

82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

JUNE 28, 1982

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Prayer today will be by Reverend...Steve Sotiroff of the Blessed Sacrament Church of Springfield, Illinois. And will our guests in the galleries please rise.

REVEREND SOTIROFF:

(Prayer given by Reverend Sotiroff)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Monday, June the 21st; Tuesday, June the 22nd; Wednesday, June the 23rd; Thursday, June the 24th; Friday, June the 25th; Saturday, June the 26th and Sunday, June the 27th, in the year of 1982 be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Heard the motion. Discussion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and the motion prevails. Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives adopted the following joint resolutions, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolution 102, 103, 104, 105. 106 and 107.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Resolutions Consent Calendar. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 619 offered by Senator Savickas and all Senators. It's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 620 offered by Senator Nash, Rock,

Savickas, Carroll, D'Arco and all Senators, and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Resolution Consent Calendar. Yes, Senate will stand at ease for a moment. The Senate will come to order. On the Order of Secretary's Desk, on page 7 of your Calendar, is the Order of Secretary...on the Order of Concurrence, is there leave to go to that order of business? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 512, Senator Philip, with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3. Do you have motions? Senate Bill 734, Senator Dawson. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Just to alert the membership that the yellow document that is on their desk is the printout with respect to the amendments that are contained on the Concurrence Calendar, so that everybody can follow along.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right...Senate Bill 777, Senator Vadalabene. Senate Bill 777 is back with House Amendment No. 1 and Senator Vadalabene is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. On May 26th, 1981, you approved Senate Bill 777, and this bill would have increased the library system funding from a dollar to a dollar and a half per capita, and from...thirty-five dollars to fifty-six dollars and twenty-five cents per square mile and would have cost the State an additional six and a half million dollars. The bill was amended downward significantly in the House and it now increases the funding authorization only from a dollar to a dollar six per capita, and from thirty-five dollars to thirty-seven dollars and twenty-seven cents per square mile, and will cost the State of Illinois eight hundred and forty thousand dollars. This reflects the exact amount in the

Secretary of State's budget bill and in the Governor's proposed budget. So, I guess the wording would be that I would concur in the House amendment to Senate Bill 777.

SENATOR BRUCE:

You've heard the motion. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 777. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, 1 Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 777, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1044, Senator Berning. Senate Bill 1180, Senator Berman. Senate Bill 1186. Senate Bill 1231, Senator Sangmeister. Senate Bill 1247. Senate Bill 1251, Senator Rock. Senator Rock is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It is fact...in fact, two motions. I would wish to concur with House Amendments 1 and 5. This is the bill, you will recall, that provides for the mechanism to afford the General Assembly the opportunity to...react to Block Grants and make recommendations to both the Governor and the General Assembly. The House by virtue of House Amendment 1 and 5, made what I considered to be nonsubstantive technical changes. Amendment No. 4, however, struck out effectively public members. We had...we had, as you...will recall, structured a board to contain public members to be appointed by the Legislative leadership. The House Task Force apparently didn't think they wanted public members. I think I have persuaded them the error of their ways, and so, I would move to concur with House Amendments 1 and 5 and nonconcur in House Amendment 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Heard the motion. Is there discussion? Discussion? (Machine cutoff)...shall the Senate concur with amendments...House Amendments 1 and 5 to Senate Bill 1251. On that question, those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 5 to Senate Bill 1251. Senator Rock moves to nonconcur with Amendment No. 4. On the amendment...on the motion, is there discussion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and the Senate nonconcur with Amendment No. 4 and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1256, Senator Kent. Senator Kent is recognized on a motion on House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1256. Senator Kent.

SENATOR KENT:

I would move that we nonconcur with House Amendment No. 1 and No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to nonconcur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate 1256. Is there discussion of that motion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate nonconcur with House Amendments 1 and 2 and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1289, Senator Lemke. Senator Lemke is recognized.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I move to...to concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1289. It takes care of a downstate problem which clears up a problem where they play bingo in a village hall or something. The village has to pay a two hundred dollar license fee, and this just puts it back to where it wasn't the intent of the department, this just clears up the language. I think it's a good...language for downstate.

10/13/83  
concur

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to concur. Discussion? Senator McMillan.

SENATOR MCHILLAN:

I would rise in support of this motion to concur. The department finds this amendment to be one that's consistent with their plans for administering the program. The bill, apart from the amendment, already passed this Body and I would seek a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? The question is...Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. Just briefly, I rise also in support of it. I think that the bill is essentially in the form in which it left the Senate which did represent a coming together of originally different viewpoints. It is a good idea, a strong bill and should be supported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1289. On that question, those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1289, and the bill having received required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1299, Senator Totten. Senate Bill 1305, Senator Maitland. Senate Bill...1324, Senator Grotberg. Senate Bill...1383, Senator Collins. Senator Collins is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I move, reluctantly, to concur with House Amendment No. 10, and the reason for that, I...I really feel that the amendment is not necessary but due to the lateness of the Session, I feel that we should not let

the bill go into a Conference Committee. And I think the amendment weakens the bill, but at this time, I'm prepared to...concur with the House Amendment No. 10.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to concur. Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you. I was going to move to agree with Senator Collins. It's a bill we'd done a lot of work on. I'm not real excited about the amendment either, but it does no major harm and rather than fight it out with the House, I would just...it does no major harm in terms of tightening up specific language as to what employees are eligible to do. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Collins moves to concur with House Amendment No. 10 to Senate Bill 1383. On that question, those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 10 to Senate Bill 1383, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. 1387, Senator Rock. Senator Rock is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1, which was offered and adopted in their Judiciary Committee, struck that part of the bill which set up a presumption in favor of or against the owner of property whereby or wherein was contained a device to tamper with public utility, to bypass the meter essentially. There was a presumption set up in there that if you were the registered owner of the property, you knew about the meter. House didn't like that kind of presumption, frankly, I...I'm

not prepared to fight about it, so, I would move that we concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1387.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to concur. Is there discussion of that motion? Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1387. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 57, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1387, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1389, Senator Vadalabene. Senator Vadalabene is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I move to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1389. This is a department amendment. It is modeled after the language in the Optometrist Act and the purpose of the amendment is to allow the department to waive continuing education requirements for a podiatrist who, because of illness and so forth could not meet them in a given year. The Optometrist Act and the Veterinary Act also has this provision, and I move to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1389.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Heard the motion. Discussion? Senator Simms.

SENATOR SIMMS:

A question of the sponsor. Senator Vadalabene, is this same practice applicable for those that have a medical license to practice medicine and surgery...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Let me put it to you this way, what it...what it

empowers...the Department of Registration and...and Education to do is to...to require podiatrists to show proof of their adherence to continuing education requirements, and also, empowers the department to waive continuing education requirements in case of extreme hardships. Now your question in...of whether they can practice medicine...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Simms.

SENATOR SIMMS:

What I'm talking about, Sam, is does this same type of procedure applicable to a physician that can practice medicine and surgery and all of its branches, are they also given this same procedure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR SIMMS:

My...my concern is in doing this that a podiatrist has the right to...if it is waived, they still have the right to prescribe and to write prescriptions for Federal narcotics drugs, and it's a little bit different than some of the other professions, perhaps dealing in veterinary medicine, there's probably not too much harm someone can do if they haven't kept up in continuing education. I just hope that we're not going on a...something that we shouldn't be doing. Optometrists, for example, that have this right cannot dispense drugs, but a podiatrist can in their own parameters of the limitations of what they can practice. And I'm not really so sure this is just a good principle to open up a door to waive this continuing education requirement for someone that can dispense drugs and practice...medicine and surgery, even though it may be in a limited field of expertise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene may close.



SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes...just let me briefly give the history of this...of this legislation. Continuing education is a new requirement under this Act and this is from the Department of Registration and Education. The current license renewal cycle for podiatrists is the first experience for the profession in reporting requirements completion under the Act. The department has become aware of cases where podiatrists for the reasons of illness or other hardship situations have not completed continuing education requirements and are now unable to renew their licenses. The current Act does not provide alternative remedies, so the department can only place a license on a nonrenewal status until the educational requirements are completed, putting the podiatrist in a situation where he cannot earn a livelihood. And I would move to concur with the House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1389.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1389. On that question, those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1389, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1401, Senator Weaver. Senate Bill 1447, Senator Ozinga. Senator Ozinga is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Yes, Mr. President, I would move to concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1447. All that the amendment really does is provides that this Act applies to the redemption from...foreclosure sales made pursuant to foreclosure judgments entered by the court...entered the effective...after the effective date of this Act. There was confu-

DB 1452  
9/29/82

sion in the Act as was formerly passed and this corrects the whole situation. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to concur. Is there discussion of that motion? Question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1447. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 49, the Nays are none, 1 Voting Present. Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1447, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1452, Senator Carroll. Senator Carroll is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would move that we do not concur with House Amendments 1, 3 and 5 and ask the House to recede or request a Committee on Conference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Carroll has moved to nonconcur with House Amendments 1, 3 and 5. Is there discussion of that motion? Discussion? On the motion, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate nonconcur with... Amendments 1, 3 and 5 and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1471, Senator Vadalabene. Senator Vadalabene is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I make a motion to concur on... is that House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1471? The House amendment would permit the State and the flexibility... the State the flexibility to be consistent with current and future Federal tax changes by allowing the State to enter into service contracts on the Illinois coal bond development projects as long as

they are secured with capital facilities. The bill also brings the interest rate limitation rate up-to-date by tying it into the other state's bond rate limitations for the sake of uniformity and...permits the use of Bond Act monies for electric generation products other than steam, and I would appreciate a...to concur with...with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1471.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Discussion of the motion? The motion is to concur. The question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1471. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1471, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1487, Senator Maitland is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate not concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1487.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to nonconcur. Is there discussion of that motion? Senator Maitland, there's a request for an explanation.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Yes, Senator Demuzio, the...the reference to the AIS statement was...was taken off of that...that legislation over there. Those of us who worked on that bill over here felt that that was necessary, and I believe that an agreement can be worked out. The Department of Transportation had some concerns, DCCA had some concerns and we're attempting to work out those...those disagreements.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion of the motion, Senator Demuzio. Further discussion? The motion is to nonconcur. On that question, those in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and the Senate nonconcur with House Amendment No. 1 and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1492. Senator Marovitz is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would move that the Senate do concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1492. The amendments are amendments that were requested by the Illinois State Medical Association and the Illinois Hospital Association. The are...put all doctors in the same category and reduce the hospital fee for inspection from fifty dollars to twenty-five dollars and add a member to the...to the Radiologic...Technology Accreditation Board...a doctor who is licensed in nuclear medicine is added to the board. Everybody is in agreement. There was no opposition. Again, it was requested by the medical society and the hospital association, and I would move that the Senate do concur to House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1492.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to concur, is there discussion? Senator Totten.

