54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall... The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Paul J. Evans, Pastor of the New Covenant Bible Church of Chicago. Reverend Evans is a quest of Representative Howard Brookins. Would the guests in the gallery please rise to join us in the invocation?"
- Reverend Evans: "Proverbs 29:2. When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice. But when the wicked rule, the people mourn." Father, this morning we thank You that we are here today. We're asking that You bless us and that you establish in this chamber a state of righteousness, a communion of fellowship, that all the walls of division be broken down, that men bind their hands together to push together to accomplish the goals. Lord, we ask the annointing of the Holy Spirit, the understanding and wisdom of the Lord to be our portions today. This we ask in Jesus name, and we thank You for it. Amen, and Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Bopp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States

 of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one

 Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for
 all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Greiman, are there any excused absences?"
- Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Christensen is excused by reason illness and the record should so reflect. His key has been removed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that Representative

 Christensen has been excused. Mr. Fangle. Mr. Pangle,

 have you recorded yourself? Mr. Vinson. Let the record

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

show that there are no Republicans requesting an excused absence. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 564, Daniels, a Bill for an Act amend Sections of the Criminal Procedure. First Reading of Senate Bill 1008, Bullock, a Bill for an Act the Bill. creating the Illinois Network for Opportunity Act of 1983. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1150, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1254, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of First Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1310, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act in relation to community support systems for the chronically meni... mentally ill. First Reading of Senate Bill 653, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to the Bill. amend Sections of the Workers Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 995, Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First of the Bill. Senate Bill 991, Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 934, White, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1017, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code and the Illinois Promotion Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 999, Birkinbine, a Bill for an Act to prohibit persons convicted of certain crimes from holding certain positions business with the in any labor organization from doing State of Illinois for a specified period of time. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 996, Ronan, a Bill for an

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 953, Karpiel, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to the Department of Law Enforcement. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 973, Reilly, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 982, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning wages. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 983, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing of Registered Occupational Occupational Therapists Therapists and Certified First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1070, Assistants. Matijevich, a Bill for an Act concerning injuries and disabilities caused by exposure to asbestos. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 512, Nelson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 751, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 603, Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 310, Slape, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to compensation of sheriffs, coroners, county treasurers, county clerks, recorders and auditors. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 313, Slape, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 329, Hannig, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 498, Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 487, Olson, a Bill for an Act in relation to filing of travel regulations by various state agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 699, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act relating to the use and

54th Legislative Day

. May 27, 1983

operation of electronic banking terminals. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 803, Piel - Harris, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 652, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 791, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilites Confidentiality Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 805, Piel - Hastert, a Bill for an Act to amend Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 816, Topinka, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Clinical Laboratory Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 348, Richmond, a Bill for an Act making appropriation Department of Agriculture. First Beading of the Bill. the Senate Bill 1000, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend Act to create Prairie State 2000 Fund. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1056, Klemm, a Bill for an Act amend Sections of the Boat Registration and Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1001, Rhem, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Job Training Coordinating First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1020, Council. Panayotovich, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1031, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to create the Boundary Street Commercial Zone Renovation Act of 1983. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1032, Terzich, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 643, Younge, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Illinois Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1111, Mays - Tate, a Bill for an Act to Act creating the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Slape, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to corneal tissue transplants. First reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1062, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Problem Pregnancy Health Services and Care Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention just for a few minutes. If everyone would direct their attention to page fifteen of the Calendar. On the Order of Senate Bills First Reading, you will see that there are several Senate Bills which have arrived from Senate where we do not have House Sponsors for those Bills. T+ would be very helpful to our continued orderly consideration of legislation if all of these Senate Bills were to have House Sponsors before we leave here today, so if you would be so kind as to review the list of Senate Bills First Reading on page fifteen of the Calendar with a view toward possible Sponsorship of those Bills. are interested in Sponsoring the Bills, please notify the Clerk, and he will place your name as the House Sponsor. The Chair recognizes Mr. Greiman for the purpose of an excused absence."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Rhem is away on official business and should also be excused, and his key has also been now removed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, has his key been removed?"

Greiman: "I'm advised that his key has now been removed. Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that Representative Rhem is excused. Mr. Vinson, good morning. Have you had your morning coffee? Mr. Vinson? Good. Tribune was inquiring. Mr. Vinson, I would propose to move to page fifteen of the Calendar on the Order of Senate Bills Second Beading Senate Bill 328 which is an appropriation Bill. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments to this Bill?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 328, a Bill for an Act... This Bill's

been read a second time previously. No Committee

Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Leverenz - Reilly - Bowman - Barnes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 would provide that we are amending every available unpassed from both Houses transfer Bill existing, also, a number of supplemental appropriations and they follow in this fashion. Section 1 of the Amendment is to the State Board of Education, would appropriate a million four hundred twelve thousand in general revenue for payment to school districts as compensation for interest lost or incurred as a result of the change in the general state aid payment schedule. Two is a transfer of ninety four thousand between line items. The Section 3, the Department of Corrections, seventy-two thousand dollars in transfers among certain line items. Section supplemental of a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to the Department of Central Management Services for State Employees Differed Compensation Fund. Section 5 is a military and naval department transfer of a hundred sixty thousand between line items - no new money. Section 6, Department of Mental Health Developmental Disabilities is a transfer among line items. Section 7 for the Illinois Arts Council would reappropriate thirty thousand dollars. Section 8, Guardianship and Advocacy Commission would reappropriate ninety-seven thousand dollars. Section 9, Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is a transfer of forty thousand among line items. Section 10 is a transfer within line items of a hundred and sixty-six

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

thousand for the Department of Revenue. 11 is the Illinois Industrial Commission transferring fourty-eight thousand dollars between line items. Section 12 is the Department of Public Health. It would transfer a hundred and fifty-nine thousand three hundred, and a supplemental five million two. Section 13, Department of Children and Family Services is a transfer among line items with no 14 is the Human Rights Commission, a transfer increase. between line items. Section 15. Department of Enforcement is a hundred and fifty thousand dollars transferred among line items. 16, Department of Insurance is a change in line item appropriation for twelve thousand dollars. 17 is a transfer of a million two between items in the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Section 18 is a Legislative Council transfer. Section 19 is a supplemental appropriation which we passed here to the Senate totalling seventeen million five hundred thousand dollars. Section 20 is for the Legislative Redistricting Commission which would appropriate a thou... a hundred thousand dollars which we have passed from this House. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 328."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz moves that Amendment #1 be adopted to Senate Bill 328. On that question, the chair recognizes Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would
 like the Membership to know that this is an agreed
 Amendment that has been discussed by both sides of the
 aisle."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion, please?

 Representative Leverenz, in regard to Sections 7

 and Sections 8, our analysis refers to this as

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

reappropriation. Is this money that has previously been appropriated to these two groups or appropriated in some other fashion?"

Leverenz: "This money is being reappropriated. I believe, in your analysis, it would show that the reappropriation on 7 and 8... consider them a protective measure should they be phased out as with the Governor's first purposed budget.

This would provide enough money for each to... the agency."

Satterthwaite: "I... I understand the purpose. I'm asking

Leverenz: "The money has been appropriated, and as I stated, we are reappropriating thirty thousand to the Arts Council, and a reappropriation of ninety-seven thousand five to Guardianship and the Advo... Advocacy Commission. Has been appropriated in the past."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

about..."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further questions? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Leverenz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2, I understand, has been discussed with the other side of the aisle also. It would appropriate three thousand twenty-seven dollars to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz moves adoption of Amendment #2.

Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, for what purpose does Mr. Harris seek recognition?"

Harris: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Harris: "Representative Leverenz, what is this appropriation for?"
- Leverenz: "Could we have some order, Speaker, I can't even hear the question."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris, could you speak up a little bit?"

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, my question's been answered."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further questions? There being no further discussion, those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. For what purpose does Mr.
 Leverenz seek recognition?"
- Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I would now respectfully move that we would suspend the rules to hear the Bill on Third today, and leave for the Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I support the Gentleman's recommendation."

- Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted to use the Attendance Roll
 Call to journalize the suspension of the rules to permit
 the consideration of this Bill on Third Beading today. Mr.
 Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 328, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of an Act making certain appropriations. Third

 Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Bill's Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leverenz."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz, do you wish to address the Bill on Third Reading?"
- Leverenz: "Thank you. House... Senate Bill 328 would provide for every existing supplemental appropriation. We are in a posture that the supplementals that we have passed to the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Senate apparently are blocked. They will not move there. This, by passage of Senate Bill 328, would provide that they would simply go back to the Senate for a concurrence. The Amendment 1 has a number of transfers and new money. We have discussed all of this and passed all of these supplementals and transfers before. The three thousand dollars in Amendment #2, I understand everyone has an explanation of that Amendment. I would now move the passage of Senate Bill 328."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 328 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', 5 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Vinson, I now purpose to go to twenty-five of the Calendar. Consent Calendar Third Reading Second Day. Mr. Clerk, read the Consent Calendar." Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Third Reading Second Day. House Bill 207 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 539 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 671 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 720 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 854, a Bill for an Act in relation to funeral directors and embalmers. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1399 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 1473, a Bill for an Act to amend the Income Tax Third Reading of the Fill. House Bill 1610 has been Act removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 1611, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1612 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 1661, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

House Bill 1753, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Franchise Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1939, a Bill for an Act in relation to state procurement contracts, authority and procedures. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2106 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the House Bill 2234, a Bill for an Act in relation to management in low-level radioactive waste. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act to amend the Joliet Regional Port District Act. Third the Bill. House Bill 2287, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Clerk having read the Consent Calen... Calendar on the Order of Third Reading Second Day... For what purpose does Mr. Vinson seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, what was the disposition on 207?"

Clerk O'Brien: "207 was removed from the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk having read these Bills on the Consent Calendar, I would advise the Membership that if anyone wishes to object to the presence of these Bills on the Consent Calendar, they should file a form with the Clerk at this time. If anyone wishes to object to the presence of these Bills on the Consent Calendar, they should file a form with the Clerk at this time. For what purpose does Mr. Hanniq seek recognition?"

Hannig: "A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Hannig: "Yesterday, Mr. Vinson made a Motion that Bills removed from the Consent Calendar would go on Short Debate. Is that Motion still in order or still stand?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "If a Bill is removed from the Order of the Consent Calendar, it shall be placed on the Order of Short Debate Third Reading."

Hannig: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The hour of 9:30 having arrived, we shall now proceed to the Special Order of Business entitled State and Local Government Administration. On that Order of Call, there appears House Bill 1978. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1978 passed previously."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk informs me that this Bill should not have appeared on the Calendar because it's already been passed. House Bill 2004. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2004, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning custodians of public monies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of this Bill?"
Clerk O'Brien: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative John Dunn, do you wish to address your Bill, Sir? Proceed."

John Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Bill does is provide that public aid recipients names need not be listed in any public notices that the township supervisor is required to publish, and I would request a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2004. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bouse Bill 2046. Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hoffman."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman, do you wish to call this Bill?

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act in relation to county zoning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2046 amends the County Zoning Act and provides that in urban counties over five hundred thousand population the agriculture exemption or land zoning for agriculture exemption purposes shall apply only to parcels of land consisting of five acres or more. Because Cook County's a home rule county, this legislation applies to DuPage County, and it is the result or is necessitated by a court case which was passed in 1979, which indicated that counties under the pres... under the law at that time could not ... could not zone land for purposes other than agricultural. It, in effect, knocked out all of our zoning, and what we're providing here that on parcels of land of five acres and less, in county... in DuPage County, the County can zone for purposes other than agriculture. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Hastert: "Mr. Hoffman, in... in my part that I represent in DuPage County, I have, oh, a lot of parcels of land that may be between three and four acreas. I have people living there who are bee keepers, who have horses, who's children are in 4-H and have 4-H projects of different time. As a matter of fact, it's rather rural part of... of DuPage County. How would that affect those people?"

Hoffman: "The Bill provides that in areas that are controlled by

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the county as opposed to municipalities, the county would have the authority to zone property under five acres as residential or to provide that you... as they had before, you had to have an acre and a half, you know, for one horse or two acres for two horses, that... that kind of thing. But they could address that issue."

