the other hand the difficulty that we have faced so far this Session in finding necessary education funds has been one that each of us knows has been a very difficult situation that we all find ourselves in. So I only suggest that knowing the limitations of our budget that each of consideration to the amount of money involved here which Representative Bullock has indicated is 6.2 million dollars additionally needed to fund this change in credit hour I think each of us would like to vote for this grants. particular Amendment, but some, I suspect, as I find myself torn between where I would like to be and where I think we're going to end up."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "I'm sorry. I was in discussion. Did you indicate what the cost of this program would be?"

Bullock: "Yes, Sir. I indicated that there was a 10.5% salary increase and that was about 90% of the personal service basis and there was a 10.5% salary increase which did not apply to the executive level administration. And I also indicated that this was a recommendation of the Board of Higher Education."

Tuerk: "What is the dollar amount though? I missed that. I get the 10%, but dollar amount I must have missed."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Bullock: "This was consistent with the recommendation earlier and

I indicated it was about 6.2 million."

Tuerk: "Six point two million? Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hudson. Representative Keane, your light is not on, Sir."

Keane: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I echo the sentiments of Representative Stuffle. However, working on the formula for the junior colleges each year is a very delicate task. And I view that as something similar to an agreed Bill process. The junior colleges have worked this formula out to ...and it's been accepted by a majority or most of the junior colleges. It's something that they have agreed that they can live with and therefore, I think we ought to go along with the Bill as it came out of the Senate and as it was agreed to by the junior college groups. And therefore, very, very hesitantly I would ask to resist this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise to oppose this Amendment. The arbitration compromise has taken many, many long hours and particularly with the Senate action and final agreement was reached on the appropriation. I want all of you to understand that this will be overbudgeted by about 6 and 2/10ths million dollars. And certainly that thing that Representative Keane was referring to is definitely true. We do have agreement now among all of the college systems on salary increases and this certainly would throw that completely out of whack. And so, I encourage your 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, with great reluctance, I have to rise against this Amendment. I think it does violence to the agreement that the junior colleges had. I think everybody

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

would like all people to have as much money as possible and perhaps as much as they deserve. But if we get out of area of agreement on the junior colleges, we're going to find that all types of people are going to put all types of Amendments on the particular Bill and in the end, we know what the bottom dollar line is going to be. It's going to set us apart Section by Section. It is an erroneous thing that has to be and I would suggest that we try to stick with the agreed process so that in the meantime some of you and where your junior colleges can figure that they have enough money, they budget for it, they will find out that they are the ones who are going to be lost. And it is with great reluctance that I must rise against my seatmate who is usually erudite, brilliant and has all of the other qualifications of leadership, but in this case I think he's simply mislead by his zeal to do too much for too many people. And a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock to close."
- Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I need Gene Hoffman over here. I can't compete with a seat mate that sits dishonorable. I mean for the first time in my legislative career my seat mate opposes my Bill. I think it is a good Bill, don't you, Gene? I think it is such a good Bill, Mr. Speaker, if you'll listen to me up there..."
- Speaker Daniels: "If you would have voted for the map you could have had Gene Hoffman as a seat mate."
- Bullock: "I think it is such a good Bill. I just ask...It is such a good Bill. I mean, Fred Tuerk spoke against it, and Monsignor Keane spoke against it, and Rabbi Stuffle spoke against it. I would just accept a voice vote on this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment #3 fails.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Further Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Third Reading. Senate Bill 250,
 Representative Jack Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 250, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency Act, Second
 Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
 Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion filed to table Amendment #1 by

 Representative Swanstrom."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Swanstrom, a Motion to table

 Amendment #1."
- Swanstrom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would at this time move to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Could the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."
- Leverenz: "For what reason would you desire to table Amendment \$1, and was it your Amendment?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Swanstrom."
- Swanstrom: "Representative Leverenz, there has been a question as
 to the germaneness of that Amendment. And that is the
 reason for my request to withdraw it."
- Leverenz: "We stand to recognize your Parliamentarian. You're entirely correct. That's alright."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew. The Gentleman,
 Representative Swanstrom, moves to table Amendment #1. All
 those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Brummer Winchester Rea Robbins Bower McCormick..."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brummer, Amendment #2."

"Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the This Amendment simply authorizes the Director of Emergency Services and Disaster Agency to transfer a state owned two unit prefabricated classroom building which is presently located on the Zeigler - Royalton school district property to the Hamilton - Jefferson Regional Board of School Trustees for the use and benefit of the Franklin -Jefferson Special Education District. This unit was placed there intially at a time there was a problem with mine subsidence on an emergency basis. The Department of Emergency Services and Disaster Agency no longer has any use for that facility there. The Franklin - Jefferson Special Education District desires to locate it on the Rend Lake College Campus to be used as an administration building, and they are willing to pay the cost of moving the building."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Miller. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, I rise in support of the Amendment. It is a bipartisan Amendment. I think Representative Brummer explained it in great detail. It is not going to cost the Department of Emergency Services any money or the State of Illinois. The school district...the Franklin — Jefferson School District will gladly move those buildings if we can give them authorization to use them. I would ask for a favorable vote on a 'do adopt' Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Amendment \$2.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Amendment \$2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Brummer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brummer."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Brummer: "I would like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdraw. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. The Chairman of the DuPage County Republican Organization is in the aisle, former Representative, present State Senator, Pate Phillips. Senate Bill 257, Representative Oblinger. 257. Read the Bill, Nr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 257, a Bill for an Act to provide exemption for certain use and occupation taxes for ethel alcohol, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Rea."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea, Amendment #1."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This
Amendment is agreed on with the Sponsor of the Bill. It
clarifies the definition of rolling stock exemption which
was overlooked in earlier legislation. And I would ask for
its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, Amendment #2.
Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 269,
Representative Sandquist. The Gentleman on the floor? Out
of the record. Senate Bill 294, Representative Vinson.
Representative Vinson, the Gentleman on the floor? Out of
the record. Senate Bill 300, Representative Watson. Read

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 300, a Bill for an Act in relation to the rights of debtors and creditors amending certain Acts therein named, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Greiman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, Amendment #1."

Greiman: "What...Bill 300...Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 300 is a very very important Bill that Representative Watson is sponsoring. I might tell you, a very good Bill that I indeed support on Third Reading. And I commend Representative Watson and Senator Weaver for their efforts to reform the Debtor Creditor Law and the Exemption Law I think that they have been true to their Illinois. commitment, and that they are doing a good job that I will support on Third Reading. But along the road we must look at this Bill critically. This...one of the elements, important elements of traditional Illinois law. provide for a homestead exemption. Under the present Illinois law, there is a homestead exemption of \$10,000 for each householder. This Bill establishes a \$7,500 exemption each individual. Now what that means, I suspect, is that a person who, for example, is a widow or a widower indeed a householder and now has \$10,000 exemption. are now reducing that by this Bill to \$7,500. In other words, we are saying that in a time when real estate values have certainly gone high, when real estate values increased and houses are worth sometimes five fold what they were worth ten years ago, we are saying that we are going to reduce the exemption from \$10,000 for that widow \$7,500. or widower down to Now the answer...the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

counter-answer to this will be 'Yes, indeed, but we're doing it by an individual. So that a husband and wife now gets \$7,500 twice if they both go into bankruptcy. therefore, for some couples, for some couples, it would be a \$15,000 exemption. That is true. And I say to you and I say to Representative Watson and Senator Weaver, in sense, they have done a good job. On the other hand, they have shut out, essentially, people...widows, widowers, who are indeed often the needlest and often people who are in difficulty and reduced in a time of inflation in home ownership. And inflation in the value of homes have, in fact, reduced the amount of exemption under the I think such an action is unwise. Certainly it is in the best interest of the people of Illinois that even if someone goes bankrupt, they stay in their home if they have a family. I mean, everybody has to love someplace. And my only suggest...therefore, this Amendment restores the traditional \$10,000 limitation for Homestead. Now, make no mistake. If a husband and wife go bankrupt, they would then get \$20,000 in equity. But in a market like today, that may not be a great deal. If any of you have purchased a house in the last few years, I, therefore, tell you that ... and certainly in terms, for example, of what a farm is worth, and what it costs to buy a farm today. \$20,000 is nothing. It is a drop in the bucket. And even in urban areas it is a drop in the bucket. It is barely what they need to stay and live and continue to live. Accordingly, I have offered this Amendment to raise back from \$7,500 that the Watson Bill reduced it to, to \$10,000. And I ask for your approval of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 300."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to

Amendment #1. The Gentleman attempts to make a case for

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

his Amendment by showing that there is a reduction for a single person household. But I would point out. Gentleman candidly has. that we're talking about individuals here rather than householders. Consequently, a married couple who went through bankruptcy, you're talking about a double exemption. Now we're also talking. I want to make very clear, we're talking about a person's equity. This is what they've got left after their mortgage because their mortgage lien obviously comes before the bankruptcy proceeding. So we're...very few people who go bankrupt will have greater than a \$15,000 equity or even a \$7,500 equity to begin with. So the Bill attempts to be as as possible by eliminating the need that...the requirement is that there will only be one such exemption and allowing one for each individual who has an interest in a house that goes bankrupt. Now this is perhaps even too fair. One thing I think we have to keep in mind when we're considering this Amendment and subsequent Amendments, we're talking about people who, for one reason or another, with justification or totally without perhaps some justification, aren't paying their bills. And they're seeking help from a federal law which gives people relief when they can't and won't pay their bills. We don't want to make it too comfortable for people to go bankrupt. There are too many people going bankrupt now, and I would suggest that you check the statistics in those states, unlike Illinois, accepted...took the entire federal exemptions into their own laws. Bankruptcy in the United States, unfortunately, is rampant. And I would point out to you, those of you who feel sorry for the bankrupt person, when a person goes bankrupt and doesn't pay their bills, the person to whom they are owed the money, if it is a firm or business, loses that amount of money They don't