SENATOR TOTTEN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Totten.

SENATOR TOTTEN:

This bill only passed the Senate by a 35 to 18 vote, and as it passed out of here, it was...it was new regulatory Act...licensing Act for radiologists, I believe. What now, precisely, is its status with the three House amendments?

I've listened to what you've said, but I'm not sure what you said.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

The House amendments really aren't terribly substantive in nature, they reduce a...the hospital association fee, if they do their own inspection, from fifty dollars to twenty-five dollars. They add a member to the board, a doctor who's licensed to practice in nuclear medicine, and they put all doctors...originally we had passed the bill out of here there were three categories depending on how they would be inspected, there are now only two categories so that all doctors are in the same category. The medical society and all the...those who were licensed to practice under that wanted it that way. The hospital association wanted their amendment that way. This bill went through the Sunset Committee and received an 8 to nothing vote in favor of the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Totten.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Including...including Doctor Mandeville.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Totten. Senator Sommer.

SENATOR SOMMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a question of intent. Are people now practicing this occupation or profession, are they now...would they be grandfathered under this particular bill or would they not be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Those people licensed...to...to administer radiation to

humans would be grandfathered under the bill and there will be no additional requirements on those individuals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Sommer.

SENATOR SOMMER:

Are you saying then, that upon the passage of this bill, there'll be no changes...no change in the status of people now engaged in this occupation, but it would apply more to new people, is that...is that how it works?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, there are people who are not licensed presently to do this and have...have no training requirement, but if they can...if they exhibit to the department that they have been doing this, then they would be allowed...to continue to do it without any additional training requirement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Yeah, that's where I...where I don't quite follow what you're saying. In the synopsis...in the synopsis it says that no technician person or other assistant acting under the supervision of a person licensed under the medical...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Gentlemen, Senator Bloom...Senator Bloom, I wonder if we could break up the conference right behind you, we're getting their conversation in on your microphone, also. Not exactly that way, Senator Carroll. If we could just take that conference off, it's right into his microphone and we're getting a roll back. Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Okay. Anyway, it says people that are under the supervision and...and as we understood it, nobody was administer-

ing this without being supervised by someone under the medical practice or Podiatry Act shall administer radiation...to human beings after January 1, 1984 unless accredited by the Department of Nuclear Safety, so the department...I gather, the Department of Nuclear Safety by that date will have devised some form of accreditation for everyone who administers an X-ray, is that what you're saying?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

That's...that's correct. There's also a section of the bill that says if they've been doing this for twenty-four of the preceding forty-eight months, they will be grandfathered in in an effect. So, any...we're not...we're not trying to hurt any...anybody who's doing this, if they have been doing it, they will be allowed to continue to do it, but those new people who come in will have to have some training requirements and probably those which are based on the Federal requirements that will be coming out within the next year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further...Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

So, in other words, anyone that is presently administering X-rays to human beings who continues to do so until 1984, or at least has been doing it since the first of this year, doesn't have to get accredited. No?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

...everybody will be accredited, they won't have any new requirements upon those people. Everybody will have to be accredited, even those people who are licensed. They will have to be approved and...so that the department will accredit them, they will issue them a certificate of accredi-

tation, but there will be no additional requirements on those people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, I...I don't want to belabor the subject, you know, maybe it's the slowness of my mind. In other words, everybody gets accredited but only those that were...doing X-rays to human beings in January of '82 do not have to go through whatever testing procedure, or what have you, that's involved? I'm trying to follow what you meant by grandfathered.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Question of the sponsor, Mr. President. Senator, when this bill passed the Senate, according to what I have, the fee for filing was fifty dollars. Now, the amendment that is before us reduces this from fifty-five to twenty-five dollars. And my question is, why if...after due deliberation, the bill as presented required a fifty dollar fee, what justification is there to now reduce it by half?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

This was at the request of the Illinois Hospital Association, and it was agreed to by the Department of Nuclear Safety who felt that they would have enough revenue to handle the inspections even if the hospital fee was reduced to twenty-five dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Well, I hate to get into this thing but this is the one I



started off with. I believe that the fiscal note that was prepared, at my request, showed a substantial amount of money, and I believe that just a few minutes ago you stated something that had had the inspections had been reduced from three to two, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

No...no, nothing like that, Senator Ozinga...the inspections have not been reduced in any way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Now, I also believe that you stated just a few minutes ago that everybody that handled this material would have to be licensed in order to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

There is no licensing in the bill at all, there is accreditation. And those people who administer X-ray and radiation to humans would all be accredited by the Department of Nuclear Safety by 1984.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

I didn't get that last statement. Credited by who?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

May we have some order, please. Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

The Department of Nuclear Safety.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Okay. Where does the Department of Registration and Education come into this picture?

PRESIDING OFFICE: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

...Department of Registration and Education has absolutely nothing do to with this bill whatsoever. The Department of Nuclear Safety presently has the jurisdiction and responsibility for inspecting X-ray and radiation facilities, and the Department of Registration and Education has nothing whatsoever to do with this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Well, now, if I read the bill right, some of these institutions can do their own inspecting and regulating, is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

They can do...they...they can do their own inspecting of their own machines as they do now. This is no change in the law whatsoever. Most of the large hospitals across the State of Illinois do their own inspecting now. This in no way changes that at...in any shape.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

In other words, what you're saying is, that an assistant for a dentist, et cetera does not have to have anything at all or have to be regulated in any way, shape or form other than being just...using the word qualified.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Presently that same assistant to the dentist that you are

talking about has no requirements whatsoever. The dentists are specifically exempted from this legislation, we did that in the Senate here...when the bill passed the Senate the dentist's are specifically exempted from this legislation. They presented a very complex case before the...Senator D'Arco's Insurance Committee and it was the feeling of that committee and the Body that the...that the dentists should be exempted and they were.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Now, you said, now. Naturally, the bill is not passed, now, but what will it be after it is signed into law?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

It'll be the same as it is now. The...the dentists are exempted and...and will be, and the dental assistants are exempted. So they're...they're not under the purview of this legislation as far...as accreditation, they are still under this legislation as far as inspection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Ozinga.

SENATOR OZINGA:

Okay. I'm not restricting my remarks to the dentists, I didn't even have them in mind, nor the podiatrists, but who else is exempted then?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Nobody else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Senator Marovitz, regarding again House Amendment No. 2 where the fee is dropped and the hospitals do their own inspection, that...in other words, who...who backs up the...who inspects the inspectors? I mean, how...how...how...what's our backup for the Department of Nuclear Safety to make sure that the hospitals are doing their job properly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, once again, this doesn't change present law at all. Presently the...the hospitals have their own inspectors which are approved by the department, and they are...and those which are approved are allowed to do the inspection facilities at hospitals throughout the State of Illinois, and they will still be allowed to do this, now there won't be any change at all, and most of the large hospitals will, in fact, do their own...inspecting, file a report...inspecting report with the twenty-five dollar fee with the Department of Nuclear Safety so that we will, in fact, know that those facilities were inspected and what the results of that inspection was.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

All right, now here's the sixty-four dollar question that a lot of us are puzzled on this side. What...if we are grandfathering in those...the accreditation for those who are now practicing, how does this bill get at the problem that you initially sought to get at?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Matovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, number one, it will...it will make sure that all

machines in the State of Illinois are inspected on a regular basis, which is not the case presently because the department doesn't have enough inspectors, wherewithal, there aren't fees paid by those individuals who are inspected and...and the machines are not calibrated properly in many cases and are administering excess dosages of radiation. Also, in fact, other individuals who are...do not administer X-ray with any regularity and have no expertise will have to...will have to either get some expertise or do it on a regular basis, and all those new individuals that come in...to this...to this field will have to have some training pursuant to the requirements promulgated by the department.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Well, what in the bill insures that those who do not now have the expertise, the very people that the Chicago T.V. report was aimed at, how...what...what in this bill insures that those people will now be forced to get some training if they're...if we're grandfathering in their accreditation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Because they will all have to apply to the Department of Nuclear Safety for that accreditation and...and in order to get accredited, they'll have to establish that they have been doing this for twenty-four of the previous forty-eight months, and they will also...they're obviously going to have to get the approval of the...the supervising authority, be it the doctor or whomever under the...under the Medical Practice Act. That individual will have to verify that, in fact, they have been doing this for that period of time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Well, just one final obvious question. What if they've been doing it badly for that period of time? Where...where's the backup...where's the investigation on the part of the Department of Nuclear Safety?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

...think anybody ever intended that the Department of Nuclear Safety send out investigators to make sure that these people are doing it well...they...that would be an absolute impossibility. You have a supervising physician who is watching these individuals, if...if they file with the Department of Nuclear Safety that they have been doing this for such and such a time, and they are backed-up by their supervising physician, that in and of itself is going to be sufficient for accreditation until 1984, because there's no way to investigate everybody in...in the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

Well, thank you. I was not going to get into this debate but, Mr. President and fellow members, nobody is better acquainted with radiation than old Grotberg. I've had it from every direction, by every hand it has to offer, and if the hospital radiation treatment is exempt from the law, those who are doing it...well, that's what we've said, the hospitals are going to supervise themselves and nobody's going to supervise the supervisor, is that technically correct? I...I will not address the bill until I hear that answer. Who supervises the supervisor, that's what...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

They are not in anyway exempt from the law. This doesn't...this bill in no way changes the inspection of hospitals at all. This doesn't make any change in the law at all. Today...today, hospitals who have their machines inspected the vast majority of them do it by independent inspectors that are approved by the department. This doesn't change that in anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

Okay, you've just said it, nothing is changed. The dentists are exempt, so I get about twenty-five shots of those every few years. My chiropractor is...is...is exempt, as I understand it, my existing one, not the new ones. Do you have a comment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

I think...we're talking about two different sections of the bill. In regards to the inspection of the machines, how they are calibrated, whether excess dosages of radiation are administered, there is no exemption whatsoever on anybody's machine. Every machine has to be inspected with regularity. Under this bill...under this bill, one of the problems that was brought to the attention through the media was that the machines were not being inspected regularly. The department admitted this and said they didn't have the wherewithal, they needed the help. Through the help of the department and the cooperation of the Governor's Office and the hospital association, we drafted this legislation so that we could give them the wherewithal and have the machines inspected regularly, and that's what's now in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Grotberg. May we have a little order, please.

Senator Grothberg.