- Hastert: "So, what, in your opinion, Sir, would this deprive those people of having the use of their land as far as raising horses, or having their children involved in 4-H projects, or things like that?"
- Hoffman: "I don't... my impression is that prior to the '79 court case, they classified land as agricultural if it was over ten acres and then had different break downs for different kinds of livestock. I... I think they will, you know, I think they'll be reasonable. I'm not, you know, I wouldn't say it would or it wouldn't deprive them. I can... I don't know that, Danny."
- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I've seen this Bill come before counties and townships I think in the last Assembly. And there were a great deal of concern about people who were 4... by people who were 4-B leaders and people who had equestrian groups, and people who spent their leisure time in semi-agricultural activities. They had great deal of concern about that Bill then. I'm sure that that concern still exists today, and for my representation of DuPage County, I would have to oppose the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Hoffman to close."
- Hoffman: "Well, with all due respect to the concerns of the last speaker, I would suggest that villages and municipalities are allowed to regulate agricultural uses, and an urban county like DuFage, it's not unreasonable for them to have

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the authority. They exercised it in the past. I think they exercised it responsibly, and I would ask for your 'ave' vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting 'no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 21 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2184. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2184, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code and an Act concerning custodians of public moneys. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. John Dunn, and Mr. Matijevich is now in the Chair."
- John Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2184 has been amended, and as amended it has the support of the Illinois Department of Public Aid. It has been cleared with both sides of the aisle, and I know of no opposition. What House Bill 2184 will do is provide more flexibility to downstate townships which provide general assistance as receiving units. Cook County is not affected by this legislation, and I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Dunn has moved for the passage of House Bill 2184. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2184 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', no 'nays', and House Bill 2184, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House... House Bill 2219, Bruce Farley. Clerk will read

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2219, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Farley."
- Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2219 is a Bill that's necessary to comply with the consent decree approved by the courts in a suit by the museums against the Chicago Park District, relating to interest earned in bonds issued by the Chicago Park District for museum improvements. What the Bill does is, it pays interest to the district's general fund, and then it transfers the interest to the aquariums and the museum funds agreed to by those parties. It increases the bonds for the museums for improvements from thirty million to fifty eight million, and it also annually deposits seven point five three four zero percent of the park district's personal property tax replacement funds into the aquarium and the museum fund. I know that the Majority Leader is very interested, as all of the other Members are, in this particular Bill, and I would move for a favorable Boll Call on House Bill 2219."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Farley has moved for the passage of House Bill 2219. On that, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman might well have mentioned that the Minority Leader is also very interested in this. We are in support of this Bill. It is as described by Mr. Farley. It is a result of a... of the settlement of litigation and is a very desirable Bill. I would move for the passage of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Farley has moved for the passage of House Bill 2219. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 11 'nays', and House Bill 2219, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Special Order appears House Resolution 125, for which the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terry Steczo is recognized."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 125 was adopted unanimously by the House Cities and Villages Committee, and it memorializes Congress reauthorize federal revenue sharing to our local units of government in the State of Illinois. As you may be revenue sharing is due to expire on September 30th of this year. And in that process, if it's allowed to, local governments. approximately twenty-seven hundred local government in Illinois, will lose approximately two hundred forty million dollars in federal revenue sharing monies. These local governments, like the state, are experiencing fiscal difficulties. Allowing federal revenue sharing to expire would provide them with a great deal of difficulty and problems, and I would ask the House to adopt Resolution 125."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 125. If there's no discussion, all those in favor of the adoption say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and House Resolution 125 is adopted. Representative Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Rep.. Representative Harris, are you seeking recognition?"

Harris: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you, on a point of personal privilege. Before we move to the next point, or Special

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Order of Business, if any of my fellow colleagues find themselves in possession of a black Cross pen, it is mine, and I'd like it returned. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "On the... the hour of 10 a.m., we have the Special Grder of Business Workers* Bights, and on that Order appears House Bill 1162. Was it..."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act relating to collective bargaining agreements. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "This matter is on the Order of Fostponed Consideration. House Bill 1162, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard debate yesterday on this proposition. House Bill 1162 is intended to provide a collective bargaining agreement in what is called a successor clause. This agreement would be binding and enforceable against any secondary or successor employer. As I indicated on yesterday, the successor employer could not be bound by the bargaining agreement if there were more than three years remaining on the original agreement. This legislation has been adjudicated as being constitutional by courts since 1979, and the courts have continued to uphold the ability of the states to enact relative legislation to successor clause, is, in fact, proper and constitutional. This legislation has the support of the major labor organizations of the state, the state AFL-CIO. The legislation is important in that we need to protect jobs in the State of Illinois. For violation of the Act, it is, in offense, which is not fact. a business punishable by incarceration. I submit, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the legislation is needed at a time when our state is witnessing unprecedented rates of

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

unemployment. Just in the last 24 hours, I have received information that in the Joliet area alone, unemployment is hovering around twenty-three percent. We must protect jobs in this state, and House Bill 1162 is a job protections measure. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Bullock has moved for the passage of House Bill 1162. On that, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor could not be more precisely wrong in this case. The Bill does more to damage jobs in the business climate than perhaps any other Bill we'll consider today. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill. We beat the Bill yesterday. We ought to beat the Bill today, so the Sponsor no longer has the opportunity to dangle this particular sword over the business communities head. And Mr. Speaker, I would request that you grant Mr. Mays the right to a verification on this Bill should it get the requisite number of votes."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should get to the Senate,

 I'm going to purpose an Amendment. The Amendment will say,

 'The last business to leave this state, turn out the
 lights.' If there's anything that would encourage business
 to leave the State of Illinois, this is it, cause we've got

 multistate corporations now who buy up companies which are
 in trouble, some of which are in trouble because of a bad
 labor contract. They would be absolutely foolish to stay
 in that location and not move away. Now, if that's what
 you want to do, go ahead and vote for this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative
- John Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

John Dunn: "Is a collective bargaining agreement a contract?"

Bullock: "Is it a contract?"

John Dunn: "Yeah, legally binding contract?"

Bullock: "Well, I would assume that it is."

John Dunn: "Is a loan at the bank, a signed promissory note, is that a contract?"

Bullock: "I would assume that it is."

John Dunn: "If a corporation sells out to another corporation, don't they have to make some arrangement to pay... pay off the notes and the mortgages, or have them assumed, or nobody says goodbye to the loans and debts of a corporation when they sell, do they?"

Bullock: "Not to my knowledge."

John Dunn: "Why should this contract be treated any different than any other contract?"

Bullock: "I could see no reason that it should be treated any different."

John Dunn: "I agree with the Sponsor. This is a good Bill. We should have green votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we debated this Bill at some length yesterday. I see no reason to belabor it.

The Bill has not improved overnight with a good night's sleep. It's still as bad a Bill as it was yesterday. The previous three speakers on this side of the aisle innumerated the reasons. I just think we ought to take a Boll Call, defeat the Bill, move on to another piece of business."

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

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

in opposition to this Bill. That contract analysis we heard a few moments ago didn't go quite far enough. where in other areas of contract law is a defrauded party held to a binding contract executed by a prior company, and I'll give you an example. If a person unknowingly and in a defrauded manner is called upon to assume the debts and liabilities entered into by a previous party, under contract law that person is not obligated. He can get out of that contract because of the fraud. Now the only justification for not following that rule of law is that you're dealing with employee rights, and that is not inappropriate except when you get to the point when defrauded employer has to pick up the burden. The only justification for this type of law is to avoid the sham of successor corporations to avoid a labor contract. Now, if that is not done, if, in fact, we're not dealing with a shame, if, in fact, we have a defrauded third party who's picking up the contract, the purpose of the Act in the first place is not furthered by requiring him to pick up that labor contract. It is unprecedented in contract law. The analysis we just heard does not... is not correct. This is not a contract treated like any other contract. It's only justification is to avoid sham turn overs to avoid labor contracts. If, in fact, that's not the case, then it shouldn't be enforced against a defrauded third party. This is a bad Bill. It was a bad Bill yesterday. It's going to chase business out of the State of Illinois. I oppose it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "That's not necessary. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock to close."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bullock: Under present law the purchasing employer, or we Housecall successor employer, is under no obligation to honor the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the first employer and his employees. We understand that contract law is discussed and debated in our courts every day of the year. It is, in fact, the very livelihood of the scholars in this Body in practice jurisprudence to make certain that contracts are binding. House Bill 1162 is a contract. should be honored. We're saying that the employers of state cannot engage in subterfuge to do violence collective bargaining agreements that have been reached good faith at an arms length over the bargaining table merely by changing the names of one corporation or playing a shell game. This legislation is needed at this time, for we need the legislation so that we can send a clear message to the citizens of this state that not one more job will be lost in the State of Illinois. And we want to affirm that policy here today, and I urge an 'aye' vote for 1162."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bullock has moved for the passage of House Bill 1162. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'aye', 58 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present, and House Bill 1162, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. On the Special Order of Business appears House Bill 2172. Out of the record. Is that right? House Bill 2202, Giorgi. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2202, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning wages of workers employed in any public works.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Winnehago, Bepresentative

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It amends the Prevailing Wage Law. If a workman is paid less than the Prevailing Wage Law allows, he has a cause of action against his employer. And all this Bill allows is a poor worker to... to sign his claim to the Department of Labor who collects the claim on his behalf. Very simple Bill. I'll answer any questions. 2202."

Speaker Matijevich: "2202 should be on the board."

Giorgi: "2202."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Giorgi has moved for the passage of House Bill 2202. On that, the Gentleman from Peoria, Bepresentative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Sponsor yield?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "What... what's really the reason for the Bill? There is
a procedure through the Wage Payment Collection Act
available right now for this type of thing."

Giorgi: "This is to refine it a little bit, Representative Tuerk.

You know, a lot of times it's much... it's such an insignificant amounts of money, and you can't afford to hire an attorney, so you'd rather get to the... the weight of the Department of Labor to collect the person's prevailing... the difference between the wage he would get and his prevailing wage. This is a very simple little Bill. All he does is gets the help of the Department of Labor."

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

Giorgi: "And I might add..."

Tuerk: "To the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "Well, actually we have a procedure in place right now to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

take care of this matter. There's no telling what it's going to cost the Attorney General to further enforce this thing. I see no need for the Bill. It's duplicative, unnecessary, any kind of language you want to use. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Represe... Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I might want to admonish the last speaker
that a few of the capital sins mentioned in the Bible are
to deprive a worker of his wages. The sins that cry to
heaven for vengeance are the sin to deprive a worker of his
wages. I admonish you to vote for this... to this Bill
with the Biblical connotations on your mind."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Giorgi has moved for the passage of House Bill 2202. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', and House Bill 2202, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Reading next Bill page seven appears House Bill 1280, Representative Satterthwaite. The Clerk will read the Bill. We are on page seven next Bill 1280."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1280, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Champaign, Bepresentative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the purpose of House Bill 1280 is to eliminate an inequity that results from double taxation of certain dividends that are reinvested in common stocks under a dividend reinvestment plan. Most public utility corporations permit a stockholder to accept additional shares of common stock in lieu of cash dividends. In 1981, Congress approved

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

legislation which provided that a taxpayer who choses to receive additional stock in lieu of a cash dividend may elect to include up to fifteen hundred dollars of annual dividend as taxable income in the year in which the stock is sold, rather than the year in which the dividend is declared. The Illinois Department of Revenue has taken the position that the amount of the public utility dividend reinvested in stocks must be included as income for Illinois Income Tax purposes in the year in which the dividend is declared. The Department has also taken the position that the dividend must be included as income for state income purposes in the year in which the stock sold. This, of course, results in a double taxation on that particular income. My Bill will relieve that inequity by allowing the Department to continue to collect the tax on the dividend in the year in which it's declared, but would prohibit the Department from collecting the tax again in the year in which the stock is sold. I'll be happy to have your support for passage of this measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved for the passage of House Bill 1280. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1280 pass?' favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 ayes'. 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present', and House... Representative Olson 'aye'. 108 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1281, Representative Ronan. Is Ronan back there? Representative Neff, do you want to handle that for Representative Ronan? You're a Co-chief Sponsor. 1281. Read... read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act in relationship to transportation and highways. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Neff on 1281, I think.