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

get any money back. They lose money. Consequently, they have to stay in business to pass that cost, and it is a cost of doing business onto those people who do pay their bills. So I just wanted you to make sure that you know who you're hurting here. You're hurting the people, if you vote for this Amendment and make it easier for people to go bankrupt, you're hurting people who pay their bills by making them pick up the slack for the deadbeats and others who do not pay their bills. I urge the rejection of this Amendment and the subsequent Amendments that will be offered."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 300. As Representative Greiman mentioned, this raises the homestead bankruptcy exemption from...what we want to do is \$7,500. He wants to raise it to \$10.000. married couple, this will end up with A \$20,000 exemption instead of \$15,000. Those of you that were here last year recall that we decided to opt out of the Federal Bankruptcy Act of 1978. Congress passed particular Act but allowed the states to opt out. this act did was liberalize considerably the bankruptcy exemptions. And as Representative Leinenweber has alarming mentioned, there has been an increase in bankruptcies throughout our country, and many people point to this federal law and the liberalization of exemptions as a rationale for the increase in the number of bankruptcies. The federal exemptions of which we opt out of were \$7,500 for an individual, similar to what we have proposed in Senate Bill 300. Representative Greiman wants to liberalize it even more than what the Federal Bankruptcy Act of 1978 did. This is supported by all of the financial institutions. It is supported by House hold Finance,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Consumer Finance Company, Illinois Retail Merchants'
Association, and it is also supported by the Legislative
Support Center which services the Illinois Legal Assistance
Clients of Illinois. This has been a compromised effort on
all parts. The Bill passed out of the Senate by a vote of
51 to nothing. Therefore, I would appreciate a 'no' vote
on this Amendment and any following Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Okay, who has a farm in their district? Does anybody have a farm in their district here? Nobody, huh? Okay. because I guess you must not. Now it doesn't just apply to bankruptcy. This is the Homestead Act. It applies to bankruptcy, but it also applies to judgment creditors so your...when those farms, if those farms, find themselves under the hammer, and those farmers, that widow farmer, and she is a widow, because this is who this you're taking and you're saying, applies to, 'Under Illinois law now she gets \$10,000 exempt. Under Illinois law after this Bill, she'll get \$7,500. Now, are the farms going down in value? Are the houses going down in value? This is only for a place where a person has a residency. Now I am telling you what you're saying here is that, you're saying that widows in Illinois who own a farm, if you have a judgment against you and it goes under the hammer, instead of \$10,000, you're going to get \$7,500. can't believe that. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Greiman, moves for the passage of Amendment #1 to House Bill 300...Senate Bill 300. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Representative Greiman requests a Roll Call. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

wish? Take the record. On Amendment \$1 there are 51 'aye', 89 'no', two 'present'. Amendment \$1 fails. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, Amendment #2."

Greiman: "Two...Amendment #2 also deals with residential homestead. It doesn't change the value one bit. Ιt doesn't change what deadbeats can get one bit. T+ just...under the Bill we have...or under the law and our customs we've changed somewhat how we hold real estate. Ve hold in condominiums. We hold it now in cooperative apartments. We hold residential real estate in fee title and joint tenancy, a lot of different ways. But one of the ways we also hold real estate that is used for residence is in trust. Sometimes a parent will put a building or an apartment in trust. And this just makes sure....this Amendment just makes sure that if the property, if the home is in trust, that those people will get the benefit of the homestead exemption. That is all it says. It doesn't do anything with it. change the values. doesn't tamper with it. But if you put your...the house in trust and then there is a bankruptcy or a judgment whatever, then you will be entitled to receive the That is it." homestead exemption.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment isn't needed. The Bill very clearly provides that the person is entitled to a homestead in regarding land therein a condominium or in personal property. A person who their property is subject to a land trust has converted personal property. their interest into So it is verv clearly covered. I would suggest that we vote 'no' on this Amendment. not needed. If we...if we put this It is

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendment on, it might not hurt, but it will require the Bill to go back to the Senate. Stranger things happen when Bills go to the Senate. This is an important piece of legislation. And I would urge a 'no' vote on Amendment \$2."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also urge a 'no' vote on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 300. I would recommend to Representative Greiman, if he wishes to change the Illinois exemptions, that he issue or he submit a Bill to do so. We...if this Bill goes back to the Senate, I am afraid that it will not survive the wrath of the Senate. And therefore, the Bill possibly could be tabled. We want to pass this Bill out without any Amendments on it, and I would appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "I appreciate the lesson, Representative Watson, and I am certainly taking some notes. But I think that it is necessary. I don't think this is a very significant Amendment. I think it is a piddling Amendment, and probably for that reason ought to be accepted. But I apparently get the feeling that somehow this was written in stone and brought down from Mount Sinai, and this Bill cannot be changed. That is what I am hearing. That is not the process that I learned, Representative. I learned that the Amendment stage was where we did have input and we did change..."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir. To the Amendment." Greiman: "I am just speaking...I a m responding tο the Representative. So it is a piddling Amendment. If you'll put it on, you'll make the Bill clearer. You'll protect some people who are beneficiaries of trust, and it seems to me that sometimes the beneficiaries trusts are to be

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

protected. We...sometimes we put property into trust to protect people, sometimes spendthrifts, people who can't take care of themselves. So I think it is a good idea to add this on, but if, you know, it's not so terribly critical."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. The Amendment fails.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Greiman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, Amendment #3."

Greiman: "Yes, well, Representative, to save myself the continued frustration of defeat, fortunately Amendment #3 a federal court will strike down because it invades the province of the federal...of a federal jurisdiction, and fourth, I don't think I probably have the votes here, so I will accordingly withdraw Amendments #3 and 4."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendments #3 and 4 are withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 350, Representative Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 350, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Vinson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, Amendment #1 to Senate
Bill 350, Sir."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment \$1 to Senate Bill 350, under it the clerk which set the deputies salaries, is subject to appropriation by the county board, which I believe is the

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- appropriate way to do it. And I would move for the passage of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. On that Motion, Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I had discussed this matter with the Republican Leadership, with Representative Vinson, with the Republican staff, who all assured me that this Amendment would be taken off and tabled. Now, I, you know, I don't make these hysterical speeches very often..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson. Excuse me,
 Representative Greiman. Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "I believe there may have been a possible error in communication here. I would defer to the worthy Gentleman from wherever and withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #2."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a piddling Amendment, but Representative Greiman thinks that his Bill was written in stone, so I will withdraw it."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #3."

Cullerton: "Another piddling Amendment I would ask to withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, Amendment #4."

Greiman: "Yes, a piddling Amendment which I would like to have adopted. It changes the cost attributable to a defendant in a criminal case and how much we charge in Cook County. It increases the amount of felony complaints, misdemeanor complaints, and business complaints to...by small amounts,

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- relatively small amounts. I would ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."
- Leinenweber: "I don't think this has been printed and distributed."
- Speaker Daniels: "It has not been printed and distributed.

 Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "May we take it out of the record and come back to it,
 Sir?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, it is your Bill, Sir. We can take it out of the record. I can't guarantee I'll get back to it tonight."
- Greiman: "Well, that is what...I guess I am asking is if we got
 to Third...if we got to a place where it had not been
 distributed and you were on a different order of business,
 I would understand that. But before you move off of Second
 Reading would you come back to it, and I'll move it to
 Third Reading then with or without the Amendment. If the
 Amendment is on, fine. If it is not it dies. That's all."
- Speaker Daniels: "I can't guarantee I'll get back to it today."
- Greiman: "Even on Second Reading?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Even on Second Reading. We have a...I am just...."
- Greiman: "Then I'll move to table the adoption and move it to Third Reading."
- Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Amendment #4 is withdrawn, Sir?
 Withdraw Amendment #4?"
- Greiman: "Well just move it to three. Apparently...isn't that the custom of the House?"
- Speaker Daniels: "What is your pleasure, Sir? Do you want to withdraw Amendment #4?"
- Greiman: "My pleasure is to put it on Third Reading. You get there. It is your business."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay, withdraw Amendment \$4. Further

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 356, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Br. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 356, a Bill for an Act to give peace officers status to certain employees of the fire department and the office of State Fire Marshal, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich, Amendment #8."

Terzich: "I move to withdraw Amendment #8."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Purther Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich, #9."

Terzich: "Amendment #9 I would like to refer to Representative

Jack Dunn."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Dunn, Amendment #9."

"Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Dunn: #9 combines the language of four of Amendment Amendments adopted in Executive Committee. This was to eliminate possible conflicts of reference to Paragraphs and Sections of the Illinois revised statutes. it Also. improves some language requested by the Committee to clarify an exception. The four Amendments recommended the office of State Fire Marshal and introduced by me have no effect on any other state agency. They were adopted Executive Committee because they eliminated a potential misrepresentation of legislative intent. They consistency in the fire prevention and training practices,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

and they identify appropriate penalties for safety fire violations. The proponents in favor of the legislation is the office of State Fire Marshal, Illinois Fire Chiefs' Association, Illinois Firemans' Association, Illinois Fire Protection Districts, Illinois Fire Inspection Association, Illinois Firefighters' Association, Associated Firefighters' of Illinois, and the office of the State Fire Marshal, and the Fire Advisory Commission. There were no opponents to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Any discussion? I mean Amendment #9. Any discussion?"

Terzich: "Amendment #9."