SENATOR GROTHBERG:

Believe it or not, it is helpful. The main thrust of this bill then is to inspect machines and accredit new people to run them, is that what you're...we're saying? But the main thrust is to finally have the machines all carrying an inspection stamp, whether it's in my dentist's office...is my dentist's machine going to be monitored? Okay...okay, all of the machines, my chiropractor, my podiatrist, my everybody, and I...when I lie down in front of those machines, I know or will ultimately know that somebody looked at the machine itself and maybe somebody certified the operator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

For what purpose...all right, for what purpose does Senator D'Arco arise?

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Mr. President, I believe we're on a motion to concur in the House amendment to this bill, now none of the speakers have addressed themselves to that amendment. We're discussing the merits of the bill which we discussed on 3rd reading when the bill was before the Senate. So, my point is, they should refrain their remarks to the motion that's on the floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

Senator Marovitz, I see here that we...in House Amendment No. 3 we increased the membership on their Radiology Technology Accreditation Board from eleven to twelve, who suggested that amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

The Illinois Medical Society.



PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

We had exposures on over-radiation and everything. Now, what we're doing here is...looking at this bill and to me in looking at what the amendments do now, it now makes a very special interest bill that takes care of grandfathering in people that are existing doing things that are wrong, there's no way of controlling them, there's no way of getting rid of them. All we do now is say to a guy that wants to become a radiologist, buddy, you got to go to school, and you got to get trained, and you got to pass the accreditation. This is a bill that if Senator Nudelman, if he was here, would have never got out of the Senate Regulation Committee and I'm sure Soper would also, 'cause these are the kind of bills are just for one particular group and that's the in's. The out's are out of order. You can't come in unless you meet certain requirements. This is a very good special interest bill, and I would say this, that if I sponsor this bill, my...my name would be on the front headline that I was representing a special interest group.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

For what purpose does Senator D'Arco arise?

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Well, just to inform my colleague to my left, Senator...Soper is not here and Senator Nudelman is not here, but Senator D'Arco is here, and he passed this bill out of the Senate Insurance Committee because it's a darn good bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right, further discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Indicates he will yield, Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, I read in...in House Amendment No. 1 that you have cut the fees of inspections in half from fifty...okay, Amendment No. 2, are you not...is the Department of Nuclear Safety in accord with that? Do they say that they can now do this on half the money that they said they could do it for in the...the Senate Committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

The department...the Department of Nuclear Safety is in total accord with this, this is...we have not cut all the fees in half. The only fees that were touched were the fees of hospitals, and that would be a maximum of a thousand hospitals, that were going to pay...that were going to do their own inspection and they were going to pay fifty dollars...those are the only fees that were touched. All the other fees in...for doctor's offices and..and dentist's offices, and other offices and hospitals that didn't do their inspections, they were not touched in anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

All right, what I...my concern is that the Department of Nuclear Safety was created to protect and keep safe the nuclear power plants, and I...I don't want to see that...their fortunes get diluted by having to take care of this and not have enough money to do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Marovitz may close.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, this...this bill, over the last four months, has gone through more deliberation I think than...than any bill

that I have been involved with. It started because of a expose on ABC television about people who...who are administering X-rays that had absolutely no training whatsoever and weren't even supposed to be doing that, and machines that were uncalibrated and not inspected with any regularity. We have gone over this thing with the nuclear technologists, the radiologic technologists, the Governor's Office, the medical society, the hospital association, we've gone through the Sunset Committee, and you know how difficult a committee that is to get through, they passed this bill 8 to nothing and...and the Department of Nuclear Safety has gone through this thing with a fine-toothed comb. This bill will make sure that people who administer X-ray and radiation to humans know what they are doing, and before they're accredited, they're going to have...have to have the stamp of approval of their supervising physician, and...and have operated in the field for at least twenty-four months, and have the approval of the Department of Nuclear Safety. All new people will have to have courses before they even begin and some training, and all machines will be calibrated and regulated, and inspected on...on a regular basis, all of which did not happen before. And I think for every citizen in the State of Illinois, when they're getting X-rays administered to them, it's a very, very serious situation, and I...I would hope that the...the work of the Insurance Committee and the Sunset Committee, and the work between the Governor's Office and the medical society and the hospital association would not go for naught, this is a very important bill. These amendments were...did not change the substance of the bill, it...it makes a very good bill even tighter, and I would hope that everybody would support Senate Bill 1492.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Question is, shall the House...shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1492. On

that question, those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 14, 3 Voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1492, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1500, Senator DeAngelis. Senator...for what purpose does Senator Vadalabene rise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, as a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

State your point.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yeah, seated in the gallery behind me is the Mayor of Edwardsville, Mayor Kenny Evers, and I would like for him to be recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Would our guest in the gallery please rise and be recognized.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

He is also given the Hometown Award for the City of Edwardsville, and I know he's proud of that award also.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur to...with House Amendment No. 1 on Senate Bill 1500. And actually what the amendment does is it reduces the...membership on regional youth planning groups and it clarifies the procedure for filling those vacancies on the Regional Youth Planning Committees and the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

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

the Senate...Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

A question of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ROCK:

Who...who was the chairman, or who appointed the chairman of the Juvenile Justice Commission prior to this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

The same person, the Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1500. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, 1 Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1500, and the bill having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1510, Senator Nedza. Senator Nedza.

SENATOR NEDZA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1510. House Amendment No. 1, what it did was it was suggested by the Civic Federation to delete one sentence, the sentence being, "Without making a previous appropriation thereof." There are no...objections to any of the parties...the concerned parties with the amendment, and I move to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1510.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill

1510. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 48, the Nays are 6, 1 Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1510, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1518, Senator Rock. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President...members of the Senate. I move to nonconcur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1518. The House, by virtue of this amendment, effectively took the cap off the costs for the use of building facilities under the Orphanage Act. It is readily agreed, I think, by members who are familiar with the Orphanage Act, that the cost of maintaining...or using the building facilities, particularly in light of the increased utility costs, the ten percent is unrealistic, but to remove the cap altogether seems, to some of us, to be a little much. So, I would move that we nonconcur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1518 and we'll go back to the drawing board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Rock moves to nonconcur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1518. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it and the motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1519, Senator Walsh. Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, Senate Bill 1519 passed the House with two amendments. I would move that the Senate concur in Amendments No. 1 and 2. Amendment No. 1, among other things, relieves local police departments of the burden of forwarding fingerprints and other arrest data on

certain misdemeanors and traffic offenders to the Department of Law Enforcement. The department feels that these reports are unnecessary since the...where an offense is serious, the report is made to the Secretary of State. Amendment No. 2 provides that conservation offenses, which are Class B misdemeanors, not be reported to the Department of Law Enforcement. That would include such things as Fish Code, the violations of boat registration, et cetera. I urge the Senate concur in Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1519.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1519. Those in...Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I'm sorry, Senator Walsh, I...I heard your explanation of House Amendment No. 1 and then I...I just lost you on...on No. 2. Would you briefly explain that again, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Amendment No. 2 is requested by the Department of Conservation and concurred in by the Department of Law Enforcement. It would relieve the Department of Conservation of reporting to the Department of Law Enforcement certain Class B misdemeanors, which under the present law, it does report to DLE. It doesn't mean that conservation wouldn't continue to keep its records, but it was just felt by both that it's not necessary for both to maintain records on these violations. As I said, it would include, for example, Fish Code violations, Park District Code violations, boat registration, et cetera.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate

Bill 1519. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1519 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Okay, Senate Bill 1526, Senator Sangmeister. Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move to concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1526. If you recall, Senate Bill 1526 dealt with the night depositories and, apparently, the House has raised a question legitimately that we did not provide for a new bank that may be established, and this lays out the...the criteria that they must have their notice an outside time of six months. So, it establishes some time within which framework of a new bank would have to get their notice out. That's all it really does. It's a good cleanup amendment and I move for concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICE: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1526. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1526, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1532, Senator Netsch. Senator...Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, there is at least one, and perhaps two, of the amendments that...need to be nonconcurrent in, and I think



just to make it easy, I will simply move to nonconcur in all of the amendments. We know it's going to have to end up in a Conference Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Netsch moves to nonconcur in...House Amendments No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 to Senate Bill 1532. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and the Secretary shall so inform the House. For what purpose does Senator Keats arise?

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President, I was just asking for an explanation. I would appreciate it if the Senate President would be careful that the members tell us...I'm looking at things, some of them don't look that unreasonable. So, I'd appreciate it if you'd make sure they're explained. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Well, I thought she explained it clearly that she was not in favor of some of the amendments and to...instead of wasting your time to go through all of them individually, to nonconcur with all of them. Senate Bill 1558, Senator Chew. Senate Bill 1566, Senator Etheredge. Senator Etheredge.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move that we concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1566. House Amendment No. 1 redefines the boundaries for the Joliet Civic Center to...so that they will be coincident with the boundaries of the County of Will. House Amendment No. 2 is permissive legislation which makes it possible for the Rockford Civic Center Authority to establish a security force.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to particularly, House Amendment 2. It seems to me we have had some rather lengthy discussions in the waning days of the Session with respect to the authorization of or...or granting of police powers, and there was all kinds of consternation because Department of Revenue inspectors were to be afforded certain police powers. For those of you who haven't bothered, take a look and read Amendment No. 2, on page 51. This is truly a wild amendment and I, for one, don't care to vote for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Simms.

SENATOR SIMMS:

Mr. President and...Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I rise in support of...of...Senator Etheredge's motion. The reason for Amendment No. 2, very frankly, if you'll look at it, it very clearly defines that would allow the Rockford Civic Center to establish their own security force to be confined entirely to the premises of the Rockford Civic Center.