 Proceed Representative Neff."
- Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1281 is a very simple Bill. It amends the Regional Transportation Act and the state finance to create a highway construction fund and to extend the cut off date for transfer of state revenues to the public transportation. The Public Transportation Fund was used prior to 1979. The highway construction... is the... term used to describe a fund who's revenues may be used for highway construction and reconstruction. That's about all the Bill does. It's a very simple Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Neff has moved for the passage of House Bill 1281. Oh, I'm ahead of the printer. Hold on. Representative Currie, are wishing to debate on this, or is your light just on? Didn't sound like the type of Bill you wanted to speak to. We're waiting for the machine. Be at ease. Representative Robert Piel, from Cook, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Piel: "While we're waiting for the machine, Mr. Speaker, to sort of expedite matters a little bit, about the third Bill down is House Bill 1314, and I've talked to the Chairman of the Revenue Committee. We seem to have some problems with this Bill, so to alleviate any problems that we might have and one thing and another, I would ask that we put this in Interim Study in the House Revenue Committee, and see if we can work them out."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Leave that House Bill 1314 be on the Interim Study Calendar in Revenue Committee. Leave, and House Bill 1340 is in the Interim Study. 1314. All right, now we can back up. House Bill 1281, Representative Neff has moved

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

for the passage of House Bill 1281, with Representative Ronan, who has now appeared. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 9 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 1281, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Domico 'aye'. House Reso... House Bill 1282. McGann. The Clerk will read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Bouse Bill 1282, a Bill for an Act relating to the availability of compressed air. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

 Amendment #3 is House Bill 1282. It's simply asking that diagnostic centers, tune-up centers, provide an air compressor for tire inflation during their regular hours of business. I think this a people's piece of legislation. I think it's an important piece of legislation for Cook County, and I would appreciate total bipartisan support. This... This Bill has nothing to do with gasoline stations. It has only to the... I noticed the support I'm already getting, and I appreciate it. There's an awful lot of air going on here, and it's all free. Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Let's come to order. It's too... too early in the morning for that."
- McGann: "Thank you. I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just close in saying that I would appreciate bipartisan support to serve the people once again. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McGann has moved for the passage of House Bill 1282. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... I certainly can appreciate what the Sponsor's intent of this legislation would be; however, the issue here is one that unfortunately this would place, I think, an undue hardship on... on a lot of small gas stations. And... well, it has to do with inflation air... whether they would have air compression... Let me see Amendment 4 then."
- Speaker Matijevich: "You want to sit down and listen for awhile,
 Mike? The Lady from Cook, Representative Alexander. No,
 she does... I think she didn't read the Amendment either,
 or did you? Representative Alexander."
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm somewhat confused, and I
 drive backwards and forwards down here. Can I ask the
 Sponsor a question?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."
- Alexander: "Thank you. Representative McGann, do you mean that if I drive into a gasoline station and need air, there will be no facilities there under your Eill?"
- McGann: "Pardon me. I... I'd like you to repeat that."
- Alexander: "If I had a flat tire... tire going flat, and I drove into a gasoline station, I would not be able to secure air, under your Bill?"
- McGann: "No, no, that is... that is incorrect. Representative, 99% of the gas stations in our area provide the air compressor for the inflating of tires. It's the diagnostic centers, the tune-up centers that have sprung up in Cook County that are not providing this service, and that's all we are going to ask, to have these people comply. As far as gas stations, they have nothing to do with this Eill, as amended."
- Alexander: "All right. Thank you so kindly."
- Speaker Matijevich: "All right. With leave of the House, we'll return to Mike Tate, and I... I apologize for that. It was

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

not personal. Proceed Representative Tate."

Tate: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now since I've had opportunity to look at Amendment 4, I still haven't changed my mind. This is still a bad Bill. What we're basically doing in this legislation is telling a small businessman what he has to do. This is going to increase cost for business, and... and if you feel that it's your role State Government to tell the small businessman what he has to do... has to have, or can do or can't do. then VOII should vote for this, but I don't feel it's our responsibility to tell businesses what they should have their business. So, I would encourage a 'no' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann to close."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

Once again..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's have order, please."

McGann: "Once again, I must reiterate that this Bill has nothing to do with gasoline stations. Further, a previous speaker was speaking about Amendment #4, when he's stating it's a bad Bill. Well, probably Amendment #4 is a bad Bill, no Amendment #4 to this Bill. Now, as far as there is increased costs are concerned. I don't believe that. I think that's a fallacy. All we're asking for is these individuals to comply. The qasoline stations have done for a half a century more. All we're asking these

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

beautiful, very expensive tune-up shops, diagnostic centers to comply. If that's asking too much to help our people, I am surprised at the esteemed Representative Tate making a statement such as he does and then bringing erroneous information about an Amendment that isn't here. I ask you bipartisan support. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McGann has moved for the passage of House Bill 1282. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."
- Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of parliamentary inquiry. Was that Representative Cullerton's imitation of Richard J. Daley?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "I'll tell you, with all this energy in the morning, I don't know how we'll make it through the day. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'nay', and House Bill 1282, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1306, Representative Pangle. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1306, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Pangle."
- Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know why I always get stuck following Representative McGann. House Bill 1306 simply allows the highway commissioners to hire legal counsel. I have several opinions from the Attorney General's Office. He highly recommends this Bill to pass. I'd appreciate you 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "We... We've got to wait for the machine

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

again. Representative... Representative Pangle has moved for the passage of House Bill 1306. Representative Brummer on that, the Gentleman from Effingham."

Brummer: "Yes, because of all the excitement surrounding our...

our Representative McGann's desk here, I couldn't hear the
explanation of this. Could you briefly go through that
again?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pangle."

Pangle: "Yes, this Bill... yeah, this Bill simply gives the road commissioner the authority... the authority for allowing him to hire legal counsel."

Brummer: "That... That may be independent of the township's attorney?"

Pangle: "That's correct."

Brummer: "Okay, briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think this is a reasonable proposal. Many times there are some differences that exist between the highway commissioner and the... and the township trustees. The highway commissioner has different statutory responsibilities, and when those differences exist, ought to be able to hire legal counsel with regard to those functions regarding the road district. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pangle has moved for the passage of House Bill 1306. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 1306, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1313, McPike. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1313, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, the Majority Leader, Jim McPike."

- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under our current law, banks are allowed to have three facilities. At those facilities, they can provide a variety of services like cashing checks, taking deposits, payments of debt. This Bill would expand the ability of those facilities... would expand the ability of those facilities to offer services to the banking customers. It would allow loans to be made at those facilities. It is a very simple Bill. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on it."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike has moved for the passage of House Bill 1313. On that, the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a conflict of interest in this matter, but I am going to speak against my own interests. A few years ago, we started this thing, and they said, 'Well, a separate facility wasn't branch banking.' The next thing they said, 'Well, this holding company thing wasn't branch banking.' Then we had more separate facilities, and that wasn't branch banking. And we finally made the full circle, and now these facilities will be a branch bank. Basically, I think that, again, is a step in the wrong direction."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an ironic position on this Bill. Representative McPike and I have done battle over the years in the past with regard to the issue of branch banking and holding companies and on different sides of the issue. But I think now that we have federal decontrol of the banking institutions, the other financial institutions that we have in place, the situation in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Illinois with regard to the facilities, the drive-ups and holding company legislation which, admittedly, I opposed, I think the time has come that we do recognize that since these are in place, there is a need for the service. And I have even found, in talking to people who past in the banking community were greatly adverse in the to this, that they have shifted their position. The polling done by the banks indicates that's the case and indicates that there is strong support for this measure this time, and I would rise in support of it, against my longstanding view in opposition to Representative McPike's view on the other issues, and support his Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick." Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Bouse. I simply rise to support House Bill 1313. I think the main issue that one must look at on this Bill is a matter convenience, and that is for our constituents. And that is what they need in banking service. The three drive-up facilities are being used more and more consistently time goes on, and they have proven to be a great convenience for people, particularly in areas like I come from and in some of the downstate areas. consider that when you decide how to vote on this Bill. would be a great convenience for many of our voters out there if they were able to apply for loans at these facilities as well as using them for their other banking purposes, so that they would only have to make one trip to someplace that's closer to their home. I think it's a good Bill for you to support, and I urge you to do so. you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would be opposed to this type of

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

legislation, but I have done some checking, and I find that at least 90% of the banks in this state are in support of this - the Illinois Bankers' Association. And therefore, I am supporting this legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Neff and Representative Stuffle agree with me on this, it must be an unusual Bill. Yeah, I probably should take it out of the record. I think it's...I think it only makes sense that when you have a facility that can issue checks, drafts, money orders, receive deposits, change money, et cetera, I think it is silly that you don't allow that facility to also make loans. I would move for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike has moved for the passage of House Bill 1313. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will Giorgi 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. This Bill. having question, there are... received three-fifths of the Members voting and a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Greiman: "Across my desk has come Supplemental Calendar #1. On Supplemental Calendar #1 are three Bills on... that were on Short... that were on the Consent Calendar yesterday that have been knocked off that Consent Calendar. Late in the day, late in the day and yesterday, a Motion was made by Representative Vinson, I believe, that Bule 9(F) be suspended and that matters that are removed from the Consent Calendar would stand on the Short Debate Calendar.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Is that correct? And that was adopted. Now, it seems to me if those Bills were knocked off of the Short Debate... of the Consent Calendar yesterday, they should appear on the Regular Order."

Speaker Matijevich: "Al, would you hold once. There is a question whether I announced the vote on the last Bill."

Greiman: "I'm sorry. I'll be glad to."

Bills that were knocked off of the Consent Calendar yesterday should have been integrated with those Bills on Short Debate on page, probably two or three, page two of the Calendar. They were not, and now they are... now we have a... a Short Debate Calendar on Supplemental #1. That would mean that the Sponsors of those Fills, if they... if it is the intention of the Chair to take these up as a Calendar would... they should be on the Regular Order and they are not. Accordingly the Chair... the... the people who are on the... this Calendar, Supplemental #1, would have a significant advantage then having their Bills called on a separate Calendar. I trust that... perhaps you could give me an explanation or a ruling on it, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "In response to the inquiry, the Chair will call on the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Those three Bills that were taken off the Consent

Calendar yesterday, we failed to pick them up on the

regular Calendar in their proper position. When it was

pointed out to us this morning, we published the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Supplemental Calendar."

Greiman: "Well, the question is that's... that's fine, and I...
you know, it's a long day, and the Clerk's job's an
incredible job. I don't know how you do do the job you do,
but nonetheless, will we afford these three Bills a special
treatment because of that error, or will they be integrated
into... onto the Order of Business? I... I don't even care
about the Bills. They're one by Representative Nash, who
is a good Democrat. There's Mr. Davis, who's independent,
of course, and Mr. Vinson, who's a Republican. I... I
don't, you know, the Bills are not important, but I think
the issue of orderly process is important."

Speaker Matijevich: "Were... were those in your order of priority?"

Greiman: "Fardon?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Did you list those in your order of priority, Al?"

Greiman: "No, just... I... I mean the question is, do you intend
to go to that Order of Business and to have three Bills
taken out of order, given an advantage when there are
several hundred Bills that will not be heard, Members
Bills?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, all I can say, Representative Greiman, that the Chair has the prerogative of going to any Order, and I... it all depends on who's in the Chair, I guess."

Greiman: "Well, I..."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's the only way that I can answer that."

Greiman: "... have a sense of..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You may be in the Chair..."

Greiman: "No, I have... I would take a lot of bets on that today,
but that's not the point. The point of it is that those
three Bills are improperly placed on Supplemental Calendar
#1."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's proceed to the... Representative

Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, talking about Supplemental Calendar #2. Now there were a number of Bills today that were knocked off of Consent Calendar which go on the Short Debate Calendar, yet, on Supplemental Calendar #2, I notice that some of those Bills do appear and some of those Bills do not appear. And I would like to know the rationale for not having, for instance, Bouse Bill 207 not appear on that particular Short Debate Calendar or House Bill 1399 not appear, when they, in fact, were knocked off at the same time. It certainly would seem to me that if they were knocked off at the same time that they should be on this Calendar all together."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe, after discussing that with the Clerk, I understand they filled up one page, the next page in on the way, so you..."

Jaffe: "Well, Mr... then I would imagine that you would start from the very top, and I don't understand the Clerk starting from the middle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, evidently they..."

Jaffe: "Now, the Clerk is too wise to start from the middle."

Speaker Matijevich: "I understand they... they started from when they received the objections, so that's all they could do.

Let's proceed with the Order of Business. That's the only way they could do it. Let's continue on with the Regular Order, so we can com... try to complete our work.

Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Greiman: "Well, I made a specific parliamentary inquiry, and I really didn't get an answer. I'd like to hear the Parliamentarian or the Speaker make an answer. Representative Jaffe also made an inquiry of the Chair, as to whether we are shortening Short, Short, Short Debate.

54th Legislative Day

Τf

May 27, 1983

to the reading in the Third Reading of Consent Calendar, those should be on single Calendar, unless you just want to throw out that rule and just let the Speaker roam the Calendar. If that's the opinion... if that's the request, fine, so be it. That's the belief of the House, so be it."

Speaker Matijevich: "In response to Representative Greiman, and I hope this finishes it, the Clerk has made his response, and the Supplemental Calendars are coming out in accordance with the custom of this House in the only way that we can do it. And now we shall proceed with the Order of Business. House Bill 1328, DiPrima. The Clerk will read the Bill."

we... If Members have knccked Bills off prior to the...