Speaker Daniels: "Being none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #9

be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',

opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is
adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 370, Representative

Tuerk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 370, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Tuerk."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk, Amendment #1."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 370 passed out of the Senate almost unanimously, but during the interim period there has been some questions raised about this legislation. It involves the Coroners' Association. In a meeting with them, we have agreed to delay the effective date of this law into 1982 in November which would give it about a 15 month delay. I think it is

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- agreeable...well, it is agreeable with me and the Senate Sponsor. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, O'Brien."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Brien, Amendment #2, Senate
 Bill 370, Sir. Act in relation to coroners. He's ready.
 Go ahead."
- O'Brien: "Can you give me just a minute, please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, Representative O'Brien needs your help on this Amendment. Representative Katz, you're asking to be recognized, Sir?"
- Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to rise to welcome a great person in Illinois history, the really...Sam Burnstein was Mr. Unemployment Compensation. He was the head of the agency for many, many He was also head of the Legislative Reference years. Bureau, and I think sometimes we acknowledge all of great past political persons in Illinois, and we don't acknowledge all of the past great staff people who this Legislature what it is. And so I simply wanted to present Sam Burnstein to the Members here of the General Assembly."
- Speaker Daniels: "Welcome again to Springfield, Mr. Burnstein.

 For a moment there we were afraid it was the guy on his

 right there that he was talking about. Senator Marovitz,

 how are the White Sox doing? Good. Representative

 O'Brien. Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, what Amendment #2 would do would be to substitute language which said where a death occurs in a trauma center that the coroner of the county in which the

69th Legislative Day

June 23. 1981

trauma center is located would have jurisdiction. Now what it does is it changes that to provide for transfer by the coroner of the county in which the hospital is situated to the county where the incident resulting in admission to the hospital occurred for investigation. It gives jurisdiction to the place from which the accident occurred rather than the place where the trauma center happens to be located. Now that is just orderly process to ensure that wherever the situs of the accident was is the situs where the jurisdiction for investigative purposes ought to be, and I would join Representative O'Brien in moving for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the original intent of this legislation was to take care of those jurisdictional problems where a trauma center was located. It was not intended to expand the provisions of this Bill to include all hospitals, and as I see the Amendment, that is what this Amendment does, and it just doesn't limit it to those hospitals designated as trauma centers. afraid that with this type of an Amendment it would have bad effects on the legislation and might create multiple problems throughout the state. I would think that perhaps if we allow this Bill to pass the way it is with Amendment #1, and if we see that we could improve upon it later on, that is the time to do it. Not now. I would resist this Amendment, and I would ask for the Nembers to oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty to close."

Getty: "Well, I am not quite sure that the Gentleman completely understands what the Amendment does, quite frankly, Fred.

All trauma centers are hospitals. They are so designated by the Department of Public Health. Now, all this is doing

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

is saying that that trauma center - hospital would have the jurisdiction transferred from there. The body would be transferred back to the county where the incident occurred rather than to that county. Now that is all this Amendment does. It clarifies that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, under those conditions, that is the intent of the Bill in and of itself, and I am not sure that the Bill as it stands with the Amendment that we just adopted makes it fairly clear, and I don't understand why it needs further clarification. However, if that is your intent, only to include the hospitals designated as trauma centers, that is the intent of the legislation to begin with, and if that is a fact, then I would have no objection."

Getty: "Well, I think that clears it up, and just so it will be clear in your mind, I'll read the entire thing as it would be if we adopt this Amendment. A death which occurs in any trauma center may be transferred by the coroner of the county in which the hospital is situated, to the county where the incident resulting in admission to the hospital occurred for investigation. That is what it does. If you adopt this, that is what it will say in lieu of the other language which, I think, was a little bit unclear, and that was the reason for this Amendment."

Tuerk: "Very well."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 376, Representative Nelson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 376, a Bill for an Act to amend the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Illinois Municipal Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Tuerk."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk, Amendment \$1."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what this Amendment does, and I'll read you Section 1 of this Amendment, and it is perfectly clear what the Amendment intends to do. It says 'It is the policy of this state that where any unit of local government makes a local improvement by special assessment or special tax which benefits abutting state property, the state shall pay for the benefit so conferred on the same basis as other property owners benefitted by that improvement, subject to the same rights as are afforded to such property owners.'

That is what the Amendment does. And we've passed this concept before. I think it is a perfectly good Amendment. The Sponsor of the Bill is agreeable. The Senate Sponsor is agreeable. I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster, Amendment #2."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Nelson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Nelson, Amendment #3."

Nelson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster, Amendment #4."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of Amendment #4. What Amendment #4 does to incorporate the provisions of Senate Bill 217 which affects interest rates as does the basic Bill with respect to the Industrial Building Revenue Bond Act, and this is a Bill passed Senate 51 to nothing. It. that the got posted unfortunately, never over here, and this Amendment is agreeable to the House Sponsor and the Senate I would be happy to answer any questions concerning Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Any questions? Representative Getty, Amendment #4."

Getty: "Well, the purpose of this is I...Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "The purpose of this is to repeal the provisions of 11-74-14 of Chapter 24, the disclosure of interest. Is that correct, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question, Representative Getty."

Getty: "The purpose of this Amendment would be to repeal the provisions of Section 11-74-14 of Chapter 24 which is the disclosure of interest provisions. Is that correct?"

Deuster: "No, Sir, Representative Getty. That was included in the Amendment \$2 that I tabled. But when it was brought to my attention that that was included, I thought that was improper and not something I would want to ask the House to do, and so Amendment \$4 does not have that repeal in it."

Getty: "Alright, fine. Thank you."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves for

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Nelson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Nelson, Amendment #5."

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

Amendment #5 is a technical Amendment which is brought to

my attention by a staffer from the other side of the aisle

who pointed out that I had failed to insert this language

'to create variable interest rates' at one place in the

Bill. This is identical to the language that is in 12

other places in the Bill. I would move for the adoption of

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "There has been a fiscal note requested,
Representative Nelson. We'll have to hold it on Second
Reading till you file a fiscal note. then we'll try to
move it as soon as you file it. Thank you. Senate Bill
390, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 390, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Barr, amends..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr, Amendment #1.

Representative Deuster and Nelson, Representative Barr is right behind you."

69th Legislative Day

Barr:

June 23, 1981

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The purpose of Senate Bill 390 is to remove from all municipalities and counties in the State of Illinois the way, regulate the construction, in any development, conversion, sale or management of condominium And the principle proponent of this residential units. Bill, as all of us know because of the literature we have received, is the Illinois Association of Realtors which tells us that this legislation is necessary in order to create a uniformity in the State of Illinois with regard to very important subject. However, the Bill, written, exempts from its provisions two very interesting areas in our state, namely the City of Chicago and the unincorporated areas of Cook County. In other words, municipalities and counties in Illinois would, by this Bill, be prevented from regulating in any way condominium residential units except that the City of Chicago and the unincorporated areas of Cook County would be freed from this statewide prohibition and would be free as they are today to continue to enact their own regulations of these condominium residential units. The purpose of Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker, is to remove that exemption consistent with the basic purpose of the Bill itself and to provide that all municipalities and counties including Cook County including the City of Chicago would be subject to this statewide preemption. If you support the principle of Senate Bill 390 and support the reasoning behind it, you will of course, want to support his Amendment. oppose Senate Bill 390 you will, nevertheless, want to support his Amendment as an effort to make a better in the chance that it might someday become law. I solicit a 'yes' vote from both proponents and opponents of Senate Bill 390."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe someone can understand better what I was trying to do This is a perfect example of the one of many yesterday. Bills that I told you that big brother state is now to come in and tell local authorities what they can do. Can you imagine a Bill introduced in this House and municipalities do not have zoning boards jurisdiction over the zoning of condominiums. Now, it cleverly drafted so that they can get the support from the Chicago contingent by eliminating any municipalities over a million million or any counties over a So this would exclude the City of unincorporated areas. Chicago, the County of Cook in the large unincorporated area and my vital interest in this is that Leyden Township is one of the largest townships with an unincorporated area and has quite a condominium construction in that township but yet, the County of Cook, would be free to do their own zoning and the rest of the State of Illinois and the the home rule units throughout the state would come under this law. Again, big brother is going to take of some six thousand governmental agencies in the State of Illinois who are telling the local authorities that don't know how to regulate or zone in their OWN And we who sit here down in Springfield municipality. are tell these residential areas or these going t.o municipalities what kind of construction they can have their own municipality. This is one of about four more Bills that are to come up where the state's going and really make creatures of local economies. supersede know that this isn't the right time to question the amount of votes it takes to pass the Bill because it's Second Reading but if any of these Amendments shall fail I would

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

like the Parliamentarian to keep that in mind when it comes to Third Reading whether this is going to preempt the home rule."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Braun: "Would preemption and absence of a Uniformed Condominium

Act hinder local efforts to bring their local law up to the

standard set forth in that Act?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr."

Barr: "Would you repeat the question, Representative? I didn't hear it."

Braun: "Would preemption in the absence of the Uniform Condominium Act, which regulates condominium law or suggests regulation of condominium law nationwide, would preemption in the absence of that Act in Illinois hinder local efforts to bring local law up to the standard of the UCA?"