The people that are employed must have the necessary police training as required as any other police officer in the State of Illinois must. It's a matter to save money for the City of Rockford's Civic Center, that security costs being contractually obligated to the park district police or to the Sheriff's Office were becoming exorbitant and, therefore, is a money saving devise. The Civic Center Commission asked that a...a special security force, a permission be established. There police powers are entirely limited strictly to the confines of the building of the civic center and to those activities, and they must be...police officers must be trained...under the same requirements that any other police officer in the State. And for this reason, I would urge concurrence with the entire bill of Senate Bill 1566.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR HALL:

Senator, if I read this, it says here, the board may establish reasonable eligibility requirements for appointment to such security police force, relating to health habit and moral character, and no person may be...at least twenty-one years of age. Now, if that's left into the discretion of that board doing that, then they might find reasons to discriminate against some people for being appointed to that board. Now what guarantee are you going to have that this board is going to have to be governed by that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Well, Senator, there is no permission to discriminate

under this law or any other law. I think that the...the language that is outlined there in...in the amendment gives the board appropriate responsibility and guidelines, as an employer, to choose those people who would...who could best do the job.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Well, all of these agencies that appoint police officers, they usually have a minimum or a maximum. Is there any maximum age limit on this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

No, there's not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Further discussion? Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...would like to speak to the amendment rather than a question to the sponsor. It would appear to me that we are embarking here on a rather unusual precedent. While this is limited to Rockford, we all know that there are other civic center boards in the State, and we would be establishing here a security police force for Rockford, which as I said becomes a precedent, obviously, soon to be followed by the other civic boards. That in itself may not be too bad, but inherent in that then is the ultimate request that these people, these security personnel then, would become eligible to be classified as policemen and to serve under the same police pension benefits as a normal police officer. This compounds the costs for the municipalities in each case. And perhaps, equally as important and worthy of consideration in this amendment something that I wonder if we have given serious enough consideration to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Gitz. Oh, I'm sorry, Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Well, Mr. President...I...I would like to have the sponsor, as well as anyone else, consider the...part of this amendment which provides that for violating ordinances of the civic center board, there can be imprisonment or a fine. Now that in itself seems to be frightening enough, but I wasn't aware that we had given civic center boards, or any other board, other than the boards of municipalities or county authorities the option of imposing penalties of this nature. The frightening aspect of it is that for whatever they establish in the way of ordinances for these penalties, the potential is there for even a greater expansion of this, and we could certainly soon have a rather extensive potential for police activity within these civic centers and beyond.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR GITZ:

By adding House Amendment 2 to give peace officer powers to the Rockford Civic Center, are you thereby also amending the other section so that they will be able to enter into lease arrangements in real estate without competitive bidding and all the things that have been extended in the original provisions of the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

No, I'm not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

There is no reference anywhere then in that authority for noncompetitive bidding?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

You are correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

Why then is it necessary to do it for everybody else?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

All right, this House Amendment No. 2 is...is a...an amendment which was added at the request of Representatives in the House, and I'm simply tried to accommodate a...a local...the concern of...of that local community and letting them solve their problem via this amendment on my bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

Well, the thing that concerns, me Senator Etheredge, is we started with a bill aimed at one civic center, Aurora, then we expanded it to take care of other problems, now it's become a Christmas tree for all the authorities, and I realize that House Amendment 2 is somewhat restricted, but the overall effect of this bill, if we vote in final passage and send it to the Governor, is to setup different rules. Some can noncompetitively bid, some can't under the legislation, and that seems to be entering into a new phase of uniqueness where we generally had consistency in our application of these authorities throughout the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Senator, I would...I would disagree. First of all, you will...you will find that the Acts which govern the...the work of the various civic centers are quite different at the present time. You will find that there are some of the civic centers at the present time that do not...that are not required to...competitively bid the leasing of space. So what the original bill did was actually to...to bring the...the Joilet and the City of Aurora civics and other authorities in line with those that presently do not have to bid.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise in opposition to concurring with Amendment No. 2. I think Senator Etheredge is well-intentioned and you have responded to a local request, but can you tell me any of the other authorities in the State of Illinois that have the powers to make arrests and bring before a circuit court? Do they have...any of those authorities have that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

No, Senator, not to my knowledge.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

All right, I don't...I believe that's part of the problem is that Rockford can do what everyone else has had to do, and that is cooperate with their local police forces, their city and...and county sheriffs. As to Senator Simms' statement

that this is somehow limited to the confines of the area...surrounding the exposition hall, I would call the members attention to the fact that there is a little word called "and," and although they have the right to act as police officers upon the driveways, sidewalks, and property control by the authority, there's a word that says, "And shall have the power to make arrests, cause to be arrested with or without process any person who breaks the peace or may be found violating any of the ordinance of the authority, the City of Rockford, or the State of Illinois." And that gives these the general police powers of any other police officer in the State of Illinois to make arrests and bring people to justice and I just...I believe that the Rockford...well, you may shake your head, but let me tell you, once you create these guys as police officers, under the police decisions that have been rendered, once they find a person violating any of these ordinances they may pursue them, and as long as they pursue them or have reasonable belief, they may pursue them not only within the confines of the authority but onto the city streets and once into the city, they may pursue them across county lines. The old movies in which people avoided the law by crossing state lines or county lines was abolished years ago and these fellows have general police authority. I think that it is not a good idea, besides that, it's unique in the law, I think, that if you bring these people into a circuit court, the third objection I have is that having the County of Winnebago having provided the courtroom, the judge, the prosecutor and the whole ball of wax, all the fines derived from...from arrests made by these people go back to the authority. I don't know of any other authority in the State of Illinois that gets all the money from every fine by using the circuit court process in this State. I just believe...I believe everyone is well intentioned. I think Senator Etheredge is particularly...just got hung, but Sena-



tor Simms, these are general police powers stated within the metropolitan area, and that includes a great deal more than just the confines of the exhibition hall, it includes all of Winnebago County, at very least. And I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Well, I...just to continue on what Senator Bruce was saying, the...the point, Senator Etheredge, that...the point, Senator Etheredge, that I...I was concerned about is that all of the fines that are collected pursuant to arrests made within the small jurisdiction that you are creating, although the police power now, apparently, does not...is not limited to that geographical jurisdiction necessarily, I don't know. Assuming that it does, all of the fines that are collected pursuant to those arrests goes back to the authority. That troubles me. In...in honesty, I...I think that you're creating a "speed trap." I...I just...that troubles me...that provision troubles me. It would seem to me that the authority could be self-sufficient, and...and...they probably won't need any funds at all to run that authority after they get the police power to arrest and fine and have the money come back to them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Totten.

SENATOR TOTTON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in opposition to this concurrence to the amendment. The only good thing about it in my mind is that I've thought for a long time that the only good we could do with these civic centers is to turn them into prisons, and we might have a trained police force if we allow them to do

what they're trying to do in Rockford, ready for the correctional center. But I can find nowhere's in the amendment that this...these security officers would be trained in the same manner we would...we would train policemen. This is a special provision for the apparent...Winnebago, probably the Giorgi police force in Rockford and it's a dangerous...it's a dangerous course for us to be going on for a lot of the reasons enumerated by Senator Bruce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Berning, for the second time.

SENATOR BERNING:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I had not had a chance to pursue my point when I was cutoff and you recognized somebody else. Senator Bruce, of course, has picked up on what was part of my original concern, but I wanted to carry it one step further and ask the sponsor, what ordinances in particular are involved, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge. Senator Berning. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Senator...well, they keep shutting my light off. My question has to do with the ordinances, Senator Etheredge. Is this civic center board authorized to adopt independent ordinances or are these only city ordinances? And if they are city ordinances, why should the civic center police officers operating on private...so-called private property be enforcing city ordinances if these are civic center authority ordinances, then my question is, what kind and how many and to what extent are their...or is there any limitation to the ordinances that the civic center board may enact? It appears to me that this would be setting up an entirely new governmental entity, and that I don't believe is in the best interest of the citizens of Illinois and certainly not Rockford even. Is that what it amounts to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Senator, the..the Act...first of all, the...ordinances involved would be those established by the board of the civic center as well as those of the City of Rockford, and the...the Act does define the ordinances that the civic center board can establish.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Then, Mr. President, I, too, rise in opposition to Amendment No. 2. It seems wholly inconsistent with our whole law enforcement procedure and governmental operation that an independent body, such as a civic board authority, should have the authority to enact ordinances which it may be...may enforce with its own police force.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Simms.

SENATOR SIMMS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I apologize for riding...rising on a second time, but maybe to explain something to Senator Berning. The Legislature has already has completed this with the civic centers authorities throughout the State. Now if you're concerned about the police power...the extra police power, it might be news to some of the members of the Senate, park districts have this authority at the present time, airport authorities can establish their own police department, and at the same time, so can sanitary districts enact their own ordinances, they can have their own police department. The objective between Representative Giorgi's bill in the House, and evidently there is a great deal of opposition to it, frankly, the Rockford Civic Center does have a serious finan-

cial problem in trying to control cost, and without going into more deficits, it was thought that it was less expensive to have its own security force. And you have the same principle as already been established by the Legislature in allowing sanitary districts, park boards, airport authorities to establish their own security forces and to enact ordinances. The police powers are... that are enumerated in the legislation are well spelled out. The requirement for satisfying the requirements for a police officer, the training is the same as any other police officer. I think if most of you would consider there are many more governmental agencies that have complete police power throughout the State of Illinois and your counties, and your municipalities than what you believe...whether or not the civic center authorities should have this additional power is another one. At the present time, it costs the Rockford Civic Center many thousands of dollars a year to contract to the Rockford Police Department or the Winnebago Sheriff's Office, and frankly, they don't have the manpower to assist the civic center in crowd control and the problems that a civic center generate, and I think only those legislators that come from areas that have civic centers can appreciate the problem. And I'm kind of sorry that Senator Etheredge got caught in this type of situation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Friedland.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, Mr. President, if you or members of your family have attended some of the functions at some of these civic centers, stadiums, and arenas around this State, you might wish there were a little security there, recall with me some of the events that have occurred over the past year, and I urge support of this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that we divide the question. I am perfectly prepared to vote affirmatively on House Amendment No. 1 and concur therein. House Amendment No. 2 is a totally different animal, and I would point out to those who have risen in its favor that there was no bill introduced in either the House or the Senate to effect this purpose. There was no committee hearing in either the Senate or the House. I am reliably informed that this Amendment No. 2 was approved by the House, by voice vote and that nobody, frankly, was paying much attention. Now if, in fact, the Rockford Civic Center or any civic center doesn't have money enough to contract with the local police or the local sheriff's department, how in the world are they supposed to get money enough to provide their own police force? And you and I know very well how they're going to do that because this little gem also says, that all the fines that are levied against all these violators who attend the civic center will be paid back to the authority. Doesn't make much sense, if it's that good an idea, it should have been introduced. I would urge affirmance of House Amendment...concurrence in House Amendment No. 1, and I ask that the question be divided.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. All those in favor of dividing the question signify by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion is divided. On the question of concurrence with House Amendment No. 1, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56,

the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566. Senator, on House Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

I regret that there has been so much misunderstanding of the...the language of Amendment No. 2. I...I...but we have an informal statement from the Attorney General which indicates that the authority of the security police is...is defined on lines 21...20 and 21, 22, as...of the amendment which would include the driveway, sidewalks and property controlled by such authority, and that the...the language which...as referred to earlier which suggests that the...the authority extends beyond that is in the section on arrests and...it refers to those instances where there has been hot pursuit. We've...I permitted this amendment to be added to the bill in order to...to meet the needs...local needs and concerns of the...of the people in Rockford. I...as I say, I regret the fact there's been misunderstanding in the regard to the...to the language. I think it's a good...amendment and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Again, I rise...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 2...House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1566. I think we ought to afford the House the opportunity to recede from this amendment. I think it is ill-conceived, the language is much, much too broad, and I am sure that once the responsible folks in Winnebago County, in Rockford have a chance to read this, they're not going to want it either. So, I would urge a No vote on the motion to concur.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amend-

ment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1566. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Senator Etheredge, for what purpose do arise?