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative
 DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Is Mr. Keane at bis desk? Jimmy Keane. this Bill was given to me by the Veterans anvwav. They were having a little conflict with Administration. Hynes, the county assessor, and T Representative Keane that we would put on an Amendment in the Senate that would solve all the problems. Other than that, I would appreciate an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative DiFrima has moved for the passage of House Bill 1328. No discussion? Have all... those who are in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... will take the record. Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you rise?"
- DiPrima: "Well, due to the kindness of all the Members, for any of you that are giving Memorial Day speeches, I have copies

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

of them here at my desk. Come over and pick them up. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. On this there are 114 voting 'aye', no 'nays' and House Bill 1328, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1331...Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I did hear the Clerk's...I go back to the last issue. I did, indeed, hear the Clerk's response, as well as your ruling, Sir. I personally put in objections at the same time to 539, 671, which is my own Bill...I knocked my own Bill off the Consent Calendar, 720 and 1399 at the same time as 1612, and I find 1399 is not on this list. I put in 1399 before 1612 and it is not on this list. Now, that just...that...now, I don't...I think..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Greiman, then why don't we just take that under advisement so I can talk to the Clerk about that. I...that's...it's pretty difficult for the Chair when people bring up numbers and for the Chair to make a response without discussing it with the Clerk, so...Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Fine, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I believe that...that we should at least follow whatever rules we are making today and that we should accordingly, Sir, at least provide a Supplemental Calendar that is responsive...that is responsive to the objections put in. That's what I believe."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Was that number 1379, that you said?"
- Greiman: "No, I think it was 1399, Mr. Speaker, put in the same time as the others, exactly the same time."
- Speaker Matijevich: "We're looking into it because it could have been a mistake from what they are telling us here."
- Greiman: "What...who's error? I mean..."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, the Clerk's it would have to be, but we're looking into it."
- Greiman: "Well, then if it's a mistake we can easily cure that by making a new Supplemental Calendar, withdrawing this one.

 Isn't that correct? We would want to rectify a mistake.

 We do it for...all the time here."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Al, let's go. I said it could have been a mistake. We don't know and the only thing...and that's why I would plead with you. I said, take it under advisement and we can look into it, Al, that's all we can do."
- Greiman: "Well...when we take it under advisement, and we search out the record and we search out our consciences, may I expect to have a response before 4 o'clock today or even before we get to the Consent Calendar on Third Reading...or the Supplemental Calendar?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "We're going to try to get to it, please. I understand now we have Supplemental 3 and it's on that."
- Greiman: "No, no, it shouldn't just be on that. It should be in the order that they were put in. That was the representation that you made to us and that's the way it should be, Mr...Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Calendar is going to be distributed.

 Let's proceed. House Bill 1331, Representative Terzich.

 The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1331, a Bill for an Act to create sanitary districts and remove obstructions from the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 House Bill 1331 provides a moderate salary adjustment
 ranging from a low of 4.4 to a high of 6.7 percent. The
 current law covers salaries for the commissioners through

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

1984. This adjustment would start in 1985 and go to 1991. If it is not changed, then the commissioners, which are three, that would run in 1984 would not be able to receive any adjustment because it prohibit - elected officials salaries may not be increased during their term. They have a six year term. The total amount of the entire increase, the start in 1985, is \$6000, \$12,000 in 1987, up to a maximum of \$24,000 in 1991, and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved for the passage of House Bill 1331. Those in favor signify...the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is, as I understand the Bill, a salary increase for the Chicago Sanitary District. I would submit to the Assembly that both state and local government is in such serious financial straits at this time that we ought not be spending this money on a salary increase for a particular set of individuals. We are in a position where we may not be able to finance general assistance for the year. We are in a position where we are foregoing aid to education. We are not in a position where we ought to be protecting a specific set of individuals at the expense of important governmental programs, and for those reasons, I would rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved for the passage of House Bill 1331. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nc'. Bepresentative Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, no, this is absolutely a ridiculous statement. I said that the increase does not go into effect until 1985.

It amounts to \$2,000, which is \$1,000 a year and that the total is \$6,000. \$6,000 in 1985 is the total increase for

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

that. Now, if these individuals do not receive an increase, they will not get one for six years, up until 1991, and if you feel that 4% or a total of \$6,000 is a favorable 'no' vote, you know, all other employees in the state, I assume that we are going to vote 'no' for any salary increase for state employees, or public aid workers or anyone else. And that, you know, this is absolutely ridiculous that if you feel proud that you can reject someone for a \$1,000 a year pay raise starting in 1985, I feel sorry for the Members of this Bouse."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Bave all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 32 'ayes', 66 'nays', 13 voting 'present', and House Bill 1331, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1332, Terzich. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1332, a Bill for an Act to add Sections
to the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Hr. Speaker, this one is a little more than \$6,000; however, it's a very, very simple Bill. House Bill 1332 provides that the Members contributions to the state supported retirement system shall be reduced in proportion to any shortfall in the required state funding. As you all are aware that the state supported retirement system, depending upon who you talk to, are either in good shape or bad shape. However, one of the things that we are always assured of is that the employees' contributions will be continuously made into the pension system. If there is any excess earnings from the State Foard of Investments, we have the Governor coming in and saying well, we can borrow money from the pension systems. We are not going to fund

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

them this year, and over the last two years, we've seen to the tune of close to \$600,000,000, not \$6,000, \$600,000,000 that the Governor has used to fund State Government. So what the Bill simply does is that if there is any shortfall in the appropriation to the pension systems, then the supported contributions will be decreased a similar amount as what the employer would have in the shortfall. It's a fair and equitable Bill. If the employer does not put in his contributions, there's certainly no reason for the employee to put his contributions into the pension system either, and I'd be more than happy to answer any questions and appreciate your support on a very, very fine Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved for the passage of House Bill 1332. On that, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative, as the Chairman of the Commission, I know that you have been quick to rise to point out the disapproval of your Commission on these Bills. What's their position on this Bill?"

Terzich: "The Bill has been approved by the Pension Laws

Commission in their last meeting."

Stuffle: "Was that a change of position?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Stuffle: "You pulled that one out, didn't you?"

Terzich: "No, it's a good Bill. It's for the people of the State
of Illinois and for all of the pensioners that have put in
their money faithfully into their pension system. It's the
employer that hasn't put in his contribution,
Representative, as you're aware."

Stuffle: "Good. Thank you."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Be indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Terzich, if we cut back some of those contributions by law in the statutes and we have some legislation... I think the builders took 50,000,000 out of the pension system here just recently and also we have another Bill coming up that involves another 40,000. Will be... Will there be enough in there if we cut this back to accomplish all this that's available? You know, a lot of that is tied up."

Terzich: "What is that, the withdrawal of funds into the..."

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Terzich: "Who has been withdrawing those funds, Representative?"

Ebbesen: "Well...somebody said in debate the other day, on Representative Stuffle's Bill that...it was defeated, but that the...was \$50,000,000 made available to the economy."

Terzich: "That was on the assets of the pension system. That has nothing to do with the contributions into the unfunded liability by both the employer and the employee. Representative Stuffle simply was applying to the investments of the pension funds, the not contributions."

Ebbesen: "Well, I think there is a Eill that is coming up in short order that involves, I think, \$40,000,000, an Amendment that could be used. If we cut back these contributions, will there be enough available to cover that \$40,000,000 because, you know, a lot of it is tied up and is...can't be touched."

Terzich: "Well, that I couldn't speak to, Representative Ebbesen.

Like I say that the Bill is simply a fair and equitable

Bill that if the employer does not put in his contributions

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

then this will simply be reduced a similar amount that the employer... If he can't put them in, why should the employee put them in?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Ebbesen: "It's terrible Bill. Ought to be defeated."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich moves for the passage of House Bill 1332. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 38 'ayes', 72 'nays', and House Bill 1332, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1334, Terzich. The Clerk will read the Fill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create sanitary districts and remove obstructions from the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative
 Terzich."
- Terzich: "I would like to have leave to either put this in the Spring Calendar or Interim Study."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to place House Bill 1334 in Interim Study. Is that what you want, Interim Study? Leave and House Bill 1334 is on the Interim Study Calendar. House Bill 1342, Leverenz. Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1342 would provide that law enforcement

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

people in a situation only where they take a person to a mental health center, a zone center, they would be allowed access to the name of the individual and the address of the individual, so they would not end up providing a "John Doe" police report. The other part of it, in terms of investigations, has been taken out by Amendment #1. I would ask for your "aye" vote on House Bill 1342."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved for the passage of House Bill 1342. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1342 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 97 'ayes', 15 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 1342, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1358, Marzuki. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marzuki, on House Bill 1358."
- Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very simple Bill that I sponsored at the request of the Illinois Education Association. All it does is ask that contracts which are currently audited by the state to be placed in the regional superintendent's office. All the Bill does is make it easier for the public to examine those contracts, including IEA members, of course. There's nothing sinister about it. It will cost very little to have these contracts on file with the regional superintendent. I ask for your 'aye' vote, if you favor making it simpler to follow these Fills. Vote against it, if you wish to have them remain in all of the various

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

school districts where such contracts currently exist."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki has moved for the passage of House Bill 1358. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "I really didn't hear. What is the current practice with regard to these contracts?"

Marzuki: "The current practices are that they remain in the school districts where such contracts are started."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Keane." Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to House Bill 1358. We had a similar Bill that was sponsored by the IEA or put forward by the IEA earlier in this Session which increased the reporting requirements of private schools for purposes of the IEA. What this Bill does, or what...the problems with this Bill is that it creates a new mandate for local government...local public schools without any justifiable reason. The Bill, as presented, is incorrect. Services under the School Code and the federal law are provided to students, in terms of the child benefit theory, and are not provided to schools. Therefore, with this Bill, we'll probably end up having litigation to determine whether or not a school or a parent would even sign the contract. The Bill is also superfluous. It's not needed because all services now provided to the children in nonpublic schools are audited by the state and when appropriate, by the Federal Government. And this audit and Federal Government review includes services under Chapter 1. Transportation, Special Ed and so forth. Again, Bill is opposed by the Illinois Conference of Bishops. It's opposed by many private schools. They do not wish

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

further state restrictions upon their operation and I would ask for a vote 'no'."

- Speaker Matijevich: "With leave of the House, under the new rule, the Chair can make introductions on special occasions, and when a Congressman appears on the Floor, it's special occasion. Dick Durbin, Congressman Dick Durbin. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marzuki, to close."
- Marzuki: "As I said, it's a very simple Eill. There is nothing sinister about it. I'm surprised that it's opposed. The contracts that we are talking about are legal. The only thing this does is make easier access to those contracts. It does not oppose any of the current services that are offered through contracts by non...public and nonpublic schools. If you feel that the public should have easier access, vote 'yes'. If you feel 'no', vote the other way. Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki has moved for the passage of House Bill 1358. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 45 voting 'ayes', 56 voting 'no', and House Bill 1358, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1367, Stuffle. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Bepresentative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the Body
 to hear 1367 and 1368 together on one Boll Call. They are
 companion Bills and save some time of the House."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman asks leave to consider House Bill 1367 and 1368 in one Boll Call. They are companion Bills.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Leave? Leave is granted. The Clerk will read House Bill 1368."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, thank you for leave. With regard to the two Bills, the first Bill is an Amendment to the Uniform Commercial Code: the second, the Code of Criminal...Civil Procedure, excuse me. These Bills together, the first Bill deals with the sale in the course of business of farm products. It provides for protecting security interest of lenders, farmers against ... and, if you will, the elevator in most cases, with regard to the sale of products against the unscrupulous seller of those products in the course of business. The second Fill deals with the transaction and sale of commodities with regard to landlord tenant situations to sellers. The Bills have been worked out with the Farm Bureau, Farmers* Union, banking groups in the state in an attempt to provide the necessary security situation of the parties involved in I know of no opposition to the Bills. transactions. would ask for an Affirmative Boll Call."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle has moved for the passage of House Bills 1367 and 1368, and the question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' On that, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "136... Both of these Eills deal with liens on grain or farm products, one from the standpoint of a commercial institution, the other from the standpoint of a landlord.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

1367 provides a penalty for the sale of that to someone other than whom the farmer indicated. You and I had filed an Amendment with regard to 1368 to establish the same type of penalty provision in the landlord-tenant situation. Was that Amendment adopted?"

Stuffle: "No, Mr. Brummer, it wasn't. We never got to that Order of Business to move the Bill back to date."

Brummer: "Are you willing to...is it your plan to have that

Amendment adopted on 1368 in the Senate?"

Stuffle: "Absolutely."

Brummer: "And that is your commitment?"

Stuffle: "Absolutely."
Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, "Shall these Bills pass?"