Barr: "Representative, it would not only hinder, it would prevent it absolutely."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I speak in support of Amendment \$1. The Bill itself seeks to provide that condominium regulation to be an exclusive state power or function. Now, if it's to be exclusive it ought to be exclusive and not just for those areas of the state who don't pack enough political muscle to get themselves out of the coverage of the Act. I happen to agree that condominium law, because it relates to the ownership of land, ought to be uniform, ought to be exclusive state regulation because of the very real problem that people face when attempting to make a purchase of real

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

estate interest in a condominium. They need to have some certainty as to what the law provides so that their title will be good. They'd needs some certainty as to what regulations govern the rules and so forth and governing body of the condominium. A uniform state law will provide uniform court decisions interpreting that law and will be of great aid to potential purchasers of condominiums and for developers of condominiums. But it makes the whole idea a nullity to take what amounts to almost fifty percent of the population of the state out from under exclusive state power or function. So the Amendment makes a lot of sense, it's a good Bill with the Amendment. Without the Amendment the Bill makes very little sense. So I urge the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of I rise in support on two grounds. First of Amendment. all, we are in this together as Representative Leinenweber suggested that if the proposal embodied in Senate Bill 390 makes any sense at all it should be uniform statewide. I know that the Sponsor of the Bill feels that way. He said so in Committee and the only reason that preemption not extend to the City of Chicago is because it would presumably make it harder to pass. So I think it's a reason for a Bill which simply preempts home rule in a particular area.. Thank you. Simply preempts home rule in particular area without providing any substantive law within the context of the same Bill to show us what it that, indeed, we would be imposing on ourselves if we were to preempt. Also, I rise in support of this Amendment because the logic of the Amendment to suggest that ... excuse me, the logic of the Bill suggests that we should not have a mixed pattern or a crazy quilt in some people's

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

terms of different laws within the state. However, I would point out that unincorporated Cook County is exempt from the Bill and unincorporated Cook County is a very bizarre crazy quilt indeed. And it seems to me that the Bill, its present form, not only exempting Chicago but exempting unincorporated Cook County would leave the matter of condominium law as geographically confuses and now is without really solving the problem that the Bill purports to solve. I think that if you believe in the concept of the Bill you ought to support the Amendment. If you don't believe in the concept of the Bill you ought to support the Amendment anyway because it seems to me on the principle of preemption of home rule is so vitally important to all of us that we ought to realize that all communities in this state are in this thing together and we rise together or we fall together. And in either event, you should support the Amendment offered by Representative Barr, my colleague from the Bleventh District to Senate Bill 390."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. Generally speaking, I'm very supportive of most of the things that the Illinois Association of Realtors sponsors because it's very well drafted and it generally serves a good purpose. I don't like preempting home rule and this particular case, I think standardization of condominium laws is a good thing. However, without this Amendment there is absolutely no question as to what is standardization. Chicago has the single largest number of condominiums and yet they would be exempt in the Bill as currently being presented without this Amendment. If it is to be uniform, it has to be for Chicago, also. So I would support this Amendment because indeed it would bring that uniformity. Anything less than that, I think the Bill is

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

just gross nonsense. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of in support of Representative Barr's rise T As he indicated in his remarks the Amendment in Amendment. a short measure might in some way help defeat the Bill of which I also support. Many of us from time to time have been confronted with the choice of local options or state In this area, I think Representative Leinenweber control. said it rather saliently that, in fact, when you're talking about tax at the local level you are, in fact, talking about tax on land. As I said to Representative Getty when I rose to speak on this Bill, that I have a conflict of interest. As Representative Barr knows I have a summer home in Evanston and because I have a summer in Evanston I will vote my conscience. But the fact remains this is a good Amendment. It's a people's Amendment. And we should support it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hallstrom."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Can we hold that for a second. We have a people on that.. if you don't mind. number of Representative E.G.... The Lady moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. 'Ayes' have it. The Gentleman, Representative Barr. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it has always been the custom of this
House to permit the Sponsor of the Bill to, at least,
address a proposed Amendment. I have been called on for
that purpose although the record would indicate that I had
indicated by my light that I wish to be called on..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, Mr. Barr said that you

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

may go ahead and address it and he will allow that. Go ahead, Sir."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Barr. I appreaciate that Gettv: Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the issue here notwithstanding the rhetoric is really a very issue. The Amendment would put Chicago back in. political Chicago does not want to be back in. It has no effect at all as regards unincorporated Cook County. No effect whatsoever since there aren't any regulations by the County of Cook for the unincorporated areas. Now, this decision was made by the Sponsors of the Bill in the Senate. The people who support this, the realtors and others, agreed to that as a pragmatic political consideration that Chicago had a very large, well functioning Condominium Act. best of all possible worlds I would agree to some extent that we ought to have a uniform comprehensive Condominium The record of this General Assembly would reflect Act. that I, together with Representative Leinenweber, have introduced House Bill 1887 which is on Interim Study. promulgated by the National Conference of is the Act Commissioners on uniform state laws addressing, comprehensive statevide manner. condominiums. Notwithstanding that, Illinois does have a very good An Act which this General Assembly has existing Act. brought up to date from time to time, which this General Assembly has in, I believe, every year since I've been here addressed and readdressed in order to improve the Act. The problem is there is an existing crazy quilt of a potential of 92 some municipalities enacting different ordinances. Realtors, lawyers, people who are buying condominiums don't know what the law is. It's too confusing. They can live with two different laws, one for Chicago and one for outside Chicago but they cannot live with the multiplicity

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

of various laws that would be engendered if we don't enact this Bill. Now, this Amendment guts the Bill. That's what it does. It guts the Bill. If you want to support this Bill, if you want to vote for it on Third Reading, vote against this Amendment because this Amendment, if it's adopted, will destroy the intent and the purpose of this Bill. So I'm going to ask for your 'no' vote if you support House (sic, Senate) Bill 390."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr, thank you very much.

Representative Barr, to close."

Representative Getty Barr: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. delivered his speech now on Senate Bill 390 which we'll discuss again when it come up on Third Reading. just address myself briefly to a couple of points that made though with relation to Amendment #1. He tells us that we should not adopt Amendment #1 because the City Chicago does not want to be included in this Bill, does not want to have it's home rule rights preempted. Well, I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. many other municipalities in the State of Illinois also do not want to have their home rule rights preempted. not want to be denied the privilege to tailor regulation of condominiums to the local problems and situations of those have no choice under this communities. But they legislation. Representative Getty has not given us any reason why the City of Chicago should be singled out for special treatment. Why the City of Chicago should be freed from the restrictions of this legislation which he feels would be so beneficial for the rest of us, for the rest of us in Illinois who do not live in the City of Chicago. tells us that it would have no effect on the unincorporated areas of Cook County because those areas... because Cook County does not now regulate condominiums. That is true.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

it certainly would affect those areas because if However. this Bill were passed without this Amendment on it then the Cook County Board of Commissioners would be free as other county and no other municipality in Illinois would The Cook County Board of Commissioners would be free to pass their own regulation of condominiums which may well be far below the existing state standards. But no other municipality or county in the State of Illinois would have this privilege. If you believe in the principles which the supporters and proponents of Senate Bill 390 enunciated on this floor and in the literature with which we've all been flooded then of course you support Amendment you oppose Senate Bill 390 but fear that it might nevertheless become law, you want it to be the possible law and you also should support Amendment #1 and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kustra, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Kustra: the Representative Getty makes the point that unincorporated Cook has no condo laws and therefore, really wouldn't be affected but I remind you, especially those of you from the suburban areas that suburban municipalities that are affected by this law would be affected by the law or in many cases annexing those unincorporated areas of Cook County. And when they do that, at least in my area, they're trying to attack very difficult problems in some of the most densely populated areas of Cook. So what you would have here is a situation where the village of Glenview or Niles or Des Plains in my district, for

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

example, would be subject to a set of state condominium laws which would be less stringent than their own set of laws because they would be preempted from establishing their own condominium laws. That's the real danger that I see in this Bill. You wind up with a crazy patch..(cut off)."

Speaker Daniels: "Bring your remarks to a close, will you please,
Sir?"

Kustra: "You wind up with a crazy patchwork quilt which is exactly the thing the realtors told us they didn't want. I think we should vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative E.

G. Steele, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment and urge that you vote 'no'. I think it's an important Bill and it's also important that we keep it intact with the Senate version. Now, this same Amendment was tried in the Senate and it was voted down. And it's important that we vote 'no' on this because the Bill is important. It's important to jobs in condominiums where we promote construction jobs, jobs, and so forth. A 'yes' vote here is going to weaken the Bill. It's going to weaken it if not kill it. say that we should vote 'no' on this to keep it intact so that we don't weaken a very important Bill. And I urge that we vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "In case this should Amendment pass..."

Speaker Daniels: "You'll be recognized."

Conti: "Verification of the..."

Speaker Daniels: "You'll be recognized for that purpose, Sir.

The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Deuster: "I think the most eloquent argument for this Amendment was spoken a little earlier today by Mayor Balandic who quoted former Mayor Daley to say, 'We are one state. ought to stop this business of considering Chicago or Cook County separate. We're one state. We should have We'll have one law.' And that's what this Amendment does. condominium law for the entire State of Illinois and then we don't have to say that there's some parts of this state consists of bunkins or people that eat greasy food. should have one law for the State of Illinois and I urge support for this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill... Amendment #1 there are 65 'aye', 82 'nay', Sir. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I've seen a lot of buttons pushed that I know aren't here. I'd like to proceed with the verification of the negative vote."

Speaker Daniels: "You're entitled to that, Sir."

Conti: "Poll the absentees first."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis. Bluthardt. Brummer. Garmisa.

Giglio. Jackson. Kosinski. Kucharski. Leverenz.

Margalus. Martire. McMaster. Ted Meyer. O'Connell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

O'Connell: "Please record me 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Becord Representative O'Connell as 'aye'.

Proceed. Representative Dick Kelly. Record Representative

Dick Kelly as 'aye'. Change him from 'present' to 'aye'.

Proceed, Sir."