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Mr. President, I would move that we...that we nonconcur and ask the House to recede.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You don't have to now. At this point, Senator, it's...the...the motion...the motion to concur fails and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1588, Senator Schaffer. Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, there are two amendments that have been placed on...Senate Bill 1588 at the request of the Department of Conservation. The first does not really relate to the indemnification issue on the bill, it...it clarifies a bill that we passed last year in which the registration fees for snowmobiles, a portion of which would go into the snowmobile trail...Snowmobile Trail Fund. Evidently, we failed to indicate that renewals of the snowmobile license, the two dollars, would go into this fund and that's what that does. The second amendment is a clarification of the exemption for those people who receive compensation for using their trails. We, evidently, referred...we did refer in the Senate bill to the people that receive money from the Snowmobile Trail Fund, and evidently, there are some people who..where they use some of those funds on the land for snowmobiling but the owner does not receive a benefit automatically, and this language clarifies that situation. I...I believe there's no controversy. Appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

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

the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 1588. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 1588, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1592, Senator DeAngelis. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I move to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1592 which extends to the Department of Law Enforcement the same right that we extended to the Secretary of State's Office to maintain two signature checking accounts for the purposes of obtaining evidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Is this...question of the sponsor, Mr. President, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ROCK:

Is this in addition to the...the authorization for the Secretary of State? They didn't delete everything and...it is in addition to?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1592. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1592, and



the bill having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. House Bill 1593. (Machine cutoff)...1593, Senator DeAngelis. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Mr. President, there are some technical difficulties with that bill, I intend to hold it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1614, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom, on 1614.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and fellow Senators. I'd like you to listen closely to this explanation because these...House Amendments 2, 4, 5 and 6, I'm...I'm going to move to concur in, but they are rather complicated. As you know, this bill as it passed the Senate was as a result of the five year review of the Medical Disciplinary Board and...it was sought by both the affected parties and pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act mandating the Department of Registration and Education to set out the grounds for revocation or discipline under the Act. In the meantime, as you are aware, the Chicago Tribune ran a...a series on the...laxness of reporting and of discipline of various errant doctors, and the fact that this was creating a serious health and welfare problem. These four amendments, basically, address the issue. House Amendment No. 2, which was proposed by the Medical Society, adds a new section to the Medical Practice Act to require...specified entities to report to the Medical Disciplinary Board when a doctor, a physician is found negligent, convicted of a felony, or has been sanctioned by a health care institution due to patient care concerns, as opposed to administrative concerns. Failure to make a report mandated by this section, was a Class A misdemeanor. Now, immunity from criminal or civil liability is granted, under the amendment, to the groups or individuals

required to report. Also included in this provision, which...indemnifies members of the Disciplinary Board for good faith actions that they take during the performance of their duties. The amendment provides for representation of the members by the Attorney General or in cases where the...AG refuses to act on specified grounds, private counsel reimbursed by the State. Physicians who are subject to a report under the new section are granted the right to be notified of its existence and to review and comment on it. The Disciplinary Board must review all reports no earlier than the sixty-first day after it receives it nor later than the hundred and twentieth day. Finally, the amendment requires the Disciplinary Board to send out summary reports, at least annually, of disciplinary actions taken by it so it can be monitored by the General Assembly and the public at large. They're to be sent to all health care facilities and professional associations, and the Federation of State Medical Licensing Boards and the malpractice insurers. Now, House Amendment No. 4...adds two public members designated as nonvoting, ex officio members, they're not physicians. It makes changes to the numbers in the section dealing with the Disciplinary Board to add to...to reflect this addition. It does not affect the original provisions of the bill. House Amendment No. 5, this amendment extends the Statute of limitations on when proceedings to suspend, revoke or take any other disciplinary action against a physician must be initiated from three years to one year after the date of settlement or final action rendered in favor of a plaintiff in civil sanctions in a civil...in a law malpractice lawsuit charging negligence on the part of the physician. The reason behind this is that the physicians that are parties to malpractice litigation, and many times that litigation goes beyond the three year Statute, they indicate the plaintiffs in malpractice cases will not discuss their charges with the

Disciplinary Board until after the settlement of their suit, and many times this happens after the three year limitation. The amendment does not affect the provisions of the original bill. Finally, the amendment provides that the rules required under this bill to elaborate on what constitutes certain grounds for disciplinary action a physician are not admissible, evidence in a civil action involving a matter other than the review of the licensing or disciplinary action. In other words, you cannot use this in malpractice litigation. Now, I will answer any questions you may have, otherwise, I would move that we concur in Amendments 2, 4, 5, and 6.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. A question, please, of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR EGAN:

Is this the same as, quite the same as, or similar to the Sandquist bill? I'd like to know if there is a difference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Senator Egan, I am not familiar with a Sandquist bill, however, the sponsor of House Amendments 2 and 4 was Representative Sandquist. The sponsor of House Amendment 5 was Representative O'Connell and the sponsor of House Amendment No. 6 was Representative Cullerton, does that assist you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Not entirely, but...we're...we're moving...we're

progressing. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 2, 4, 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1614. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nye. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 2, 4, 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1614, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1630, Senator Berning. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1630 with House Amendment No. 2 adds to the bill, which was a North Shore Sanitary District bill, the Sanitary Districts of...Act of 1917, and then makes provision for five members in any sanitary district which includes one or more municipalities or with a population of over ninety thousand but less than five hundred thousand according to the most recent Federal census. My understanding is that this is to accommodate a special request by Rockford. The amendment was offered by Representative Giorgi. I have no objection and unless there is, I would move for concurrence with House Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

A question of the sponsor. I just...I'm not sure I'm understanding what Amendment No. 2, in fact, does. Does it increase the size of the board, is that simply all it does?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

That's correct, from three to five.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1630. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1630, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. House Bill 1652, Senator Bloom. House Bill 1653, Senator Rupp. House Bill 1657, Senator Bloom. House Bill 1663, Senator Maitland. House Bill 1672, Senator Simms. House Bill...Senate Joint Resolution 5, Senator Keats. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I would move we concur with House Amendment No. 1 on Senate Joint Resolution 5. As explanation, much to our chagrin when the resolution passed the Senate, the wording in the title which dealt with the National Guard Scholarship Act was incorrect and they corrected it to the appropriate title. I'd appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in Amendment No...in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 5, and...and the resolution having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senate Joint Resolution 44, Senator

Nimrod. Senate Joint Resolution 72, Senator Rock. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the joint resolution which directed the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation to engage in a study with...and make recommendations with respect to the infrastructure across the State of Illinois. There was one word change...or two words changed in the fourth whereas clause at the request of a House Executive Committee member. We had suggested in the whereas clause that it was pretty apparent that there was going to be a reduction in Federal subsidy for the purpose of sewer and water grants and so forth. The word "reduction" was taken out and it was...it was changed to the word "change in Federal aid." Mox-nix, I move concurrence in House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

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

SENATOR KEATS:

I was just going to mention, is this the same resolution about two months I asked that they were going to study the fact that we were going to have less money to spend and what problem would it cause, and I told you, for a lot less money than this, I'd tell you the answer right now and save us all the trouble? Is that resolution, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

This is that resolution, but you still haven't told me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

*MB 12 HH  
Nonconurrence*

Come on over for dinner. I'll treat you to dinner and I'll pay and save you the whole problem.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 72. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are 2, 1 Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 72, and the resolution having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Nonconurrence, House Bill 1244, Senator Degnan. House Bill 2234...House Bill 1244, Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGHAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate refuse to recede and request a Conference Committee be appointed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senate...Senator Degnan moves that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of...from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1244 and that a Conference Committee be appointed. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Mr. President, I was asking you to slow that process down a little. I don't have this listed in any of the things I've got. Where's...which is the correct form? I mean, do we have no analysis on it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

I would suggest you get a hold of your staff and get an explanation. House Bill 2234, Senator Geo-Karis. House Bill 2342, Senator Berman. On the Order of...Senator Berning, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BERNING:

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

State your point.

SENATOR BERNING:

We are honored here today to have a guest in the gallery, Miss Christine Cox, who is visiting us from England. She is with my daughter, Penny Schaffer, and her husband, Doctor Schaffer, formerly from Princeton in Bureau County. They are up in the President's Gallery seated with my wife. I wonder if they would all stand and be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Please rise and be recognized. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions, on page 6, Senate Resolution 57, Senator Newhouse. Senate Resolution 97, Senator Joyce. Senate Resolution 395, Senator Gitz. Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

I wish to Table this resolution. The issues raised in it have already been dealt with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

There is a motion to Table Senate Resolution 395. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Resolution 395 is Tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

On the Order of Resolutions, Senate Resolution 396, Senator Savickas is recognized.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, Senate Resolution does...396 does exactly what the synopsis...states. It requests that the Departments of Public Aid and Aging investigate the effect of the new Federal Medicaid standards of medical care for the elderly and poor of Illinois, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)



Motion is to adopt amendment No...Senate Resolution 396. (Machine cutoff)...the expenditure of money, there will be a requirement for a roll call. The question is on the adoption of Senate...Joint...Senate Resolution 396. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. (Machine cutoff)...voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are 1. And Senate Joint Resolution 396 is adopted. Senate Resolution 445, Senator Gitz. Senator Gitz is recognized for a motion on Senate Resolution 445.