Those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114 'aye', no 'nays', and House Bills 1367 and 1368, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. House Bill 1369, Oblinger. The Clerk will read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative

Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to take this back to Second for an Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger asks leave of the Body to return House Bill 1369 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Leave? Leave is granted. Second Reading. The Clerk... Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Oblinger, amends House Bill 1369 on

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

page 1 and so forth."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, the
Community College Board has assured me that they are now
working on their own rules and regulations pertaining to
sabbatical leave, and they would like to be taken out of
the one that said they were to adopt the same ones as K
through 12, and that they would like to have their own.
It's very simple. It says that they will be empowered to
establish quidelines regarding sabbatical leaves."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye'...

Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brunmer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Brummer: "I think originally this Bill provided sabbatical leaves
to community colleges at least at one half pay."

Oblinger: "I can't hear it."

Speaker Matijevich: "She... Would you get a little closer, Dick?"

Brummer: "I think originally this Bill provided sabbatical leaves
by community college employees at at least one half pay.

Is that provision still in the Bill, that the...their leave
shall be at one half pay?"

Oblinger: "No, it was taken out by saying that they...they would establish their own guidelines rather than adopting those of K through 12. In the Education Committee, this was one of the questions that was brought up, "Why do they have to adopt somebody else's. Aren't they capable of developing their own?' So they brought me the Amendment to say, yes, they would develop their own, so that would take that half day out."

Brummer: "Is there any prohibition against the...the community colleges establishing pay with regard to those that are on sabbatical then in the Amendment?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Oblinger: "No."

Brummer: "So they could establish the pay rate for someone on sabbatical at whatever rate they wanted...at no pay or at 100% pay?"

Oblinger: "They have assured me that they are going to adhere to
the 1 through K through 12 with a few exceptions where they
have different situations like people who are temporary
people, but have been there for a number of years and are
working on them. And so I agreed that if they wanted to
establish their own rules and regulations, I would amend
the Bill."

Brummer: "I... I guess my followup question then would be why...what will this ... Can they not currently do this?

If all we're doing at this point is to authorize them to establish guidelines regarding sabbatical leave, can they not do that currently without statutory authorization?"

Oblinger: "They felt they didn't when it was listed. Right now they have A through H of things they are to do...are able to do, and they wanted this actually in the language so that there would be no discussion of whether they had that authority."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Stuffle: "Representative Oblinger, I think I understand the intent of this. We passed a Bill out of here not long ago with regard to sabbatical leave in terms of the University Pension System under which these people fall. Would it have any effect on that particular Bill?"

Oblinger: "They assured me that this would not have any effect on that."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Stuffle: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Ropp: "Representative, under our analysis, it says that the Community College Trustee Association opposes this. Why would they necessarily oppose it?"

Oblinger: "They opposed the original Bill. They don't oppose the Amendment."

Ropp: "Oh, okay."

Oblinger: "That's why I introduced the Amendment for them."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Oblinger has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. And now Bepresentative
Oblinger asks leave for the immediate consideration of
House Bill 1369, and leave is granted. Clerk will read the
Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act to add Sections
to the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Amendment becomes the Bill allowing the...or directing the Community College Board to draft...rules and regulations pertaining to sabbatical leaves. I would request your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger moves for the passage of House Bill 1369. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', and House Bill 1369, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1373, Hastert. The Clerk will read the Fill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1373, a Bill for an Act in relationship to service occupation and service use taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert on 1373."

Hastert: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1373 is a Bill that is a compromise Bill and it's agreed Bill sponsored by an Senator Pierce... Representative Pierce and myself. What it does is to allow automobile dealers and those people, parts dealers to come under the same preface of rules as pharmacists and printers, which really not...does not change the tax status or positive or negative tax accrued. But all it does is let the Department of Revenue establish rules and regs that put them under the same class as printers and pharmacists in being able to establish the gross tax that they charge. I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert has moved for the passage of House Bill 1373. On that, the Majority Leader, Jim McPike."

McPike: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

McPike: "As the Bill was introduced, it would have generated revenue for the state. As it is amended, does it generate revenue or does it cost tax dollars to the state?"

Hastert: "Representative McPike, it does not add revenue, nor does it cost the state. All it does is give a simple way that they can add on their tax. The intent of the Bill was not to be a tax raiser."

McPike: "The Bill, itself, as introduced, did turn out to be a

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

generator...did turn out to be a tax raiser."

Hastert: "That's...that's one of the reasons I amended it. That was not my purpose, Sir."

McPike: "So there is no fiscal impact in its present form?"

Hastert: "No fiscal impact."

McPpike: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert has moved for the passage of House Bill 1373. The question is. 'Shall House Bill 1373 pass?! Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. there are 112 voting "aye", no "nays", 1 'present', and House Bill 1373... Diana Nelson 'a ye'... received the ... Virginia Frederick 'aye'. having 114 'ayes', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1379, Homer. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Antitrust Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer on 1379."

Homer: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Members, this Bouse Bill is to rectify a judicial construction of the Antitrust Act as announced in People vs. 'Climatemp' and Feople vs. 'Ward', 1981 consolidated Appellate Court Cases. Very simply, would allow actions to be brought under the Antitrust Act for both civil fine and treble damages, and I would urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved for the passage of House Bill 1379. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1379 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes',

54th Legislative Day

- May 27, 1983
- no 'nays', and House Bill 1379, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1382, Homer. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1382, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman...Homer. Representative Homer on 1382."
- Homer: "Mr. Speaker, Members, this Bill very simply would amend that portion of the Code pertaining to the physician-patient privilege to allow a physician to disclose information pursuant to investigations, civil or criminal, brought pursuant to the Public Aid Act. I would urge your favorable consideration of this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved for the passage of House Bill 1382. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 100 'ayes', no 'nays', 11 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1385, Saltsman. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1385, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Speaker of the House, Madigan, in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill prohibits municipalities from contributing dues to any organization that advocates strikes by public employees in preference to compulsory arbitration. This Bill, as amended, will apply

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

to police and firefighters only. The collective bargaining Bills that were passed from this House yesterday is proof that no one... no one wants police orzfirefighters to strike. This Bill will encourage municipalities to...the organizations that they belong to to not advocate strikes by public employees. It's a very simple Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, all those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Stuffle to explain his vote."
- Stuffle: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope people would take a little closer look at this Bill and give us an "aye" vote. I think that's what I want them to do. I'm not sure if they do, they may not vote 'yes', but I think the Sponsor here has a Bill that deserves our consideration, and we ought to put a 'yes' vote on it."
- Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 49 'ayes', 53 'nos'...Mr. Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Mr. Speaker, can I put this on Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Madigan: "This matter shall be put on Fostponed Consideration. House Bill 1389, Mr. Ronan."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1389, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. What House
 Bill 1389 does, it eliminates the requirement that each
 organizational licensee shall pay the cost of investigative
 services performed by the Department of Law Enforcement at
 the request of the licensee. The racetracks in this state
 are in favor or the Department of Law Enforcement

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

performing their investigations. They have no complaint with that. What their complaint is is that the budget for this in the Department of Law Enforcement has gotten out of hand in the last five years, and what you have got right now is over \$900,000 being billed to the racetracks. And... And it just doesn't seem to be equitable. It's a bureaucracy out of control. The racetracks in this state obviously raise \$72,000,000 for this state, and this is an unnecessary burden upon them. I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Who was this requested by, Representative Ronan?"

Ronan: "Ron Swanson."

Mautino: "And what was the rationale? You kind of mumbled through that pretty good. I thought I'd...I'd like to have you speak into the microphone so I can hear what you are saying."

Ronan: "As I said, Representative Mautino, the situation is that the racetracks have nо problem with these They feel the Department of Law investigative services. Enforcement should perform it. The problem is is that in last five years, these costs have gone up from the approximately \$400,000 to \$800,000, and what you've got is you've got a bureaucracy that just keeps paying higher and higher salaries and is not accountable to anyone because the tracks have to pick up the tab..."

Mautino: "And that was at the request of the licensees, right,
those people that have the charitable races as well as all
others, and you are saying that they want to pick up the
tab now on the Law Enforcement? Like the Tribune charities
and all of that, they...they want to fund this or they
don't?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Ronan: "They don't want to."

Mautino: "Interesting Eill, very interesting Bill."

Ronan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Jaffe: "Bepresentative Ronan, many years ago, I served on the Agriculture Committee, and there was a Bill similar to this. And, basically, it took all the funds out of the Agricultural Premium Fund. Now, are these funds taken out of the Agricultural Premium Fund or do they come from General Bevenue? The answer is?"

Ronan: "Premium Fund, Fremium Fund."

Jaffe: "It's taken from the Agricultural Fremium Fund, so you are taking that money that the...the poor farm kids want for their fairs and whatnot, and you are going to really give them to the tracks. Representative Fonan, I never thought you would do such a thing."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Bonan to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's make sure we understand what this Bill does. The racetracks generate \$72,000,000 a year for the State of Illinois - what's used to fund the many needed social programs. What's happened is that you've got a bureaucracy over at the Department of Law Enforcement that right now is spending \$900,000 a year. The attitude of the racing industry is that they are in favor of investigations. They want to make sure the racing industry stays clean, but unless you set up some system of accountability, you are going to have a situation where the Department of Law Enforcement is just going to keep putting high priced bureaucrats into positions that don't do anything. I move for the passage of the legislation."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 48 'ayes', 63 'nos'. This Bill fails to pass, and the Bill is hereby declared lost. The last Bill considered, House Bill 1389, was in the category of Racing Administration Proposals and pursuant...maybe I should do my impersonation of George now. For what purpose does Mr. Daniels seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could explain to the Membership what it is that you are doing, and from whence..."

Speaker Madigan: "Yeah, that's what I thought we would do."

Daniels: "And from whence you get that authority."

Speaker Madigan: "We get the authority from the rules."

Daniels: "That is correct. You might...you might explain to the Members, Mr. Speaker, that you do have the authority to do what you are doing, so that they understand why we aren't standing up here throwing arrows at you."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "The Gentleman is on the phone, if you'd like to..."

Madigan: "Maybe we should put you up here."

Daniels: "I would be happy to help you cut... I got some good..."

Speaker Madigan: "...previous experience."

Daniels: "Can I say Special Order of Business, Racing

Legislation, we will call the following Bills."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay, that Bill was in the category of Racing Administration Proposals, and pursuant to Rule 39(a-2) which provides for Subject Matters, Orders of Call, I shall proceed to call certain Bills in that same category, and the first of those Bills to be called will be House Bill 1404, Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act creating Illinois Off-Track Betting Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have House Bill 1404 taken back to Second Beading to...to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Amendments filed. A Motion...Motion. 'I move to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 1404, signed by Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli, on his Motion."

Capparelli: "Just that I'd like to table Amendment #1. When it
was put on this Bill, there was a mistake in it, and we'd
like to go back to the original Bill as it was, so I'd ask
to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Those
in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have
it. The Motion carries. The Amendment is tabled. Are
there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Like...I'd like to have leave to have this Bill heard immediately."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave is granted to consider this Bill on the Order... There is an objection filed by Mr. Dunn, therefore, Mr. Capparelli... For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seek recognition? Gentleman indicates he does not seek recognition. Mr. Capparelli moves that the rules be suspended to consider this Bill on the Order of Third Reading in light of the fact that...in light of the fact that it has been amended today. All those in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

favor of that Motion will vote "aye", all those opposed will vote 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 77 'ayes', 20 'nos'. The Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act creating the
Illinois Off-Track Betting Study Commission and defining
its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "House Bill 1404 now creates the Illinois Off-Track

Betting Commission to conduct a feasibility study on the implementation of off-track parimutuel betting on horse racing in Illinois. The Commission will consist of four Senators, two appointed by the Fresident, two by the Minority Leader, four Representatives, two appointed by the Speaker and two appointed by the Minority Leader, and four members appointed by the Governor. I would ask that it get a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Mautino."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Mautino: "Representative, did we not have the same type of study Commission back in the 79th of 78th General Assembly as it pertains to the messenger service? It was enacted at that time after the report?"

Capparelli: "Not that I know of. They had Crime Commission Study

Commission, but I don't recall having any parimutuel one,

no."

Mautino: "Well, I thought I remember reading a report back in, I think around '78. I believe that was the year that addressed the question of the messenger service for off-track betting that we enacted at that time and then two

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

years later eliminated. Is that not true?"

Capparelli: "Not that I know of. I wasn't part of it."