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- O'Brien: "Redmond. Stewart. Telcser. Turner. Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Macdonald from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I erred on my understanding of the Amendment. Please change my 'aye' vote to a 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative O'Connell from 'aye' to no". Further changes? Representative Brunmer? Representative Brunner wishes to be recorded as "no". Further changes? Representative McMaster. Record Representative McMaster as 'no'. Further? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 67 'aye', 84 'no'. The Gentleman wishes poll of the Negative Roll. Proceed with a poll of the Negative Roll Call."
- Ackerman. Alexander. Balanoff. Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Boucek. Bradley. Barkhausen. Capparelli. Christensen. Daniels. Darrow. Brummer. Doyle. John Dunn. Davis. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Plinn. Dwight Friedrich. Getty. Hanahan. Hannig. Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff. Jackson. Karpiel. Keane. Kornovicz. Kulas."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney."
- Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my 'aye' vote to 'no', please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Stearney from 'aye' to
 'no'. Representative Emil Jones."
- Jones: "Change my 'present' to 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Emil Jones from 'present' to 'no'. Representative Henry. Change Representative Henry from 'present' to 'no'. Proceed with a poll of the Negative Roll."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Mautino.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

McBroom. McClain. McCormick. McGrew. McMaster."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Leinenweber: "I just wonder, there was a lady looking for Representative Collins in the gallery. Apparently he's found her."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins, welcome to Springfield,
 Sir. Representative McAuliffe. Record Representative....
 Change Representative McAuliffe from 'aye' to 'no'.
 Proceed, Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. O'Connell. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Pechous. Piel. Reilly. Rhem. Richmond. Robbins. Schneider. Ropp. Slape. Margaret Smith. Stanley. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Tate. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. Watson. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard and Yourell."
- Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Negative Roll, Representative Conti. Representative Getty."

Conti: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Getty."

Getty: "I wonder if we could have the new score before we start."

Speaker Daniels: "The present count, Mr. Clerk. 65 'aye', 88 'no'. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley requests leave to be verified. He's up front here. Does he have leave?

Alright. Representative Keane. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane in the chambers? Remove him."

Conti: "Boucek."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Boucek. The Gentleman's right behind you, Sir."

Conti: "Hanahan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hanahan. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Hanahan."

Conti: "If he's in his office, Mr. Speaker ... "

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Leverenz wishes to be recorded as 'aye'."

Conti: "Yourell."

Speaker Daniels: "Just a second, now. We have Representative

Leverenz recorded as 'aye'. Alright, Representative

Yourell. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative

Yourell. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Capparelli."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Capparelli. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Capparelli. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Schneider."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider. Glenn Schneider. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pechous. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Representative Abramson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson. Representative

Abramson is back there. Against the window."

Conti: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk. Ben Polk. Is the

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Christensen. Representative

Christensen. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Darrow."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow. He's in his chair."

Conti: "Representative Davis."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Davis is in his chair."

Conti: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Daniels: "Ralph Dunn is in his chair."

Conti: "Jackson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jesse Jackson. Is that Topinka?

Representative Topinka, I can't see. Is Jesse Jackson?

The Gentleman is not voting, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz is right here in

front."

Conti: "Leon."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leon is in his chair."

Conti: "McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew is in the back."

Conti: "Murphy."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Capparelli has returned. Return him to the Negative Roll."

Conti: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Laz Murphy. The Gentleman is in the rear."

Conti: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly. Jim Reilly is over here."

Conti: "Representative Rhem."

Speaker Daniels: "Rhem. Representative Rhem is in his chair."

Conti: "Mr. Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich. He's over here on the left, Republican side."

Conti: "Representative Vitek."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek. Representative Vitek.

Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley. Jerry Bradley. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Conti: "Representative Madigan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan. I'm advised he's in the rear."

Conti: "Alright, fine. I thought maybe he went back with the Chicago contingent."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, is Representative Madigan in his office?"

Getty: "Yes and forget him."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright then, we'll forget that one. Alright.

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Excuse me, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bower: "I think my switch was accidentally, incorrectly punched.

I should be recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Bower from 'aye' to 'no'.

Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, record me 'no', please."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Collins from 'present''
which was voted while he was in the gallery to 'no'.
Correct, Sir? Alright. Further questions?"

Conti: "No further questions. If anyone wants to change their vote it's alright with me."

Speaker Daniels: "Any other changes? Representative White.

Change Representative White from 'present' to 'no'.

Further changes? Alright, Mr. Clerk, what's the count? On

Amendment #1 there are 65 'aye', 82 'no', 5 'present' and
the Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Bowman-Greiman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #2."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment \$2, grandfathers in all existing ordinances on the subject. It seems to me that this Bill is particularly pernicious because it wipes the slate clean of many good ordinances which have been adopted throughout the state. These ordinances were adopted in response to local needs. Now I know that not every home rule community in this state has adopted ordinances because they have not felt the need. But those communities which have felt the first waves of conversion to 'condominia' had adopted ordinances in response to those needs and it seems to me that it is appropriate that we do grandfather in these

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

particular ordinances in communities. I would point out then that if this Amendment is adopted the Bill would then restrict the further proliferation of these ordinances but I believe to the extent that local needs had been met through local ordinances that we ought to respect those ordinances and grandfather them in accordingly. I offer Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose Amendment #2. Ιf you voted in support of Representative Amendment you 11 probably Barr's prior Representative Bowman's Amendment because it's intended for same basic purpose, to gut the Bill. It would make absolutely no sense, however, to adopt this Amendment. Representative Barr's did make some sense in the best of all possible worlds. This makes none at all. What it would do would be to grandfather in existing, conflicting ordinances. This is a bad Amendment. It should be It's intended to gut the Bill to make the Bill defeated. If you support Senate Bill 390 vote against meaningless. this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, to close."

"In response to Representative Getty, let me just say, it seems to me that as long as he's taking the political route and arguing for and against these various proposals on political grounds, let me just point out that this does not gut the Bill. In fact, this Amendment if Amendment goes on Chicago would continue to be included under the terms of this Amendment. This Amendment would not conflict with anything else that's in the Bill including the exemption for Chicago. And at the same time,

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

it would pick up support from other communities that perhaps have adopted such ordinances on the subject. So rather than gutting the Bill as Representative Getty suggests it seems to me that this makes the Bill politically more palatable to other communities in the state. I think that Representative Getty is misreading the politics of this particular proposal and so I offer this to the membership for their favorable consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. The Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Jaffe-Bowman, amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, Amendment #3."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3, is a reasonable Amendment. Actually, what the I think. Bill does at the present time is that it plays havoc with Because what happens in Cook County is that Cook County. you now have a Chicago and the unincorporated areas being What this does is that all of Cook County will be exempt. exempt. It makes no sense for you to have Chicago exempt and the unincorporated areas exempt when you don't have Park Ridge being exempt and you don't have Glenview being exempt and you don't have Skokie and Evanston being exempt. And the same thing, Morton Grove, right and even Dalton where Representative Getty lives. I think it's sort of a silly concept that produces really patchwork situation in Cook County when you say that only Chicago and the unincorporated areas will be left out. This makes it uniform. It takes all of Cook County. It places it in the Bill as an exemption. I think it would strengthen the Bill and I would urge an 'aye' vote for it."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons that we articulated for Amendment numbers 1 & 2, Amendment #3 is a bad Amendment. What it would do would be to continue the crazy quilt complexity of varying laws within Cook County jurisdiction. It would make the law uniform only outside of Cook County and I would submit to you that even you who supported Representative Barr's Amendment ought to be opposing this Amendment. It makes absolutely no sense. If you support Senate Bill 390 please vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's sort of obvious that the Sponsor of the Bill has not read the Amendment because if there ever was a crazy quilt it's the Bill in its present form. What this Bill actually says that local government except for counties within a population of excess of three million.. three million which is Cook County or any unit of local government therein. I think if you really want to stop the crazy quilt in Cook County what you ought to do is the sensible thing and vote for Amendment #3. And Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call vote on Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's asked leave for a Roll Call.

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Vinson.

Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? One more time. Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On this Amendment there are 29 voting 'aye',

113 voting 'no', one 'present'. Amendment #3 is lost.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Jaffe-Bowman..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, Amendment #4. Same Roll
Call, Sir?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Jaffe: "No, no. I want Roll Calls on all of these because I think these are going to be very interesting votes back home."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay, Amendment #4, Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Okay, this basically says that all local government is exempted except for home rule units. I think that's quite clear and I would ask for a Roll Call vote on this too, Mr. Speaker, because I think these are interesting votes to send back home."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, this is really the same as 3. It's a rerun of the same principle except that it extends that principle throughout the state to every home rule unit. I would suggest to you that this is not a good idea. If you support Senate Bill 390 please vote against this."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, to close."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again I must say that the Sponsor of the Bill evidently doesn't read the Amendments. He has one speech made up for all Amendment and he recites that speech. And those of you who can read know that there are differences between these four Amendments. So I think those of you who want to vote for it, vote for it. Those of you who don't, vote against it but I would want a Roll Call vote, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Once more. Have all those voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 35 'aye', 104 'nay', 1 'present''.

 Amendment #4 is lost. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 390."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #5."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Bill itself does not refer to Chicago specifically in granting an exemption. What it does is it exempts all cities over five hundred thousand and as we all know there's only one city in It seems to me that this has been a favored status that Chicago's long enjoyed. They really ought to with some other communities throughout this state. proposing in Amendment #5 to change the threshold to fifty thousand 80 that if Amendment #5 were adopted all communities larger than fifty thousand would be exempt from I would also like a Roll Call vote on because it does affect communities such as Aurora and Joliet and Schaumburg and Arlington Heights and Des Plaines as well as areas further downstate. The Rockford, Peoria, Springfield, East St. Louis, Decatur. It seems to me that these communities are large enough to have a need in this area. They certainly ought to have the privilege of legislating this area if they so desire. A city of fifty thousand people is large enough to be defined as a nucleus of the standard metropolitan statistical area by the United States Bureau of the Census. It seems to me that this is a progressive Amendment that extends the same favored privilege that Chicago's enjoyed for many years to other communities throughout the state and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
previous question is moved. Representative Bowman, to
close."

Bowman: "I believe I've said it once. I won't say it again. I

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves..."

Bowman: "I do want a Roll Call though."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Getty made a good point a few Amendments ago that he is the Sponsor of this Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Cullerton: "I think he should be allowed to address this important Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay."