SENATOR GITZ:

Senate Resolution...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

...Mr. President and members of the Senate, Senate Resolution 445 was drafted in conjunction with the State Auditor General, also, in conjunction with the Energy Resources Commission. It clearly defines a set of criteria from which to evaluate the Illinois Commerce Commission in the first ever performance audit. I would urge your favorable support. I would be happy to respond to any questions. The Auditor General has indicated that he is most anxious to begin with this and is able to do this resolution within the confines of his present appropriation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Is there discussion? Question is...Senate Resolution 445, Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Didn't we just pass a bill out of here appropriating cer-

tain amounts from the public utilities funds so the Select Joint Committee on Regulatory Reform, the Sunset Commission, could go out and perform this kind of work, and wasn't one of the arguments of those proponents of that that this wasn't necessary?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

The Select Joint Committee, if the Governor signs the appropriation, will be able to do their own study which hits in a variety of issues in the Public Utilities Act. However, that is pursuant to the Sunset's future mission. The performance audit is for the General Assembly and the Auditor General to pursue their evaluation, and whether or not the Sunset Commission proceeds in its guidelines does not alter the fact that the State Auditor General feels that this is within his purview and thinks it is a suitable use of his office's time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, I don't...I don't disagree that it's within his purview or that it...and I don't disagree that it's a suitable use of his time. I think it seems inconsistent for this Body to vote a committee substantial amounts of money and...one of the arguments is that they can somehow do it better and then turn around and...a duplicate the effort by having the Auditor General do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis. Senator Bloom, was that a question? Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

I thought that I responded to the Gentleman's question. This is a...a different animal than what he's talking about with Sunset, and moreover the Sunset Commission's

report...ultimate report will be in 1985 when they examine the Public Utilities Act. This is something which we can deal with...with over the next twelve months. It is something we can do immediately which, I think, will give the General Assembly some very useful information from which to evaluate the performance, positive or negative, of the Illinois Commerce Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Indicates he will yield, Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Gitz, why did you make this request of the Auditor General rather than the Legislative Audit Commission?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

Senator DeAngelis, no one was particularly excluded or included in the resolution. We did consult with the staff to the Audit Commission for their advice and input. They were aware when I introduced the resolution, so you know, they were involved, and so was the Auditor General, and so, was the Illinois Energy Resources Commission. There is nobody that was purposely excluded because we wanted to have the best drafted resolution possible and to be as specific as possible and what were the items that we felt were most useful to have an evaluation done with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, if you're going to ask for an audit by the Auditor General, is it not more proper to ask for a joint resolution,

Senator Gitz, rather than a Senate resolution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

Well, if Senator DeAngelis has some real problems with this, maybe we can just take it out of the record at this time and take care of the Gentleman's problems.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right, is there leave to take it out of the record? Leave is granted. House Joint Resolution 42, Senator Bloom. Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Probably to...thank you, Mr. President, probably to cleanup our Calendar. That resolution has been passed...passed by time, overcome by events, or what have you, so I suppose it would be in order to move that it be Tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to Table HJR 42 at the sponsor's request. On the motion to Table, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is Tabled. SJR 67, Senator Buzbee. Senator Buzbee is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Yes, Mr. President, this is a resolution that recognizes and promotes the establishment...of a National Coal Museum to be located near West Frankfort to tell the story of one of our State's strongest resources, coal, and the story of the people in industry behind the production of Illinois coal. This is an ongoing attempt at establishing a National Coal Museum. Former Congressman Kenney Gray has donated a considerable amount of money to a foundation for the establishment of this coal museum, and Southern Illinois University has been working with a lot of groups all across the country, including the National Coal Operators Association, the United

Mine Workers and several foundations and so forth to try to bring this National Coal Museum to fruition in former Congressman Gray's hometown. And this is an expression of the Illinois General Assembly's intent and desire to see this coal museum established and...and I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Yes, I'd like to declare a conflict of interest on my part here. My own property near the coal museum and so, I've declared myself to many who wanted me to be co-sponsor with Senator Buzbee of this. I do believe in it. I'm going to vote for it, but I wanted you to know that it's not on the basis of...of improvement to my lot in life, but simply on the basis of educating our young people and many of the people in the area to the history of coal. It's right off the interstate and many people traveling through southern Illinois would have a beautiful opportunity to get better acquainted with us, understand the hazards of coal mining, and so I'm going to vote for it but I want to declare I do have a conflict of interest and I have so stated.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? (Machine cutoff)...Buzbee, does this require the expenditure of any funds? Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

If not...all right, Senator Buzbee may close.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. With leave of the Body, I'd like add Senator Demuzio as a co-sponsor of this Senate joint resolution.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

My closing is simply that I think it's a good idea and...and I would appreciate support from this Body.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 67. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Resolution is adopted. Senator Bruce on HJR 70.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Governor came down and...to Mt. Vernon...to Effingham, rather, and we spent a good afternoon dedicating this Fayette Avenue underpass and this would follow up with the naming of that underpass for Mr. Nickum who worked many years as did Representative Keller and many other State Representatives. It's in place, the Governor was there and I would like to follow through with the resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of House Joint Resolution 70. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. House Joint Resolution 70 declared passed. Senator Newhouse on Senate Resolution 57. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions, middle of page 6 is Senate Resolution 57. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. With leave of the Body, the following Senators ask...have asked to be joined as co-sponsor of this resolution: Senator Taylor, Senator Netsch, Senator Jeremiah Joyce, Senator DeAngelis and Sena-

tor McLendon.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted...if you'll submit that name to the...names to the Secretary, we'll make sure that's completed. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

There have since been several other requests, I'll...I'll submit those in writing to the Secretary after this. This is a Nuclear Freeze Resolution, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The resolution clause is that we call on the President of the Congress to offer the Soviet Union a mutual freeze on all further production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons. I have its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Keats. All right, hold it, Senator Keats. Can we take the caucuses off the Floor? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I, like I think almost all Americans, are interested in the concept of nuclear freeze, and I'm not opposed to the concept myself, but I want to say that this kind of simplistic resolution sometimes misses the boat. There is a second freeze effort being made by Senators Jackson and Werner that also deals with the same subject but it's probably a little more balanced. Let me explain a minor problem, when we say an immediate freeze from an American point of view or from a Soviet point of view, that's probably not that bad because we do have basic comparable arsenals, but as you may remember, in April, I was on official business, not at Illinois taxpayers' or American taxpayers' expense, in the Federal Republic of Germany. When you talk about a freeze on nuclear...arms, if you're in Europe, the Russians have already put in SS4's, SS5's, SS20's that do a

fine job in terms of hitting Bonn or Paris, but...much to our chagrin, would not hit New York or Washington D.C. which would probably help some of our problems, but they do hit Bonn and Paris. And I would say that it's easy for us to say we are in favor of an immediate freeze, but I think if we're to say that the NATO alliance means anything and that we're all supposed to look after each other, it's a little difficult to go with an immediate freeze when the Jackson-Werner freeze takes a more sophisticated approach and says we...we are asking the Soviet Union to reduce the SS4's, SS5's, SS20's that are aimed directly at Europe, because in terms of the intercontinental capabilities we are comparable, but in terms of our American allies, this type of resolution kind of says to the German's, the French and the English, tough luck, buddies. So I suppose we could vote for it because after all these resolutions don't mean anything to anybody anyway, but we should be probably be more realistic in our assumption and say we should be specific and say perhaps we support the Jackson-Werner effort which does call for reductions at a level that might help our allies, too.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Totten.

END OF REEL



REEL #3

SENATOR TOTTEN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. If I were Secretary of State, I'd probably speak to this in a manner of which I think we're embarking on a dangerous precedent here. Although an individual Legislature commemorating Congress or asking Congress to do something may be insignificant, there has been a movement in the country by people who really are not what you would call interested in American security, and a lot of people in our country have been duped into the freeze because of our fear of a nuclear war. But a freeze would be completely unverifiable and unforceable. The Soviet Union has continually demonstrated that it cannot be trusted to conform arms control agreements. Why are we talking about freezes, and that's in the face of the most conclusive evidence, it will simply deny all charges. It's development of biological weapons as...evidenced by the anthrax epidemic at Sverdlovsk, its use of yellow rain and other chemical and biological weapons to subdue guerrilla movements in Laos, South Yemen and Afghanistan and its continual violation of the SALT I, and the signed but as yet unratified SALT II...treaties have clearly shown that even when violations are detected, compliance is impossible to enforce. Beyond this, playing on American desires for arms control is a potent propaganda tool for the Soviet Union, and it has certainly contributed to the unilateral U.S...disarmament in the 1970's. The Soviet press and the actions of its representatives in the United States indicates that the Soviet Union hopes to exploit the move for a nuclear freeze in this same manner and that's where this...resolution originated and that's where it's originating in many of the other states. A bilateral freeze of

nuclear weapons is clearly undesirable, would be unverifiable, destabilizing and would condemn the United States to a permanently inferior position. More ever the hysteria that this movement has generated blinds its advocates to the benefits of American possession of nuclear weapons. For thirty-seven years there has been no war between the major super powers, in spite of all the crises, confrontations and nuclear power. The extended deterrence provided by nuclear weapons has allowed the United States to preserve not only its security but also that of its allies without having to match the universal military service of fifteen percent or more of gross national product the Soviet Union annually...invests in its military machine. It has redressed an enormous imbalance in conventional forces, negating the at least four to one advantage the Soviet Union retains in firepower. The movement that has promoted resolutions like this in our country clearly undermines the foreign policy of our country to secure the freedom of its people. This motion should be defeated.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LENKE:

I rise in opposition to this resolution for a very simple reason, I don't think we, as a State, should undermine the policies of present negotiations on foreign policies. That is a Federal matter. We should not undermine that if each state passes it, it just helps the Russians know where we're at, and when you negotiate a treaty, no one should know where...where the government is and no...no government should be forced into a treaty because of a...of a resolution passed by the people. And I agree with Senator Totten, the Russians can't be trusted, because I look to the countries that my people come from, Czechoslovakia and Poland, especially Czechoslovakia. The Russians treated Masaryk the same as

they treated...the Nazis treated Benes. In fact, the Russians even gave the story that Masaryk had insomnia and he was walking out and fell off the window ledge with his chair, I mean, that's the kind of belief and the mentality. This is an ultraliberal attempt by a group of intellectual geniuses that all they do is read bills...books and attempt to say what society should be but forget about what type of people we're dealing with. It's the same feeling that went on in Czechoslovakia when they thought they could deal with the Nazis. It's the same feeling in Czechoslovakia when they thought they could deal with the Soviets. You can't trust them, and until the Soviets reduce their arms, how can we protect ourself from means of total annihilation or control? This is what we're talking about, and if it's the will of God that we each destroy ourself for nuclear weapons, then we as people must defend ourself from the enemy who has no feeling towards God and who could care less and is on a fatal mission to destroy all of Christianity and all those things that we feel for. I cannot, I cannot support this type of interference in Federal policy which is going on now as far as aims, just to appease an ultraliberal entity that's sympathetic to Russia and the communist way of life.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I guess I can see that we should not be involved in days and days of debate on a resolution of this type in...in a State legislative assembly, although, I suppose in terms of the real substance of what is involved in it, there is probably nothing that we have spent the entire Session talking about that is more important. I did want to just make one quick point though, although this is not worded exactly the same as any of the other pending resolutions, it obviously tracks the so-called