Mautino: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Bave all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. For what purpose does Mr. Greiman seek recognition? Mr. Greiman wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, are you prepared to change the Boll Call? Not yet, okay. Daniels is on the floor. The Clerk informs the Chair he is now prepared to change the Boll Call. Mr. Vinson, would you wish to come to the podium to watch the Clerk? Mr. Clerk, would you change Mr. Greiman's vote from 'no' to 'aye'? On this question, there are 60 'ayes', 57... excuse Strike that count. On this question, there are 60 'ayes', 56 'nos'. This Eill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Bill on this Order of Call shall be House Bill 1583. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1583, a Eill for an Act authorizing and regulating greyhound racing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request leave of the Body to return House Eill 1583 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of technical Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave is granted to place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. Clerk, read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Bullock-Giorgi, amends House Bill 1583 as amended."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eullock."

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 to House Bill 1583 is a technical revision of the previous Amendments, and these Amendments and Amendment #6, more specifically, is intended to in Sections dealing with the penalty of the Act to add the word *knowingly*. The Amendment also requires that the admissions price tickets shall reflect the reductions those admission tax, and this requirement is thus deleted from the Bill. The Amendment also deals with the Racing Board Members in that they must be knowledgeable and competent in areas of the Board's concern, but would not have to have been residents of Illinois for five years preceding appointment to the Board, and the Amendment merely makes the residency effective at the time of the appointment sufficient. Also, at least 90% of the racing officials employed at the racing track would not have to be This Amendment would make of the state. residents residency at the time of employment sufficient. The Amendment also deletes, as a reason for nonappointment to the Racing Board, a lack of, quote, 'good moral character'. That language was considered vague and perhaps nondefinable terminology, and so we, in fact, indicate professions in unprofessional conduct as a substitute for the term 'good moral character. The same is taken from the Bill as regards exclusion of persons from racing track activities. The same substitution is made regarding denial of the license in that the language originally was general reputation of honesty and this now has been changed to make, quote, 'unprofessional conduct,' end of quote, as a prohibition substitute. The Bill contains a prohibits organization licensees from giving money from public officials or Members of any shares of transferred, et cetera. The Amendment finally provides

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

that the prohibition does not apply to a, quote, "testimary transfer," unquote, or a legal transfer of stock and so forth. The Amendment, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House is technical in nature, intended to be clarifying to the legislation. I know of no opposition and I would urge adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. Whatever you think about the Bill, the Amendment should be adopted.

It's a clarifying Amendment that does put the Bill in much better form."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'...I'm sorry, I'm sorry. The question is on the Amendment. Mr. Dunn, did you wish to address the Amendment? Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a copy of the Amendment. I'd like to know what the Amendment does. Maybe the Sponsor can tell us. If he...if he explained it, I couldn't hear it. Would he yield for a question? Explain the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunn was probably off the floor, but I just finished explaining the Amendment. Would you like me to repeat it again?"

Dunn: "I'd like...I don't have a copy of the Amendment nor an analysis of the Amendment, and this is a very important, controversial Bill. And I would like to know what the Amendment does and how it changes the Bill in it's present form."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #6."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #6 is withdrawn. Are there further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Bullock-Giorgi, amends House
Bill 1583 as amended."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Giorgi-Bullock, amends Bouse Bill 1583, as amended."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #8."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #8 is withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on the Order of Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1583, a Bill for an Act authorizing the regulating greyhound racing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1583 is a jointly sponsored measure by Representatives Bullock, Giorgi, Panayotovich, Saltsman, et al. Representative Giorgi will close on this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Illinois is now confronted with an immense revenue shortfall. We have heard much to do about a tax increase in this state, and I'm proposing to this Body today that we consider licensing greyhound racing in the State of Illinois. I'm proposing that we license greyhound racing in the State of Illinois essentially because greyhound racing is the sixth largest spectator sport throughout the United States. In the Midwest, there are no licensed greyhound racing tracks. The closest track

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

to us in the State of Illinois is in Arkansas. We believe that this legislation will not only add to the recreational value for many of the residents of our state, but fully implemented and when fully operational, it will generate considerable revenues for the State Treasury. This Bill was amended previously to allow for the revenue derived from lisensing greyhound racing that accrued to the state to be placed in the Industrial Training Fund of State of Illinois in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. We feel that is a logical place to deposit these revenues for it will attack the severe problem of unemployment and underemployment in our state, and we believe that that is a necessary state policy. Speaker, to the Bill in specifics, the legislation would create the Greybound Racing Board in the State of Illinois, much like the existing Harness Bacing Act in our state. It will consist of seven Members appointed by the Governor, each of whom would serve a six year term, and no person may serve on the Board who has any financial interest in track, race meet or Racing Association. The Bill further allows for a Greyhound Racing Advisory Panel of fifteen Members who will serve without compensation and would, in fact, be appointed by the Governor for one year term. There are necessary restrictions on the licensing αf organizations. No licensing may be granted to a person conduct the meet within 45 miles of any other place conducting a meet on the same day during the same hours. Persons not having a two year application of ownership or contract lease suitable for the track would not be granted license, and licensees must pay a \$200,000 surety bond and at least 90% of all employees must be residents of the State of Illinois. The graduated tax is identical to that of the existing Horse Bacing Act. More specifically, the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill would create the Greyhound Breeders' Fund. We are interested in stimulating the Illinois economy, breeding Illinois dogs and making certain Illinois economy benefits from this activity. Funds that would be diverted from the tax...a privilege tax in this particular instance, would go directly into a breeder fund for Illinois dogs, the Greyhound Breeder Fund, and in 1984, 4% of the privilege tax would go into the fund to breed Illinois dogs. this would be administered bу the Department Agriculture, which would promote education, research, award scholarships, public information and training programs under this provision. The Act would also create racetrack improvement fund, which is to be funded through a special purse and reward account. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the legislation is sufficiently understood by all the Members of the Body. I would be prepared to answer any questions that might arise."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fiel."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Piel: "Representative Bullock, we had guite a lengthy debate on this when it was...when Amendments 1 through 4 were brought up on the House floor the other day. At that time, I was under the impression that certain Amendments were going to be added to the Bill to take care of problems in certain tracks throughout the state. Now, I notice that certain Amendments have not been introduced and other Amendments have been withdrawn. Would you explain the situation here, because I was under the impression that you had a meeting. At that meeting, there was an agreement, and that specific Amendments would be introduced, you know, to take care of the problems that the tracks throughout the state had."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Piel, I think you may recall that I withdrew three Amendment earlier. Those Amendments will be provided in the Senate. It is my feeling that had we amended the Bill at this late stage of activity, that it would have seriously jeopardized the debate and hopeful passage on this day. You have my assurance that these corrective...Amendments will be offered in the Senate."

Piel: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. You know, you hear many times on the House floor by people saying. Well. we've got a technical problem, we'll take care of it in the Senate with an Amendment, and this type of a thing. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you are looking at a Bill that is not a small, minor, insignificant Bill. you've got problems with a Bill like this, I definitely feel the House of origin is the place to take care of the problems. It's not a situation that this Bill was brought back or brought up on Third Beading all of a sudden today and dropped in front of us. This Fill has been on the Calendar for quite a few weeks. It's a situation where we've got problems with the Bill. I don't believe sending a Bill like this over to the Senate in the hopes that the Senate will increase...or will put the Amendments on that we need to have taken care of problems throughout the State of Illinois. With that in mind, I would ask the Members of the House of Representatives to vote down House Bill 1583. If the Sponsor does not want to take care of the problems in the House of origin, them we should vote the Bill down."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I would like to commend our next Congressman for

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

his intent on where he would put these particular funds, but even though the intent is good, I must rise in opposition to this particular Bill. This Bill would affect the lives of the people of this state, but it will also affect the lives of the horse racing industry - something you Legislators can be proud of. You took that...you took the horse racing that we presently have in this state to its highest heights. You are now recognized as one of the leading states in this field. We are now providing more We are implementing more breeding. ₩e providing more safeguards and providing more purse money than ever before. If dog racing is permitted, it will have a serious impact. It has been proven. Let me give you an example. Florida has both. These tracks set side by side. Pompano Park has harness racing. Hollywood has greyhound. Greyhounds are outdrawing the horses, and the reasons are very simple. And may I also add this, if greyhounds don't affect horseracing, why don't these major states like Kentucky, California, and New York have them? You are going to be led to believe that if greyhound racing implemented, it will create more jobs. This is untrue. will seriously curtail the jobs presently being provided by your horse racing industry. To promote dog racing, the expense is very little, when you only have to provide purses of \$200 or so. These animals are quite easy to raise and quite easy to maintain, while on the other hand, horses are rather expensive. Many years of breeding takes place. You also have to provide purses of at least \$1,500 The competition is unfair for the horse racing or more. industry. In my district, we do have a track. provides 400 jobs. This particular track that I make reference to is not only an asset to the community, but all of western Illinois. Last year, for instance, on how this

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

track responds to the people and their needs. \$50.000 was contributed to charity in that local area. In addition, these funds will be raised for various purposes in western Illinois. Let me cite you a few examples of what will take place for the benefit of those people residing in western Illinois. On July 5th, for the benefit of the Peoria area, which is the Cosmopolitan Club, they will have a Muscular Sclerosis night. On August 25th, the Western Illinois Shrine Club will have a meeting - on September 29, the Blackhawk Shrine Club: on October the 5th, the 'Lamone' Shrine Club: the Eastern Star. The University of Illinois. Athletic Fund Baiser will be had. The Alpha Kappa Alpha will be had. The Elito - Mercer County will receive funds, the Galesberg United Way, the Peoria United Way of greater Prophetstowns winning wills - Sterling and Rock Peoria. Falls United Way, Sterling Salvation Army. The list is endless, but what I'm trying to do is enlist the aid of the downstate Legislators. In closing let me say this, I have seen many outstanding pieces of legislation presented to But, this is not going to be the point, this Assembly. when you go home the thing that's going to be in peoples mind are, were you supportive of the Greyhound racing. Let me...and before closing let me state this. And hopely that you had this in mind before you cast a affirmative vote or negative vote on this. Will this help your district, and the people that you represent? I encourage you to vote 'no' on this particular issue. Thank you.""

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Topinka: "How do our current tracks, the horse racing tracks, now

feel about this? I mean, have they given you any

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

indication of their feelings?"

- Bullock: "Well, we...Representative Topinka, I think you are out near the Cicero area, and Sportsman Park probably has an interest in the Bill. The fact of the matter is, the Harness Racing Association set up Illinois Harnes Horsemen's Association sent out a letter several days ago advocating a negative vote on the Eill. I responded with an affirmative response placed on every Members desk and answered many of the erroneous charges by the Harness Horsemen's Association."
- Topinka: "Alright, my question again was, how do the current tracks feel about this Bill? Have you talked to them? I mean, have they given you any indication?"
- Bullock: "My answer, once again, is that the Harness Horsemen's Association opposed the Bill. We have some tracks who are supporting the Bill. I responded in writing on May 25 to the charges by those individuals from Sportsmen and others who particularly have an interest in this legislation and would not like to see it pass."
- Topinka: "Okay, thank you. To the Eill, if I might. I do that this particular Bill would provide unfair competition to the tracks who are currently in effect in Illinois and which have treated this state extremely well in the kind of monies that they have been able to produce for the benefit of numerous projects throughout the state. Representative DeJaegher brought out, horse racing is an expensive industry. Dog racing is not that expensive. T+ just hits them right at...at the bottom here in basic costs. Not only that, I think it will affect jobs, especially at tracks that are already located in areas where there is high unemployment. It's going to threaten I do feel that, really, the State of them greatly. Illinois owes a debt of gratitude to the tracks that are

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

currently in effect with horse racing, and if we pass this Bill with an affirmative vote, I think we're really just closing the door on them and on a very good relationship that we've had over the years. I do encourage a negative vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fanayotovich."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Panayotovich: "Yes, Representative Bullock, would there be a problem of any sort with a combination type track, as far as running dogs and horses at the same track at them same time on the same evening?"

Bullock: "Representative, there would be no difficulty if the harness tracks chose to also run dog racing at that existing track. As a matter of fact, many tracks throughout the United States, harness and dog racing have maintained a wholesome relationship. For example, one of the most profitable horse racing tracks in the nation is located in Hot Springs, Arkansas, and in that same state we have the number one greyhound track in the world in West Memphis, Arkansas. Those are two separate instances, but there is nothing that would prohibit a track from running both activities if they so desired."

Panayotovich: "Thank you. Also, in the same line of guestioning, isn't it a fact or have you heard anything about the fact that they can run a horse race and then a dog race, then a horse race and a dog race at the same track on the same evening?"