Getty: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cullerton, for your courtesy. And I'm sure Representative Johnson would have no objections."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Getty: "I've been asked by several people to have a new speech, however, I don't want to take up the time. This is just as bad as the others. If you're for 390 vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Getty, I'm happy to have him in comment on this. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to preclude that but unfortunately he hasn't thought up a new speech and so I will... I am urging that all the Members of this chamber who are from cities in excess of fifty thousand vote for this Amendment because it will preserve your rights to legislate in this important area."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment... I'm sorry, Sir. Excuse me. The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Amendment there are 36 'ayes', 101 'no', none voting 'present''. Amendment \$5 is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction.

In the Speaker's gallery is the President of the Village of
Brookfield, the Honorable Pierce McCabe, from the district
represented by Representatives Topinka, Pechous, and
Kociolko."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Chair mind backing up just a couple of Bills to 370? We considered a couple of Amendments a few moments ago, and the Sponsor of the Amendment #2 is willing to table that, if we could move that back to Second..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 370, Representative Tuerk. Does the Gentleman have leave to return to the Order of Second Reading? Leave is requested. Leave is granted. Second Reading Senate Bill 370, Representative Getty on Amendment #2."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, after having consulted further with Representative O'Brien and Representative Tuerk, we believe that there is still some problem with the Amendment.

 Therefore, having voted on the prevailing side by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 370 was adopted, I now move to reconsider that vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Was that adopted orally, that Motion... Amendment #2?"
- Getty: "I believe it was. I believe it was."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted. All those in favor

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

The vote is reconsidered. On Amendment #2, Representative

Getty."

Getty: "Alright. I would now move to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk, your pleasure, Sir. You wish to move it to Third Reading?"

Tuerk: "Please."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Third Reading. Representative
Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Hello."

Speaker Daniels: "You requested Senate Bill 257, Sir?"

Leverenz: "Yes, I have talked with the Sponsor. She has agreed to move it back to Second for purpose of Amendment #2."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Oblinger requests leave to move Senate Bill 257. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 257, Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the Parliamentarian to determine the germaneness of this Amendment. It has to do with electronic messages, and the Bill itself has to do with..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 257, the Lady asks leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does she have leave?

 Leave is granted. Senate Bill 257 is on Second Reading.

 Representative Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "I question the germaneness of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady requests a ruling on the germaneness of Amendment #2. Are there any Amendments to this...Senate Bill 257, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Leverenz, amends Senate Bill 257 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the

June 23, 1981

following."

Amendment #2. The Lady, Representative Leverenz, offers the germaneness of Amendment #2. And Parliamentarian, Representative Oblinger and Representative Leverenz, has ruled, and the Chair rules, that Amendment #2 is nongermane in that it provides an Amendment to electronics funds transfer, and the Bill itself is an Act to provide exemptions from certain use and occupation taxes for ethel alcohol. So the ruling of the Chair is it's nongermane. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading on Senate Bill 257. Senate Bill 407, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the occupation and use tax on certain graphic arts machinery and equipment, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Bowman, amends Senate Bill 407..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #1."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is probably familiar to many people here on this floor. I have offered it to practically every Bill I can find. This affects the manufacturers' sales tax exemption and makes changes in taht exemption which would save the state some money. However, the...we finally did have a Roll Call on it, and it was defeated on another Bill, and I'm getting tired of doing the Governor's work for him. I mean, if he wants to seek some reform in this area, I suggest that he take a little more vigorous action to move Senate Bill 6..36 or whatever. So I am tired of doing his work for him, so I am

69th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1981
- going to withdraw this Amendment. I withdraw the
- Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Martire, amends Senate Bill 407..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Martire on Amendment #2.

 Representative Watson."
- Watson: "I move to table Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson moves to table Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Amendment #2 is tabled. Purther Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Kane, amends Senate Bill 407..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane, Amendment #3."
- Kane: "At the request of my good friend, Representative Watson, I would withdraw this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 431, Representative Mulcahev. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 431, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Kane, amends..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane, Amendment #1 to 431,
 Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 431 removes the maximum limitation on salaries for supervisors of assessment. What it would do is leave it up to the individual county boards in the different size counties to set their remuneration for the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

supervisors of assessment. I think that with the kinds of problems that they have to deal with and knowledge of the local situation by the local county boards, and the adjustments that we have made for other county officials, that I think this is time for this Amendment to be adopted, and I would ask an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative, is the position of the county superintendent of assessments, is that an elective or an appointive position?"

Kane: "That is an appointed position."

Mautino: "And what is the salary range now in counties of, let's say, below 50,000 in population?"

Kane: "There is about seven catagories of population and the maximums range from \$21,000 in populations of less than 14,000 to \$37,000 in the County of Cook."

Mautino: "And how long are their duties? Is it a full-time, 12
 month-a-year job? Or is the bulk of their work done
 between April and September?"

Kane: "In all except the smallest counties they would be full-time positions. Again, this is subject to the county board. The county board does the hiring, and the county board should be able to set the salary dependent on the qualifications that they need."

Mautino: "One final question. Is it not true that most counties, especially those under 50,000 hire a supervisor of assessments on more than a one year contract, usually a four to six, very similar to the supervisor of the township roads or the county roads?"

Kane: "I don't believe so."

Mautino: "Well, Sir, are you're saying that they do not ... you

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

don't think that they have contracts, let's say, for four years. For example..."

Kane: "I think there is a statutory term of office. Yes."

Mautino: "Alright, how do you address those that are in the middle of their initial contracts?"

Kane: "Usually, at least, it has been my experiences that even though the term of office is for a period of four years, is that the county board set the salary every year when it comes up for budget time."

Mautino: "Okay, then I would like to address the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "I reluctantly stand in opposition to this Amendment from my good friend...presented by my good friend, Doug Kane. But what I think we have been doing in the General Assembly and what we will continue to do is probably make the supervisor of assessments the kings of most counties. Especially the smaller counties. We're turning over all the duties of the local township assessor to the supervisor of assessment and his board of review. It seems to me rather difficult to accept this type of Amendment that would have the only control left in county government addressed on this piece of legislation. And therefore, I do stand in opposition to Amendment #1 because I think the state should have some control because pretty soon we're not going to have any on supervisor of assessments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, thank you. I would like to ask the Sponsor a question please."

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

Van Duyne: "Doug, to my knowledge, the state pays half of the salary of supervisor of assessments, don't they?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Kane: "You may know better than I do."

Van Duyne: "Yes, they do. And they...by the way, the year...the contract is four years, not a certain number of years, but it is four years. How do you address the...well, let me just ask you, how do you arrive at the total salary of this person if the state is obligated to pay half. Are you just going to raise the county board's half? In other words, if a guy is getting \$30,000 a year now and he gets a \$10,000 raise, does the county have to put up the whole \$10,000 increase?"

Kane: "What this...what this Amendment is designed to do is to allow county elected officials, locally elected officials to have control over their local budgets and their local hiring practices, and that is the purpose of this Amendment. I think that there is no reason for us to be doing that at the state level."

Van Duyne: "Well, I agree...But there is a mandate in the supervisor of assessments' salary or contract that the state pick up half. ANd if the county board raises his salary by a certain amount, then I am asking you a direct question. Is the state obligated to pick up half of that raise?"

Kane: "If that is what the statute would require, yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, likewise, as Sponsor of the Bill reluctantly rise to oppose the Amendment. I don't know as if I have anything really against establishing maximum rates, but I think that possibly this Amendment might make the entire Bill a little bit controversial and put the whole thing down the tubes. So I would have to oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd urge

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

the adoption of this Amendment. We hear a lot about local control and local government. What this Amendment says is that depending on what the local county board wants, how much...how many duties that the local county board wants to give to the supervisor of assessments, that the local county board should have the authority to set the salary, and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Speaker Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying The 'ayes' have it. Representative Kane opposed 'no'. Representative Mulcahey, a Roll Call? desires a Roll Call. Are you joined by four Members? Alright. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? the record. On Amendment #1 there are 32 voting 'aye', 95 'no', three 'present'', and Amendment #1 is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Currie - Hallock, amends Senate
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, Amendment #2."

Currie: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, McPike, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McPike, #3."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 allows the county board at their discretion, they may provide that the county collector perform the duties that the town collector now performs.

There are five counties in Illinois that have town collectors. That is Cook County, Will, Sangamon, Peoria, and Madison. The reason for this is that the County of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Peoria last year adopted an ordinance that said that the taxpayers could pay their real property taxes by mail and could address their payments to the county collector or the town collector. The Illinois Supreme Court affirmed the appellate court decision and said that this ordinance was not constitutional, that the Legislature had said quite clearly that the town collector has exclusive jurisdiction until September 1. This Amendment, if it becomes the law, would allow the Peoria County Board to adopt such a Resolution. Again, that Resolution would allow taxpayers to mail taxes to either the county collector or to the town . collector. So this Amendment affects five counties, and it only affects those counties if the county board in those counties decides, by ordinance, to allow the collector to perform the duties of the township collector. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'nos' have it. The Amendment is...Yes, Sir. You want a Roll Call? McPike, Representative McPike.

NcPike: "Well, no one spoke in opposition to the Amendment so I would..."