Kennedy-Hatfield more than it does the Jackson resolution, and basically, the difference between the two is whether you freeze first and negotiate reductions subsequently or the other way around. Kennedy-Hatfield, in effect, is freeze first then attempt to bring about a reduction in the actual levels. The Jackson resolution takes the other approach which is you have to negotiate an agreement with the Soviet Union first and then think about freezing. Obviously, the latter is not going to happen and makes no sense at all. The one thing that I wanted to add is that this is not the figment of the twisted minds of a bunch of strange liberals, although there are indeed some of those who are involved in it also, and I would point out, for example, that the Kennedy-Hatfield resolution has the support of a hundred and ninety-four members of the United States House of Representatives and Senate, not all of whom can be characterized as misguided fools. Among the...among the members of the Illinois delegation who are indeed sponsors of Kennedy-Hatfield are some...are, for example, from the 1st Congressional District, one of our former colleagues, Senator...Representative Harold Washington, another member...a former member of the Illinois Legislature, John Fary, Frank Annunzio, Paul Simon and Lynn Martin, yes, indeed, Lynn Martin is also a...a sponsor, and I don't think anyone would consider her a...a misguided fool when it comes to the interests of a...sorry about that fellows, when it comes to the security interest of this country. The point I'm making though is...is this, that this is a movement, it is more than a hope, it is a demand expressed by a very substantial number of people in this country that we have got to put an end to the madness that is reflected in the continuous build up of all armaments, particularly nuclear armaments which is bankrupting our nation and inviting...excuse me, inviting the kind of conflict that all of us are concerned about. It seems to me that this is

exactly what we should be doing as a matter of national policy, and I would hope that Illinois would agree.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm rather disappointed that this has turned into a liberal-conservative debate on mandate against Reagan or for Reagan. I had the opportunity three weeks ago on a Saturday night to have dinner with the President of the United Nations, who was a classmate of mine in college, he...on the eve of the disarmament meeting with the General Assembly of the United Nations. And I do want to point out a few things that were called to my attention at that particular dinner. One is that currently we are spending six hundred billion dollars a year...six hundred billion dollars a year in terms of armaments. Six hundred billion dollars a year would cure all of the economic problems that this universe faces, but inspite of the fact that I know that we will not stop that, there is a universal consensus that the continuation of nuclear proliferation could only lead to one thing, and that is the ultimate destruction of this universe. This morning, for those of you who might have wakenen up early enough to watch...the Today program, there were three American doctors who spent, in an unprecedented move, one hour on Russian television at the request and consent of the Russian Government to discuss the consequences of nuclear war. And they all agreed that there was only one consequence and that was death for everyone. The only purpose of this resolution, and we all know that when they go to Washington, they don't mean that much, but unless there is a concern on the part of our country and all the countries regarding it, I think we are destined to do some things, not maybe to ourselves but to future generations which we'll all be sorry for. And I think a vote for this is simply a mes-

sage that there is a concern about nuclear proliferation, and Senator Totten, inspite of the fact that you didn't get the Secretary of State's job, I do think that ultimately that will become the position of President Reagan and the administration I follow.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. There's a Federal office in Washington which not too many people know about and it is there and funded and organized to deal with the aftermath of a nuclear holocaust, and that is funded by your and my tax dollars. And when the head of this office was asked what happens to the loss of industry and the loss of food after a nuclear holocaust? He said, well, his answer was, don't worry, that'll be offset by the loss of population. We've given the young people of this nation sexism and racism, and inflation and unemployment, dirty air and dirty water, and high crime rates, and of crimes in high places, but we've also given them the ultimate solution to all these problems and that is a nuclear bomb. I think this indeed, the outlaw...of nuclear...proliferation should be called the human life amendment. This indeed should be the human life amendment and I am flabbergasted at anybody who is supposedly concerned about human life, how anybody could oppose something as basic and important as this.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Just one comment, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Let me preface that by saying, I don't believe there is anyone in this Body or in the General Assembly or in the State of Illinois who would not like to see assurances that

we won't be totally wiped out by atomic booms. However, the reservation I have about this resolution has to do with the fourth whereas, and it says, "It would be in the best interests of everyone." Everyone is totally inclusive. It would be in the best interest of everyone to freeze the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. My concern is simply that by all accounts I've ever read, we are, at the present time, at a disadvantage with the Soviet Union. Obviously, it would be to their advantage then to agree to a freeze, but what advantage would it be to us to lock ourselves into a position of vulnerability, potential for elimination without adequate opportunity for retaliation. I believe that unless the amendment were changed to say with that the...we encourage the United States to work with the Soviet Union for atomic bomb curtailment under proper and open examination one side of the other after a degree of parity has been reached that any amendment...any resolution such as this can only be detrimental to us as a nation.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was hesitant about rising on this issue, but I thought there were a couple of points made that made it necessary for me to explain the way I'm going to vote. Senator DeAngelis, I did not have the opportunity of having dinner with the President of the United Nations, but the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Don McHenry, is an old friend of mine, an old college professor of mine. He was my Speech 101 teacher in college, and as a matter of fact, he failed me. As you can tell, I have improved considerably since then. I have had occasion to tell Don that I make my living now doing what he failed me at once in college. I remember one time in a resolution similar to this came up a few years ago and Senator Bruce made the

point that perhaps we ought to refer this resolution to the Illinois Senate Foreign Relations Committee and call in the Secretary of State, and I think we were going to do that except we couldn't figure out who it was, to...to discuss it. However, I think that Senator DeAngelis did hit the nail on the head. The fact of matter is, we in this Body do not have sufficient expertise to...know all of the in's and out's of the nuclear freeze question, but it is an expression by us of our concern for the potential destruction of the world. And we kind of enjoy it here and we'd rather not see that happen. I don't see this as being some sort of a Commie plot, and those of us who vote for it are, therefore, tools of the Commie's, and I don't think there are too many people who have implied that. It's simply an expression of our concern that we'd like to stay here for several thousand more years, if possible, and so we're telling the Congress that. So, I think probably I have as much military experience as almost anybody on this Floor, with some exceptions, and this is the sort of thing that...that perhaps...normally people would think maybe I might be on the other side, but I think again as Senator DeAngelis said, we are simply expressing our concern to Congress and wish them to be aware of that, and so I'm going to vote Aye.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This type of resolution, I'm sure, is well meaning and, hopefully, we would not tie the hands of those who we've elected to office and who are presently negotiating. This is a very touchy situation, and it is certainly one that's very complicated, and it doesn't mean that we should just sit back and...or should we make decisions for those who are doing the job. I don't think we would like it if



somebody...we passed...someone else passed a resolution telling us that we ought to give our right for other people to vote or make that decision. We presently have Congress, we have our Congressmen which we should be talking to and notifying, and I think we certainly can influence and talk to those that we know or have contact with either in the administration that's in Washington or, in fact, within the military service. But this subject is one that I think that we should not be passing judgment, making decisions and making recommendations when other people are presently negotiating and working on the issue. Seems to me that all we do is to discourage and to take away the ability of those who are attempting to do a job. I would certainly think that we should not support this kind of a resolution and innocently tie the hands or influence those that might be taking some position or negotiating on this issue.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Mr. President, just to point out to the members on the Republican side of the aisle that while the sponsor may be well intentioned, this resolution could have been a lot more balanced than it is if he had at the same time come in with a resolution praising President Reagan for his proposal late last fall to have the Soviet's...or the Warsaw Pact, rather, freeze its deployment of nuclear weapons in the Eastern Europe, in return for which Americans would not deploy the next generation in Western Europe. If that kind of resolution accompanying this one praising the President for the actions he has already taken were brought before us, then it would be considerably less of a partisan matter than it is turning out to be. I don't think this is a...a prudent resolution for us to be passing at this time, and I would suggest to members on the Republican side that there may be some

partisanship here.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Newhouse may close.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Let me remind the Senate that is setting here that this resolution was introduced during last...last Session, it's been sitting here for sometime. My instructions to the people who asked me to handle this resolution...I wonder if I could have the attention of the Body, please.

PRESIDENT:

You're certainly entitled to that, Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

...and while it may not change any minds, I think most of know how we're going to vote, but I'd like to clarify several things. First of all, when I was asked to handle this resolution, I asked those who were drafting it to try to anticipate every objection that possibly could be made to this resolution and put in such a from that it would be palatable to everyone. I've had indications from several on this Floor that if certian kinds of changes were made they would be prepared to vote for it. Let me just go back to the resolution...clause, and the resolution clause simply says, "We've asked the President to offer the Soviet Union a mutual freeze." That language is put there in such a fashion so that those things that we've talked about all could be included in that offer, period. So, so much for that kind of thing. Now, secondly, if you want to talk about the parties and aspect of this, this resolution did not, although the Democratic Party did endorse such a move during this Session, this resolution predated by some time, that resolution. And I would...suggest to most of you here that Lynn Martin, who certainly cannot be described as a wild-eyed liberal, is not probably alone within the Republican Party, and I would sus-

pect that an awful lot of...that there will be some pressure within the Republican Party to do something similar. There are those on this side of the aisle who certainly rank among the conservative, whatever you want to call it, who are, I think, going to vote for this measure. I'd windup by saying certainly that this has no, from my standpoint, anti-Christian aspects...it has no partisan aspect. It is a resolution that I think is gaining currency everyday. We look at some of the demonstrations that have taken place recently, people are genuinely frightened. It seems to me that this Body has every right to make a suggestion to those people who make the decisions...in this country. As to the highhandedness of us offering a resolution to Washington, we certainly hear from our constituents everyday and I welcome that kind of guidance. In a sense, that's what we're doing with this kind of resolution. I think it's a good resolution. We have made it as broad as it...I think it can be made, and I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Senate Resolution 57. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 29, the Nays are 19, 9 Voting Present. Senate Resolution 57 is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 79, Senator Collins. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions is Senate Joint Resolution 79. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This is the same resolution. It is a Senate joint resolution which means that it would have to go to the House, and given that, 57 just passed...that I would at this time call for this resolution, because I do think that if the State of Illinois, the General Assembly, is going to send a message to Congress that it

should have the concurrence of both Houses, and for that reason, I move for favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 79.

PRESIDENT:

All right, the question is the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 79. Discussion? Senator Thomas.