Bullock: "That certainly could be done, and let me just say, I think that that probably would aid the sagging horse racing industry, for you know the constituents for dog racing are entirely different than those for harness racing. Harness

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

racing tends to be like polo. It's sort of a rich man's haven. Dog racing is for Joe Sixpack, the ordinary person that wants to go out, and take his family, and sit at the track and have a good time and enjoy the sport. I can't understand for the life of me why the little people of this state ought not have the same rights and privileges and certainly recreational fun-filled evenings that the affluent are entitled to. This is a little man's Bill. It's a Bill that a little man can see his name in the program and really enjoy the sport."

Panayotovich: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Right now, we in this General Assembly have an opportunity to create a whole new industry in Illinois. When was the last time we here could create a new industry. That's what we have here now. We have an industry that can create four to five hundred jobs at a track. We have an industry that will take a thousand construction people...persons to put them to work to build these tracks. We have an industry that will bring more tax revenue into the state. And I support this Bill wholeheartedly, and I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Representative Bullock, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Jaffe: "Now, you know, in Skokie, we don't have greyhounds,
Representative Bullock. We do have schnauzers, beagles,
westies and poodles. Now, under your Bill, could...could
they race?"

Bullock: "Representative Jaffe, you have my assurance that we will take that up with the Racing Board and if they desire for your schnauzer to compete with the greyhounds. You know, if you like, I'd give you a lecture on greyhounds and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

its origin, but your schnauzer probably would...would at least show. I don't know if he'd place."

Jaffe: "Well, what I'm afraid of is, you know, there is an equal protection clause in the Constitution of the United States and I do want to protect our schnauzers, beagles, and westies. You understand that."

Bullock: "I do, Representative Jaffe, and I know you are concerned about the dogs."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Bullock: "Yes."

Harris: "Representative Bullock, do you have an indication of how much revenue you estimate coming into the state because of harness racing?"

Bullock: "Yes, excellent guestion, Representative Harris. We estimate that if we can create seven tracks and we certainly think that within six months of the passage and signing of this legislation, we could be operational in this state, either at some existing tracks or new track construction. This proposal offers the state tens upon tens of millions of dollars of new construction, six to seven thousand new jobs almost immediately, and by conservative estimates, we are talking about something in the neighborhood of 45 to \$60,000,000 of new revenue that would come into the State of Illinois for the purposes that I have enunciated."

Harris: "One further question. Do you have an indication of how much money is raised nationwide from the...the states that now have tracks?"

Bullock: "Representative Giorgi, could you...Chief Joint Sponsor

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi to answer that question."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, there are tracks in 14 states and the return to the states is approximated at \$167,000,000 on a handle of a billion and a half."

Harris: "To the Eill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "I certainly commend the next Congressman from Chicago in his effort to look for new sources of revenue, new jobs in It's desperately needed, but I would guestion the need for dog racing in the state at this point. figures which were just discussed, \$160,000,000 the. nationwide in 14 tracks, that averages only \$12,000,000 per state. Why should we here in Illinois expect to reap benefits ten times better or eight times better than nationwide averages? Additionally, we are talking five to eight tracks around the state. That's a big endeavor. It was stated in Committee that for a track to be successful, you need roughly five to six thousand people daily attendance. Well, it's great to build the tracks, but if you don't get the attendance, we can employ people, but if the tracks don't make the money, those people aren't going to stay employed for very long, leads me to the next point. The people who are employed in the horse racing business right now would like to stay employed. If we move the people from employment in the horse racing business to the dog racing business, we are not helping either one. The racing privilege tax in the State of Illinois right now is significantly lower than it was in previous years. In 1981, the racing privilege to the...the revenue from the racing privilege tax dropped ten and a half percent. That's ten and a half percent one year. In 1982, it dropped another five percent. revenue from racing privilege tax receipts in 1982 was \$68,000,000 to the state. That is 1976 levels. Right now,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

we are not reaping the benefits from the racing privilege tax that we should, and I'm not...I'm not sure that the...the greyhound racing is going to expand that racing privilege tax on its own without being a detriment to horse racing in the...in the State of Illinois. I applaud his...his effort in this behalf, but I think it's ill-timed, and I would urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved.

Mr. Bullock to close. Mr. Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think the...the thing to say about greyhound racing industry that would be created in Illinois in the passage of this legislation is probably the first time in the last ten years that we could create a brand new industry and with all its attendant needs. And I think the General Assembly should know at the outset, the Greyhound Racing Bill is patterned after the Illinois Thoroughbred and Harness Racing Bill. There is no difference. Governor appoints the governing Board. They are approved by the Senate. The tax structure on the Greyhound Racing Bill is identical to the tax structure on the Illinois Harness and Thoroughbred Bacing Bill. There The...the... We heard the same arguments about the lottery and the bingo, that the lottery and bingo wouldn't make any money because the underworld were deeply entwined in those type of nefarious activities. found out that legalizing the lottery, legalizing bingo has done nothing to the underworld money they say that comes from gambling. In the fourteen states that have greyhound racing now, they are enjoying all kinds of tax dollars and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

kinds of benefits from the greyhound racing industry. a11 This Bill is identical exactly to the Illinois Thoroughbred Harness Racing Bill. The Governor has control. The people that want racing dates petition the Racing Board. The tracks in existence can have dog racing dates. You can't build a track within thirty-five miles of an existing horse track. There are urban areas in Illinois that don't attend the greyhound or the harness racing tracks in Illinois. It only takes 3,500 to 4,000 people to support a track. The handle from 3,500 to 4,000 people a half a million dollars a day. You can realize almost \$3,000,000 from each track and if you, theoretically had ten tracks, you'd get \$37,000,000 more dollars from the tax end, not counting the tourist money, the sales tax, the income tax, utility tax, liquior tax and whatever. This is one chance that I think the General Assembly alone has to create a new industry, and I urge support of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Saltsman to explain his vote."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since I was publicized Cosponsor of this legislation, I have received nothing but favorable comments from my area. I have already been contacted by two successful business organizations that would like to compete in this operation. When we look jobs that are going to be involved, 5,000 аt the construction jobs, 900 greyhound trainers and track. 500 farm workers for training, 200 cooks, admission clerk, 400 concession clerks, janitors, many more, this would be a very good project for the Peoria area with 17 and a half percent unemployment. We really

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

need this bad for our area. Appreciate your vote, your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hopp to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I really think this is a laudable effort and really, it will probably do the most good in just putting people back to work just to build the tracks. Now, the maintenance. thereof and thereafter, I think, is somewhat lacking in estimation by those who are in support of this. It's been stated there would be sizable amounts of money that would be generated. I could assure you that like amount of that that would be generated would be offset in losses that would be currently involved in the horse racing business in the State of Illinois. I don't think that we have enough states large enough in population to support the need for having a race track for dogs, and I don't think that we want to get into a business where we are actually starting one that would soon be shortlived. I really think that we are talking about a proposal to create new jobs, but this certainly would be short-term in nature."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Nash to explain his vote."

Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Bill. When the State of New Hampshire legalized dog racing, they didn't have to raise taxes. This information came to me from the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of New Hampshire during one of the NCSL Conferences. It brought in about 20% of their revenue for the year. This Fill will increase the occupancy of hotel and motels by at least 30% in this state where the tracks are located and will increase business for restaurants, groceries, gasoline and other merchandise sales. Real estate rentals and sales...will be increased around the areas of the tracks. This is a good Bill, and I

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Just...just to indicate that I have a potential conflict of interest on this, and I'm voting my conscience."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall...Have all voted who wish? For what purpose does Mr. Bullock seek recognition?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Froceed, Mr. Eullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. None of our neighboring states have greyhound racing, therefore, a large number of Illinoisans are going out of state to watch greyhound racing. They are taking their money out of Illinois. One thousand of Illinois residents go to West Memphis, Arkansas to watch greyhound racing. The only opposition to this Bill...the only opposition to this Bill has come from one one thousandth of one percent of the state's population, and that's the harness racing industry, which constitutes one one The horse racing industry is already going. thousandth. It's telling people that greyhound racing will put them out of business. With the passage of this Bill, the Greyhound Racing Commission will regulate greyhound racing. say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, with horse racing and greyhound racing prospering together in six other states, Arkansas. Florida, Colorado, Oregon, Arizona. Massachusetts, I say to you, how much more do we need to do in Illinois for a dying horse racing industry. If the public doesn't want horse racing, so be it. We don't need to give the harness racing industry a monopoly in this state. Let it die. Ferhaps the next Eill we'll enact will say that if you buy a Chevrolet, you can't buy a Ford Buick. Quite frankly, the time is now for us to stop our

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

foot shuffling to the music of the horse racing industry. The time is now. We should add competition. The public wants dog racing. It's the sixth largest spectator sport. We ought to continue to support this legislation and not he puppets of the horse racing magnates. I say, let's adopt this Bill. Let's give the free enterprise system an opportunity to work, and I vote "aye"."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 41 "ayes", 64 "nos". Hr. Eullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, what is the requisite number of votes for Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Madigan: "47."

Bullock: "I'd like, if possible, to have six people give us an opportunity to put this Bill on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bullock, I don't see anyone offering to change their vote. For what purpose does Mr. Bullock seek recognition?"

Bullock: "I'd like to request leave to place it in Iterim Study." Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave that this Bill shall be placed on the Order of Interim Study. Is there any objection? Objections have been raised which will prohibit you from placing this Bill on the Order of Interim Study. Chair wishes to advise the Membership that the Chair is attempting to clarify the rule on this question. Μy limited experience in this House is that once we start recognizing people, we get other Motions offered, which just further complicates the situation. So, if everyone could please be at ease for just long enough for Mr. Justice Getty, in consultation with others, to give us an answer. Mr. Daniels, I'm told that there are some Members who may wish to change their vote on this question. Daniels."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Daniels: "In the event that they change their vote, and it gets
 47 votes, is the Motion in order then to put it on
 Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Madigan: "I believe that the rules would provide a right."
- Daniels: "So in other words, if we want to make sure that we know
 who voted on what, we should be writing quick to get the
 official Roll Call on this one. Is that right?"
- Speaker Madigan: "That is correct. That is correct. Does anyone seek recognition to change their vote? Mr. Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Yes, would you change me to 'aye', please."
- Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Jaffe as 'aye'. Mr. Greiman. Greiman as 'aye'. Representative Currie. Record Mr. Record Representative Currie as 'aye'. Representative Record Mr. Bowman as 'aye'. Mr. Levin. Record Bowman. Mr. Levin as 'aye'. Mr. Krska. Becord Mr. Krska as 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, how many 'aye' votes have now been recorded on this Bill? There are now 47 Members recorded as voting 'aye' on this Bill. That provides the Sponsor of the Bill with a right to place this Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration, which he intends to do. Mr. Bullock. let me finish. Once a Bill goes on the Order of Fostponed Consideration, there is no Roll Call. Fine. Representative Topinka."
- Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify this Boll Call, if
 I might."
- Speaker Madigan: "The... Representative Torinka, I'll return to you after we examine the rules. For what purpose does Mr. Tate seek recognition?"
- Tate: "I'd like to change my vote to 'no'."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, record Mr. Tate as 'no'. Mr. DiPrima. Record Mr. DiPrima as 'aye'. Mr. Friedrich, are you seeking recognition?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Friedrich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall anytime in the history of this House I have a great respect for you and the Sponsor that we took 15 or 20 minutes making it convenient for someone to get his Bill on Fostponed Consideration. This is very, very unusual at a time when we need to pass some Bills."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich, I think that your point is well taken, and it relates to the necessity that we all live with each other and recognize peoples' personalities and needs. I had preferred that this Bill wouldn't even to be called. The Parliamentarian informs me that, in the event, this Bill gets 47 votes, thereby, conferring upon the Sponsor a right to have this Bill placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration, there upon, Representative Topinka would have a right to request a verification. Mr. Bullock, I will suggest that this could go on endlessly, and that eventually, there will be a Boll Call recorded. Mr. Bullock."
- Bullock "Mr. Speaker, why don't we take the Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Madigan: "No, that's not permitted by the rules. Let me simply ask, is there anyone else who wishes to change their vote? Record Mr. Hutchins as 'aye'. Record Mr. Preston as 'aye'. Representative Topinka, it's my intent to declare that this Bill has received the requisite number of votes to be placed on Postponed Consideration which will provide that there shall be no record. So what is your desire?"
- Topinka: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to be dilatory or anything, but this issue is really important in my district and in my area. I would indeed like a verification."
- Speaker Madigan: "I understand that, in effect, the Bill will fail."
- Topinka: "I understand. I would like a verification."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Let us proceed to a verification of the 'aye' vote. Mr. Clerk, would you read those recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, Berrios, Bowman, Ereslin, Brookins, Bullock, Cowlishaw, Currie, Deuchler, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Giorgi, Greiman, Hastert, Hicks, Homer, Huff, Hutchins, Jaffe, Krska, LeFlore, Levin, Matijevich, Nash, Panayotovich, Pierce, Preston, Bea, Rice, Richmond, Saltsman, Satterthwaite, Shaw, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Tuerk, Turner, Van Duyne, Vitek, White, Winchester, Woodyard, Younge, Yourell and Zwick."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Domico seek recognition?"