Speaker Daniels: "But, Sir, do you want a Roll Call or not?"
McPike: "Yes, I would like a Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. All those in favor of Amendment #3 will signify by voting opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. Oπ this Amendment there are 31 'ayes', 78 'no', two voting 'present'''. Amendment #3 is lost. Further Amendments?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Hastert, amends Senate Bill 431 on page one, line 31 and so forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to offer Amendment #4 to House Bill 431. Simply what Amendment #4 was...would be is to remove the term 'just cause'. It seems to me that just cause in a situation where a board...county board would accuse a supervisor of assessment of not performing his duties could be a political thing. It is undefined, and it could lead to any type of a witch hunt that a county board might want to pursue. However, the causes of malfeasance and misfeasance are still in the Bill, and I think for practical purposes to make this a good Bill, we should remove the term 'just cause'."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor...Representative Van Duyne, you didn't have your light on, Sir."
- Duyne: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just couldn't get up fast enough. But I really...I would really like to take exception to the comments of the previous speaker. In Committee when we were talking about malfeasance and misfeasance, it was brought out in Committee that it was pretty hard to prove that. You really had to have...well, it was just too hard to prove. And so the 'just cause' was put in there to give the county board a little bit of leverage or a little bit of latitude in judging whether or not they wanted to get rid of this individual, and I really don't think it was in the intention...the intent of the Committee when they put this in there to allow this to be taken off so easily. After all, it was put in there for

June 23, 1981

the purpose of allowing the county board to dismiss this person by a two-thirds vote, and I don't see why taking it off is such a good idea when it would make the...it would really gut the Bill as far as the intent of the Committee, and I would ask for a 'no' vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I concur with Representative Van Duyne.

Inasmuch as we do have Amendment #5, and which I believe
Representative Hastert agrees with, which will identify or
define just cause. So I would oppose Amendment #4 and
accept Amendment #5."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Well, I would urge for the adoption of Amendment #4. I
think just cause is an umbrella. I guess I am going to be
willing to retreat from that a bit, but I think we ought to
take a vote on that and see what people think about just
cause."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment \$4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman has requested a Roll Call. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Representative Vinson...have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On this Amendment there are 56 'aye', 53 'no'. Representative Brunmer."

Brummer: "Record me 'no' please."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Brummer as 'no'. On this issue there are 56 'aye', 54 'no'. Alright...Who is that you're standing next to, Representative Mautino? Who is that standing next to you there? Is it the President of the Senate? The Honorable Phil Rock. President Bock, we're always pleased to have you in the Chambers, and we're

June 23, 1981

welcome to see your face since you guys are never in Session. Alright, we're going to take another Roll Call. Dump this roll Call. Now, everybody by their switches. Are you ready? All those in favor of Amendment #4 signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Have all those voted who wish? voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? the record, Mr. Clerk. 67 'aye', 81 'no'. Amendment #4 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Hastert, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hastert, Amendment #5."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I abide
by the Democratic decision of this House, and just because
of that decision I do offer Amendment #5. Amendment #5
does define what just cause is, and it defines it as
willful misconduct in the enforcement of the official
duties as pertaining to the supervisor of assessment. This
does define just cause. I think it is a good. Amendment
and makes a good Bill better, and I would urge its
adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor will...Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "All those in favor will signify by saying
'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is
adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Kane, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane, Amendment #6."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #6 does is to approach this problem from a different direction. And what it does is to say that if the county board wants to dismiss the supervisor of

June 23, 1981

assessments, that the reasons for which that supervisor of assessments could be dismissed is for malfeasance, or non-feasance in the performance of the duties of the office. And it also says that if the county board shall dismiss or does dismiss a supervisor of assessments, that the county board should provide in writing its reasons for the dismissal, and the dismissed supervisor may within 21 days after the receipt of the statement of reasons for the dismissal request a hearing by the county board. I think that one of the things that we have to keep in mind is the political sensitivity of the office of supervisor of assessments and the kinds of pressures that individual members of a county board can bring onto a supervisor of assessments. I think that we all want supervisors of assessment that are going to perform well and that we ought to insulate that office as much as possible from the kinds of pressures that can brought to bear. And I think that if we provide hearing procedures for dismissals of teachers and other kinds public officials, I think that a supervisor of assessment, if that supervisor of assessment is dismissed by the county board, should at least be entitled to a written reason for why that dismissal has taken place and an opportunity for a hearing if the supervisor so wishes. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again I rise to oppose this Amendment. As was indicated earlier, misfeasance and malfeasance is very hard to define. Just cause has been left in the Bill now with Amendment #5, and I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane...or Representative
Hastert."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Hastert: "Just a question of the Sponsor. Representative
Kane..."

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

Mulcahey: "Don't supervisor of assessments already have the right to appeal a hearing?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane."

"Under the existing statute, if the contract for Kane: the is not renewed, then supervisor of assessment supervisor of assessment does have the opportunity for However, this is a whole new provision for hearing. dismissal so that this same kind of opportunity for a hearing is added to...to a dismissal proceeding which, under this Bill, the supervisor of assessment would not The only right that the supervisor of assessment has the current statute is if that contract is not renewed or there is notification that that contract will not be Then the supervisor of assessment would have renewed. that right. Under the dismissal proceedings, though, of there would be no right for a hearing and no this Bill. requirement that any particular reason be advanced for the dismissal."

Mulcahey: "So, Representative Kane, in essence then, this is...this would protect a supervisor of assessor who is in his first four years...that is his first term. Is that correct?"

Kane: "Yes, this would give the same kind of protection to the supervisor of assessment during their term of office as they have now at the end of that term if the contract would not be renewed."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #6. The supervisor of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

assessments in a county is a very sensitive position. Ιt is subject to all kinds of pressures, all kinds inducements. And I think that the supervisor of assessment should have the protection that other public officials have, should have the same protection during a dismissal procedure as the supervisor has under a provision in which the contract is not going to be renewed. This is a very simple procedure. All it says is that if the supervisor of assessment is going to be dismissed, that the county board should at least have the courtesy to put in writing the reasons for that dismissal and that the supervisor should be able to have a public hearing if the supervisor so desires. This is a good Amendment. This is a protective Amendment. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On this issue there are 62 'ayes', 64 'nay', one voting 'present'', and Amendment #6 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Kane, amends Senate Bill 431 on page..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane on Amendment #7."

Kane: "It is the same as Amendment #6, and I would withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Purther Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 431, Third Reading. Representative Conti, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "Bouse Resolution 404, Topinka. 405, Griffin. 406,

Bower. 409, Telcser. 411, Kulas - et al. 412, Topinka.

413, Leinenweber. 414, Irv Smith."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Resolution 405, Griffin, Oak Park - River Forest Righ School varsity baseball team has won the Class A School Championship. House Resolution 406, Bower, Gene J. 'Kirkpatrick', United States permanent Representative to the United Nations, a former resident of Mount Vernon will be honored at a banquet that day. Dean 'DiMetri' will celebrate his 50th birthday anniversary on July 17, House Resolution 404 by Topinka. House Resolution 411, Kulas, is the cause of world freedom, a great concern to all people, in the National Independence Day of Albania, Rumania, and all the Slovak countries. House Resolution 412. Reverend Victor 'Latatic', a monk of the order of St. 'Benic.....' was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Bernard 'Shiel' in May 1, 1936. House Resolution 413 by Legislative eight annual the Tennis Leinenweber. Championship Tourney was again sponsored by Southwestern Illinois Industrial Association on Wednesday. Honse Resolution 414, Irv Smith, William L. Gaule of Chatham, Illinois has for 20 years unselfishly donated his time and talents to the benefit of many charitable organizations. House Resolution 409, Telcser, Reverend George Albert of Chicago East celebrated his 50th birthday. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for adoption of the Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Representatives in the passage of the following Bills: House Bills 373, 377, 403, 438, 441, 455, 477, 508, 598, 525, 534, 542, 572, 576, 580, 598 together with attached Amendment hereto, and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit, passed the Senate as amended June 23, 1981. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Daniels: "(inaudible)."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Mr. Representatives the Senate has passed...has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, an adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #50 adopted by the Senate June 23, 1981, Kenneth Wright A Message from the Senate by Jr. Wright, Secretary. Secretary. *Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted following Senate Joint Resolution, and adoption which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution adopted by the Senate June 23, 1981, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Speaker Daniels: "Representative... Alright, go ahead."

Clerk Leone: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
Representatives the Senate has concurred in the House
passage of Bills of the following titles to wit: 410,
422, 486, 496, 415, 420, 515, 520, 541, 581, 600, 636
passed by the Senate June 23, 1981. Kenneth Wright,
Secretary."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for purposes of a Motion which has been cleared both by the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker and the Minority Leader, I would HOM move to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 A to bypass Committee and for immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 50 and ask leave for use of the Attendance and Senate Resolution 50 is a Resolution sponsored by Representative Rock which will allow the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation to hold some hearings over the summer in regard to block grants. If we..." Daniels: "The Gentleman has asked leave to suspend rule 41 so that Senate Resolution 50 can be heard without reference He's asked for further immediate Committee. Does the Gentleman consideration of the Resolution. have use the Attendance Roll Call? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Could we take a look at it for just a minute? It just arrived on our desks."

Speaker Daniels: "It's on your desk."

Kane: "I realize ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters, has this been cleared with both sides of the aisle?"

Peters: "Yes, it has been cleared with the leadership on both sides. It was initially introduced by Senator Rock who's Chairman of the Commission in the Senate. Basically, it calls for hearings involving block grants and the impact it has on state and local governments and how the Legislature may prepare and produce rules in order to handle that eventuality."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration and use of the Attendance Roll Call. Ts objection? objection. Representative there any No Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman answer a couple of questions?

What is the need for such immediate consideration of this?"

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

- Peters: "Representative, today we are on Tuesday, the 23rd. The appropriate House Committee will not meet again until sometime next year..."
- Leinenweber: "The appropriate House Committee did consider a very similar Resolution in the last meeting and, because of the fact that there was no support for it on the Committee, it was put on Interim Study."
- Peters: "The fiscal year begins in October of this year and it seemed to the Members of the Commission and the... Senator Rock...fact, as I say, cleared by both leaders on the side... both leaders on both sides of the aisle in the House that we should make some preparations to meet what we expect in October so that we can handle the situation properly. The federal budget begins October 1. There will be no other meetings of any group to prepare as to how to handle this or make any recommendations to anybody."
- Leinenweber: "The Committee Chairman indicates that she plans to hold a meeting in August which could consider this."
- Peters: "Representative Leinenweber, you can be down here in August, but I'm not sure the rest of us are going to be down here in August."
- Leinenweber: "What about the Committee of Intergovernmental Cooperation? Will they be here in August?"