SENATOR THOMAS:

Well, thank you, very much, Mr. President. I wish I could say that I had dinner last night with the caliber of people that Senator DeAngelis had dinner with, but I did have a bite to eat with Bill Shields, and Bill runs a Mobile Station in Coal Valley. Now, we got talking about nuclear freeze and what he said was this, that half of being smart is knowing what you're dumb at. Now we have been busying ourselves down here this spring with all the pressing issues such as lights in Wrigley field, and I think that we ought to stick to that and leave these matters to the people in Washington who are studying these things.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I would not object to this resolution if there was a provision in it that the Soviet Russia...that Soviet Russia would have to make a disclosure of its nuclear arsenal before we put a freeze on ours. I don't think that we should leave our resources unprotected, and I'm certainly not in favor of nuclear war, but your resolution, Senator, if it does the same thing as the prior resolution, will force me to Vote Present unless you're willing to amend it to force a disclosure by the Soviet Russia of its nuclear arsenal today.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Friedland.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

I move the previous question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

That...that motion is in order. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. Senator Collins may close.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This subject has been well debated on the previous resolution. I would just ask for a favorable roll.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 79. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 32. Senate Joint Resolution...all right, Senator Collins asks that further consideration be postponed to Senate Joint Resolution 79, it's so ordered. SJR 89, Senator Mahar. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions is Senate Joint Resolution 89, Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. For many years we've been having very serious flooding problems in the south suburban area, south Cook County. And over the years,...there's been many attempts made at all levels of local government to handle the severe problem. The project now is in the final stages of work in Congress for approval, and in view of the fifty-three millions dollars in damages to homes we had just a year ago on June 13th, we are urging Congress to give...top priority to funding this project and get it moving so, in the near future, we can have some relief. And I would ask that you support Senate Joint Resolution 89.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion on Senate Joint Resolution 89? If not, all

in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. SRJ 93, Senator Philip. A-N-D is not my middle name, this is Senator Philip's resolution. Senate Joint Resolution 93, Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 93 memorializes the present Congress to impose a steel import limitations on the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974. As you're probably aware, United States steel companies are at a disadvantage in regard to foreign imports. Many of those companies are either subsidized or owned by their governments, and all we say is, have a good strong look at them. We'd like to be fair when regards the competition. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Question is the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 93. All those in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senator Savickas for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, Mr. President, I have been informed by the Secretary of the Senate that Senate Resolution 396 that we adopted had an amendment on it and it should of been adopted before we adopted the resolution. The amendment extended the reporting date. So at this time, having voted on the prevailing side, I would move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 396 passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 396 passed. On the motion, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it, and the vote is reconsidered. Are there amendments. Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by the Executive Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Savickas to explain the amendment.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, it's amendment to extend the reporting date, I think it's, what January?

SECRETARY:

April...April the 2nd, 1982 to January the 1st, 1983.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to adopt the amendment. On the motion all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and Amendment No. 1 is adopted. The resolution is now before us. Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I would move the adoption of Senate Resolution 396.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right. The motion is to adopt. It passed 51 to 1 a moment ago. On that question, those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. Senate Resolution 396 is adopted. If the Body would...if I might have the attention of the Body, on page 12 of your Calendar, last page of the Calendar, at the top of the page, under the Order of Secretary's Desk in the Order of Concurrence is Senate Joint Resolution 44 which was amended in the House. Senator Nimrod. Senator Nimrod is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen. The amendment is strictly a change in the date. The resolution was put in last year and it was too late to get it, so they

used it for this year's respect life amendment, and I would move for concurrence in the Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to SJR 44. On the motion to concur, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate concurs with House Amendment No. 1, and the resolution is...is adopted as amended. Leave to go to the Order of Resolutions? Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 621 offered by Senator Rock and Philip, and it's congratulatory.

Senate...Senate Resolution 622 offered by Senator Geo-Karis, Philip and Sangmeister.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Executive Committee. For what purpose does Senator Geo-Karis arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I would like to move to suspend the appropriate rules so that Senate Resolution...622...referring to...memorializing Congress to adopt a guilty but mentally ill or look into a guilty but mentally ill law for the Federal Government be considered, and I'd like to move the...to suspend the appropriate rules and place it on the Secretary's Desk, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Geo-Karis, have you spoken to Senator Rock and Senator Philip about this?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

My Minority Leader spoke to Senator Rock about it, Sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right, is there leave to bypass the Executive Committee and have this resolution placed on the Order of the Calendar under the Order of Resolutions? Leave is granted. What purpose does Senator Demuzio arise?



SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, I have a parliamentary inquiry. What do our rules indicate in terms of Conference Committees. Once a Conference Committee has been appointed, is it in the rules that the Conference Committee must meet at a designated time and a designated place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Demuzio, under Rule 43D5, "Conference Committee shall meet upon reasonable public notice given by the chairman and at such time and place as need be convenient and having conferred freely, shall report to both Houses the results of the Conference." Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, I take that to mean then that there is to be public notice of such a meeting and that the chairman is responsible for seeing to it that the time and place is circulated so that the members, and press, and public, and everyone should have the opportunity to attend such meeting, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator, the Chair is informed that all Conference Committee postings are made outside the Senate doors and that is sufficient, reasonable public notice. So, it is posted outside the Chamber door as to every Conference Committee that is convened. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, then I would like to ask another question, then. Has there been a Conference Committee meeting that has been designated for Senate Bill 1193?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator, I would have no knowledge of that.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, we're not conversing freely, Senator. Two members have signed a Conference Committee report. I've just now seen it. I'm requesting a Conference Committee to meet at a

designated time, a designated place so that everyone can understand what is in Senate Bill 1193. This has been going on now for about a month, and I would suggest that we all sit down and discuss it like Ladies and Gentlemen, so that we all know what's in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Now, before we launch off into a large amount of dialogue, perhaps Senator Grotberg and Senator Demuzio can confer without spending the money of the Transcription Unit, and the Chair will get back to you when we have something to report as official proceedings. Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

You've got it, Senator. We will relax.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Berman. On the last page of the Calendar, page 12, under the Order of Nonconcurrency in Senate amendments to House Bill is House Bill 2342. Did you wish to refuse to recede and request a Committee of Conference? All right. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Could you call House Bill 2234 on the nonconcurrences, Sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Is there leave to go to Secretary's Desk Nonconcurrency? Leave is granted. On that order of business, on page 12 of your Calendar is House Bill 2234 and Senator Geo-Karis is recognized for an amendment.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I move to recede from my Senate Amendment 4 inasmuch as the sponsors... Representative DiPrima has told me that Senate Amendment 4 has already been placed on another bill for the appropriations, and he told me that he didn't need this anymore in this bill. So, I'd like to move to recede

from...Amendment 4 and concur with the rest of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right, the motion is to recede from Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2334 which will be final passage. Is there discussion of that motion? Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, just one more time, Mr. President, we do not have a...a Digest...we have a Digest, we do not have an explanation of the amendment...on this, nor was there one on House Bill 1244, and my staff member is too busy to call him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

It's not in the book.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan,...what do you wish to do? Just hold it until we get it printed?

SENATOR EGAN:

Well, I just want to bring it to your attention, Mr. President, so that we can correct it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'll be glad to explain the amendment. The Amendment 4 prohibited a state controlled college, university or community college from denying admission to a person entitled to a Veteran's scholarship solely on the grounds that State funds might not be sufficient...may not be sufficient to reimburse the institution for the scholarship. Representative DiPrima, who is one of the prime sponsors of the...of a bill that we put as an amendment here to my bill, told me that this amendment was not necessary, that we should take it off, 'cause he has it already covered in another bill, and that's the essence of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? The question is, shall the Senate recede from House Amendment No...from Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2334. On that question, those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote...yeah, it's No. 4. Oh, 2234. All right, let's go again. The question is, shall the Senate recede from Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2234. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does recede from Senate Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 2234, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock...for what purpose does Senator Sangmeister arise?

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well, Mr. President, while you were going down the Calendar, I see the next item of business is Consideration Postponed Concurrence, and I was wondering if you were going to get to that order of business for Senator Bill 125? That is the next order of business, as I see it on the Calendar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Well, Senator, I'm...I think the Chair...is correct in saying that that bill was never given a waiver from consideration by the Rules Committee, is that correct? Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

I don't believe that bill needs a waiver. That's sitting on consideration postponed. Since when do we have to have a waiver to hear that bill? It's passed both Houses, it's back here for concurrence, that doesn't need a waiver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

But...but before it can be considered, it has to go through the Rules Committee. All right, Senator Rock, did

you have a motion? Senator Carroll has a motion. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senators Schaffer, Sommer, Buzbee and I have filed a motion to extend, again, for one day the deadline on appropriation bills, continuing in our efforts to reach an accommodation on the budget...as a whole and deal with it in a sensible fashion by way of amending the bills that are over here. We feel that the possibility of...of reaching that accord are in good shape, and therefore, the four of us have asked for a...an extension for one day in an attempt to avoid eighty Conference Committees on a billion...on a fourteen billion dollar budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to amend Rule 5 and move the...the date back one day for passage of appropriation bills. On that motion, is there discussion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are altered, pursuant to the written motion. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Given the...the approval of that last motion, we have been meeting, as you probably are aware, over the weekend and as late as noon today, trying to work out some of the budgetary matters and some other matters. I would suggest since the House is still in Session and has not yet reacted, in terms of paper work, to what we sent them last night, that we effectively stand in recess until the hour of five-thirty, at which time we will come back and receive the House Messages and then adjourn 'til ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Senator Vadalabene's committee meets at nine, is that correct? And then we will stand adjourned at that time

until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is the Senate stand in recess until the hour of five-thirty. On the motion, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate stands in recess until five-thirty. Just for the membership, at five-thirty the...we will just be considering the Messages from the House and other paper work for the Secretary. We will adjourn at that time until ten tomorrow morning.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The hour of six having arrived, the Senate will come to order...the hour of five-thirty having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Leave to go to the Order of Messages from the House? Leave is granted. Messages from the House.  
SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. Leone, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House 1938.

A like message on...Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2266.

Message from the House by Mr. Leone, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the adoption of Amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 15 to House Bill 2135, and...and refuse to concur in Senate Amendments 7, 13, 14 and 16.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Leave to go to the Order of Resolutions? Leave is granted. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 623 offered by Senator Hall, Rock and all Senators, and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Consent Calendar. Any further business to come before the Senate? Senator Vadalabene moves that the Senate stands adjourned until the hour...Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Hold it. Hold it a minute.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

For what purpose do you arise, Senator Vadalabene?

SENATOR VADLABENE:

Yeah, just in the form of an announcement. For those who are here, there'll be a meeting on the Executive Appointments at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. We have a long list, and for those of you here, if you'd tell your colleagues, we'd like to get started at nine o'clock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right, in the spirit of bipartisanship, Senator Schaffer has asked to adjourn the Session until the hour of ten tomorrow morning. On the motion to adjourn...on the motion to adjourn, discussion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes...it. The Senate stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.