Peters: "If this should pass, they'll be here."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we did consider a Resolution very similar that Representative Deuchler handled and there was no support on the Executive Committee which is, perhaps, the reason why this wasn't sent there and I just don't see any particular urgency. There's discussion going on. There's no...there's plenty of opposition by the Democratic Party to this whole idea of block grant legislation, and I would not certainly want this Body to go running around the state blasting the

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

proposal, which I think does merit very strong consideration so I just question whether or not we need to rush this through at this particular time, particularly when the Committee did not feel that this particular type of study was warranted."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker, I don't see too many Members of the Dunn: "Mr. Appropriations Committee on this side of the aisle here at this time so I don't really know that I can speak for all of them but I would like to join with Representative Peters' in this request because if we're going to be faced with block grants coming out of Washington and if we're going to be aggressive in the State of Illinois there's only one thing to do and that is to be aggressive from day one to prepare ahead of time, to lay our ground work, to do what we hvae to do, and we annot wait until the Veto Session for the Appropriations Committee to come back and find out what has been done in Washington because it will all be cut and dried at that point. The deals will all be We need to do our homework now and I hope this Body cut. would join with Representative Peters in advancing this that the Intergovernmental Cooperation Resolution so Commission can do its work this summer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would join in that request and I'm supportive of Representative Peters Motion. I think this is going to be a very serious problem confronting us. I think it is one that we have to give lot of attention to if we're going to have block grants. I think we must be involved in the process, as Legislators, or else turn the whole thing over to the Executive Branch of government, which I'm not favorably disposed. I would hope that we would get the necessary votes."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. : I just want to state that there was a question as far as some of the Appropriation Members and I'm sure that they're probably thinking and contemplating joining that dinner that they're having this Very briefly, on this subject matter though, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's in reference to block grants. It's probably one of the most crucial areas, not only affecting this State of Illinois, but every state in this union. There's going to be a total change in philosophy, in the way the dollar amounts are allocated by the Reagan administration, and, previously, they were given either directly to the states and directly to local government but. in turn. now there's been a change in philosophy... block grant. And then from the block grants then the states will decide exactly who gets what to units of local government. I believe that the Resolution is in order and I'm sure my esteemed colleagues from Joliet probably would reconsider the fact that the matter assigned to the Appropriations Committee in lieu of the Executive Committee where the dollar amounts are allocated I stand in full support of Representative by the state. Peters Motion. I concur with John Dunn and Jake Wolf. matter that deserves the immediate attention of It's a this House. This Resolution should be adopted and, turn, the Committee should proceed to start working because the federal budget takes effect October the first. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, since my House

Joint Resolution 36 was mentioned by Representative

Leinenweber, I just wanted to state that there are some

very basic differences between the two approaches. SJR 50

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

sets up some very excellent hearings over the summer and will be charting the course of the Legislature. My Resolution actually recommended formulas and also more specific approaches to block grants. I am a Joint Sponsor of SJR 50 and I rise in support of it."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Ma'am. Representative Bullock." Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding the fact that the Speaker of the House, George Ryan, and the Minority Leader, Mike Madigan are in supportof this Resolution and have so instructed the Sponsor of this Resolution. I spoke to the Governor last night at the Greek Dinner and I know that the Governor is concerned about block grants. Larry DiPrima. I know the Governor's concerned about this. He made a trip to Washington just in the last 48 hours on the very subject of federal funds coming to the State of Illinois. This is not a partisan It's a very serious matter. I think the issue. Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission, we all know, that it's a very fine Commission and they do outstanding research. For them to report back to us by October of '81, I think it's necessary. I think it's essential and I would urge that all of the Members who are here to support the Speaker, Minority Leader and the Governor and, of course, Representative Peters in this particular Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration. Does he have leave? There are no objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman is granted leave without... to suspend rule 41 so that Senate Resolution 50 can be heard without reference to Committee and ask for immediate consideration. Attendance Roll Call will be used. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution... and Title."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution #50, Peters."

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters requests immediate consideration."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I House thank the Members of the and Representative Leinenweber for their consideration. This is not in any way, shape, manner, or form an effort to take a legislative stand on block grants or to embarrass one administration or another, whether it be the city, the state or the Federal We are of the opinion that the block grants Government. are going to be a fiat et 'comple' and we feel that we have a responsibility, as Legislators, to best prepare the state in order to meet that change in philosophy which comes out Our concern is the effect it has on the of Washington. state, the effect it's going to have on local governments and how we best meet that kind of crisis. It's bipartisan Commission. Senator Rock serves on it as does Speaker Ryan as do Members from both sides of the aisle. The Commission does not have a history at all of partisan kind of effort, but, in fact, is bipartisan in nature and always has been, and I am certain that it is in this that these hearings will be conducted throughout the state. I respectfully request the approval of the House on Senate Joint Resolution 50."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 50. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.

Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, I'd like to just briefly explain my 'no' vote.

I read this Senate Joint Resolution 50 and it calls for a series of hearings throughout the state to be presided over by, I believe, by this Commission which is chaired by the President of the Senate. I sincerely believe it's not the intention of the House Sponsor to create some kind of a

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

circus, but I can tell you that this Resolution calls for recipient groups and other interested persons to be ... to give testimony and it's going to turn into a circus and an attempt to discredit what I consider to be an excellent idea and that is the whole idea of the block grant program. And because of this fear, I think it's not a good idea when this is being debated in Washington, the very issues whether or not we ought to have it or not are properly before there and not here."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On the Gentleman's Motion there are 134 'aye', 13 'nay', 2 voting 'present''.

 Senate Joint Resolution 50 is adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "Death Resolution 407, Matijevich, et al, in respect to the memory of Augie Cepon. House Resolution 410, Topinka, in repect to the memory of Michael Rondinella."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti moves adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, providing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, I would now move that the House stand adjourned until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."
- Speaker Daniels: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed "no". 'Ayes' have it. House stands adjourned till tomorrow morning at 9:00. Perfuntory Session for the Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months

69th Legislative Day

June 23, 1981

after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition fo amend Section 1 of Article VIII of the Constitution to read as follows: ARTICLE VIII, FINANCE. Section 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS: (a) "Public Funds" means any funds belonging to the government which are held by or are under the control of any public official in any branch or instrumentality of government. Public funds, property or credit shall be used only for public purposes. No instrumentality of government may receive, hold, expend or use non-public funds which are not public funds except as provided by law or ordinance. The state, units of local government and school districts shall incur obligations for payment or make payments from public funds only as authorized by law or ordinance. (c) Reports and records of the obligation, receipt and use of public funds of the state, units of local government and school districts are public records available for inspection by the public according to law. Third Reading for this Constitutional Amendment as amended on Third Reading. Being no further business, the House now stands adjourned till June 24th, 9:00 a.m."

JUNE 23, 1981

HB-1902	3RD	READING	PAGE	51
HB-1903	3RD	READING	PAGE	87
SB-0202	3RD	READING	PAGE	133
SB-0215	2ND	READING	PAGE	163
SB-0223	2ND	READING	PAGE	170
SB-0236	2ND	READING	PAGE	171
SB-0250	2ND	READING	PAGE	176
SB-0257	2ND	READING	PAGE	179
	2ND	READING	PAGE	222
SB-0300	2ND	READING	PAGE	179
SB-0308	380	READING	PAGE	2
SB-0309	3RD	READING	PAGE	3
SB-0311	3RD	READING	PAGE	4
SB-0312	3RD	READING	PAGE	5
SB-0313	2ND	READING	PAGE	22
SB-0314	3RD	READING	PAGE	5
SB-0315	3RD	READING	PAGE	6
SB-0319	2ND	READING	PAGE	6
	3RD	READING	PAGE	8
SB-0326	2ND	READING	PAGE	26
SB-0329	3RD	READING	PAGE	8
SB-0330	3RD	READING	PAGE	9
SB-0331	3RD	READING	PAGE	11
SB-0332	3RD	READING	PAGE	11
SB-0340	3RD	READING	PAGE	13
SB0343	3RD	READING	PAGE	14
SB-0344	2ND	READING	PAGE	16
SB-0345	2ND	READING	PAGE	34
SB-0350	2ND	READING	PAGE	187
SB0356	SND	READING	PAGE	189
SB-0370	2ND	READING	PAGE	191
	2ND	READING	PAGE	221
SB-0376	2ND	READING	PAGE	194
SB-0390	2ND	READING	PAGE	197
SB-0407	2ND	READING	PAGE	223
SB-0431	2ND	READING	PAGE	224
SB-0464	3RD	READING	PAGE	135
SB0546	3RD	READING	PAGE	140
SB-0731	2ND	READING	PAGE	143 143
SB-0853 SB-0889	3RD 3RD	READING READING	PAGE PAGE	143
SB-0930	3RD	READING	PAGE	144
SB-0955	2ND	READING	PAGE	146
SB-0955 SB-1111	3RD	READING	PAGE	159
SB-1146	3RD	READING	PAGE	160
*HJR-0015	3RD	READING	PAGE	244
- HO M - VO 13	340	WRWDIAG	FAGD	477

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND WORTEN	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
EXCUSED ABSENCES	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE STIEHL IN CHAIR	PAGE	16
REPRESENTATIVE TELCSER IN CHAIR	PAGE	49
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	135
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	235
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	236
SUSPENSION OF RULE	PAGE	237
SJR 50 - DISCUSSION	PAGE	237
SJR 50 - ADOPTION	PAGE	244
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	244
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	244
· ·		

JUNE 23, 1981

SUBJECT MATTER

PERFUNCTORY SESSION PAGE 244
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT PAGE 245

PAGE 2