Domico: "Mr. Speaker, record me 'no', please."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, would you record Mr. Domico as 'no'.

Mr. Domico should be recorded as 'no'. Mr. Clerk, how
many 'aye' votes are now recorded on this guestion?

Representative Topinka, there are now 48 'aye' votes."

Topinka: "If I might check, please, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Before you begin, Mr. DiPrima would like to change his vote to 'no'? Mr. DiPrima would like to change to 'no'. There are now 47 'aye' votes. Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, first of all, is Ralph Dunn in his seat?"

Speaker Madigan: "Ralph Dunn. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Dunn from the Roll Call."

Topinka: "Alright, also too, Representative Winchester."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winchester. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman has record his voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Topinka: "Representative Richmond."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Could you repeat that name?"

Topinka: "Bepresentative Richmond."

Speaker Madigan: "Richmond. The Gentleman is not in the chamber.

Remove him from the Boll Call."

Topinka: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rea. The Gentleman is not in the chamber.

Remove him from the Roll Call."

- Topinka: "I really don't think I need anymore. I think we're below the required number."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Matijevich seek recognition?"
- Matijevich: "I was just wondering if... I don't know if it's a point of inquiry or what. I notice a Republican staff Member taking a picture of that Roll Call which really isn't official. Are we going to have another case where people are going to be circulating an unofficial Roll Call or what? He was up... up there taking a picture of that Roll Call."
- Speaker Madigan: "Well, this is a public forum. I presume he's an American citizen Mr. Daniels full rights and privileges. Mr. Clerk, give us a count. There are now 43 'ayes', 64 'nos'. This Bill fails to receive the required number of votes to pass and is hereby declared lost. Proceeding in the same Order of Call, we shall now call House Bill 1199, Mr. Vitek. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1199, a Eill for an Act to create the Illinois Horse Racing Bureau on Board. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vitek."

Vitek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think I could stand through that much with my ticker, so I'm going to be very brief so that we can get out of here. First of all, I want to clear up some

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

that this Bill will misunderstanding not affect Fund, which I was asked whether it would McCormick Place have any affect. It does not. The Parliamentarians does not affect McCormick Place Fund. agreed that it Secondly, I want to straighten out the fact that the Gentleman raised a point that the Members would be picked from the various eight segments of associations. The eight segments of associations that were named in the Bill able to only recommend the selection of their choice that the Governor might consider for appointment to the Board. Governor does not have to appoint anyone recommended The him by these associations. He can pick them from the eight race tracks. They still have to be approved and by the Senate. I can only say that I can't Governor stand any longer on this. I hope and pray that you will qive me your support as you did yesterday and the day before, and let's get on with the business and give me an 'ave' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In due Ropp: respect to the Sponsor, I will not ask any questions of him, but I will state the problems, as I see, with this proposal and leave it in your own best judgment how vote. I know that it is the Sponsor's only Bill this Session, and I know that it means much to him, just want to emphasize some of the concerns that I want to bring to you and let you make the final decision. been stated that there is some dissatisfaction on the fairgrounds where some of the people that want this major change to be brought about. There are nearly a hundred horses involved and some very few owners of those, There is a feeling that the State of fifteen. Illinois owes a few people in the state a race track

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

which to practice, building in which to house those horses, electricity, water, and housing all at state expense within some modification. There is a modest charge for rent of the stalls, and now the people are attempting to try to take care of their electrical and water bills. This is not a request by the major people who are in the horse racing business for about within the last seven to eight years. State of Illinois consolidated the The race horsing business into the Department of Agriculture, and it a most effective, most efficient manner in handling been that business. When asked yesterday what the fiscal impact was, because in this Bill we are capping the amount of money to which we would be placing in the Ag Fremium Fund, and the Fair and Exhibition Fund. There would be, in judgment, some substantial reduction in revenues that the State of Illinois would get, thus leaving more dollars the hands of the tracks themselves. It was also stated in the Bill, that there would be no more verification or inspection to identify whether or not the horses were actually bred and foaled in Illinois. There... Under this Bill, it's only a written verification from a veterinarian. I think that is a major problem, one of the major problems. It also states that there is a director to administer this Board, but no salary to which has been placed. states that there would be a laboratory to check the blood to see that they were not ... the horses were not tampered There is no indication as to where that laboratory with. how that would be funded. Now from a would be, or practical matter, on the Illinois State Fairgrounds, there is one water outlet in terms of administering how much water comes into the fairgrounds. Under this proposal, there will have to be two. As I understand it from the Commerce Commission, that is not acceptable. There is also

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

Under this proposal, there is no one electrical system. dealings to separate that out. In regards to the staff analysis as we have it stating the number of proponents, and there are eight, and I ve checked with nearly everyone of them. there is at best, two, certainly no more than three, one of which is the some twelve or fifteen people who live on the fairgrounds now that are in support of this Bill. The County Fair Association is vigorously opposed to this proposal, and four of the other proponents as stated in this particular Bill are opposed to it. Let me say to you. I think that in all practicality the horse racing industry in the State of Illinois has progressed and has thrived under its current administration. From a practical stand point, it would be most difficult to comply with this Bill in which the fairgrounds is located under total jurisdiction currently by the Illinois Department Agriculture. I think the Horse Bacing Boards, the horse racing industry in Illinois is thriving very well. should not, in my best judgment, yield to such a few people who feel that the State of Illinois owes them, housing, training facilities, and the like. If this Body feels that we should appropriate sufficient funds to do all that they want. we can on any given time appropriate the necessary funds. I have been a supporter of the horse racing business in the State of Illinois, and as you well know, have introduced appropriation Bills to assist that industry on the Illinois Fairgrounds. I certainly do not think that my endeavor to try to break up a good system is unjust. And I urge your wisdom in voting accordingly."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House, in the thirteen years that I've

been in this House, I've never regretted speaking against a

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Gentleman's Bill that I have to this Gentleman today. is a good friend of mine. He is a super, super quy, шy next door office mate, but I believe, he has been mislead with this Bill by the so call horse lady, 'Marvella'. facts are pretty well expressed by Representative Ropp, and I won't take much time. But what this Bill does also is detroys the Racing Board as we know it today and will let a few horsemen who are squatters cut at the Springfield Fairgrounds take over what would be a new Bacing Board. They will control the racing in the State of Illinois to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the track. I have discussed this with the Sponsor, and he understands must oppose it. And he and I... I've discussed it with him, and he and I are going to remain friends after this is over with, regardless how it goes. And I will ask that you vote 'no' on House Bill 1199."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fangle."

Pangle: "Thank you, Br. Speaker. I'll only take a short moment here. I received a phone call from the president of the Illinois Quarter Horse Association this morning, and they want to go on record as opposing this Eill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify something that was put into the record by the Sponsor. There are two funds which affect McCormick Place, one is an operating fund, and the other is a reconstruction fund, if you will, called the Exhibition Authority Reconstruction Fund. The Bill does affect the latter Fund, the Reconstruction Fund, but does not affect the Operating Fund. Representative Vitek made that point. I just want to make clear that that's exactly what the... what fund is effected, and that's it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vitek to close."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Vitek: "Just give me an 'aye' vote so that I can go and lay down and take a rest. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 43 'ayes', 55 'nos'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. At the hour of eleven having arrived, we shall now proceed to the Special Order of Business entitled Election Reform. The Chair recognizes Mr. Vinson for the purpose of a Motion."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. House. The Speaker, the Minority Leader, Spokesmen and staff have worked very hard to try to simplify the issue before us on this Special Call and to try to simplify an expedite proceeding on this in order that Members who have Bills on other Orders, and who wish to call and pass those Bills will be able to get to their Bills and that this Special Order will not tie up the House for the remainder of the day. For that purpose, I rise to make a Motion that the following Bills which the Speaker, the Minority Leader, and the Chairman, and the staffs have the Spokesman, determined are largely noncontroversial matters. I would urge that the following Bills be considered on one Boll Call and so move. House Bills 1856, 1203, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1565, 1566, 1812, 1898, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 2014, 2228. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, the Clerk believes that there was a minor error. Mr. Clerk, would you address Mr. Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "The first Bill that you read, you read 1856, I believe it should be 856."

Vinson: "It should be 856."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "So that the record will reflect that correction. Mr. Vinson, were you seeking recognition?"

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, so that Members will also know, after this Motions prevails, I believe the Sponsor of 1996 will ask to take that Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an agreed Amendment, that will not prevent that Bill from being heard on this Boll Call. We'll do that separately."

Speaker Madigan: "If you say so."

Vinson: "If the Motion prevails."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. And on that Motion, the Chair recognizes Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Clerk. I read that House Bill 1204 is on that Order of Special Order of Business today, and that Bill was mentioned as one that would be taken on this Boll Call. But it's my belief that that Bill went out of this House yesterday on Consent Calendar, and it should not be on this Order of Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I did not read 1204 as being one of the Bills that this Motion would pertain to."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, would you respond to Mr. Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "1204 passed the Bouse yesterday."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A number of the... I think all the Committee Chairman were trying to cooperate to help to put, I guess, this list together. Do we know that Bills that were agreed by the Chairmen and the Minority Spokesman are all on this list, or off the list, or what is the status?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn, we're on... We are now on the Special Order of Business, on page two of the Calendar entitled, Election Reform. Mr. Dunn."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Dunn: "Are they all election reform Bills?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Dunn: "Well, alright."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, it would appear that these are almost in a nature of a Consent Calendar proceeding, and I really have no objection to that, provided we have each of the Members who have not yet examined those Bills, anticipating examining them one by one, have a reasonable opportunity to examine them prior to voting on them on one Ecll Call. And I was wondering whether we will have that opportunity."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to make the same inquiry as
Representative Brummer, knowing how the Consent Calendar
was put together this morning. I think that we really
should take a little time to sort of back up. I didn't
even have time to check off all the Bills that
Representative Vinson had read off. As a matter of fact,
he skipped from backwards to forwards and so on and so
forth. I think what should happen is that we should read
these Bills very slowly. Let the Members look them over
for fifteen or twenty minutes and have the right to object
to them if they possibly can."

Speaker Madigan: "Sure. Representative Fraun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My inquiry was in line with Representative Jaffe's. We have a concern about at least two Bills on the Special Order of Business, Subject Matter-Election Reform, and would like to know whether those Bills were included in the list read off, so that we might be able to voice any objection if necessary."

Speaker Madigan: "I would propose, Mr. Vinson, that we take your Motion and hold the Motion in abeyance, while we proceed to a consideration of the other Bills on the Special Order,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

and then we could return to your Motion, thereby having given the Members an opportunity to examine the Bills that will be considered together. Okay?"

Braun: "He's going to hold it, and then we'll see a list?"

Speaker Madigan: "No. I will now instruct the Clerk to read the
Bill numbers that are contained on Mr. Vinson's Motion."

Braun: "Good. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay? So Mr. Clerk, read the numbers of the Bills contained on Mr. Vinson's Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 856, House Bill 1203, House Bill 1236,
House Bill 1237, House Bill 1238, House Bill 1565, House
Bill 1566, House Bill 1812, House Eill 1898, House Bill
1983, House Bill 1984, House Bill 1985, House Bill 1986,
House Bill 1987, House Bill 1988, House Bill 1989, House
Bill 1990, House Bill 1991, House Eill 1992, House Bill
1994, House Bill 1995, House Bill 1996, House Bill 1997,
House Bill 2014, and House Bill 2228."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill numbers read by the Clerk are the subject of Mr. Vinson's Motion that those Bills be considered at one time. We will now proceed to consideration of other Bills. We will now proceed to a consideration of other Bills in the Special Order entitled Election Reform. Mr. Clerk, is House Eill 32 one of those Bills on Mr. Vinson's list?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. We shall proceed to a consideration of House Bill 32. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 32, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Sponsor is Cullerton - Braun - Currie and Piel."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is identical to a Bill that we did pass -Representative Piel's Bill. It changes the date of the primary to the third Tuesday in April."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 32. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Will the Spon... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Giglio: "Representative Cullerton, it says here... Are we going to have another election in August during the presidential year?"

Cullerton: "No. The Bill has been amended so that it changes the date to April and not as it was originally filed."

Giglio: "Just the primaries will be in April. Thank you."

- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? All those in favor of the passage of the Bill will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 99 'ayes', 13 'nos'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 471, Representative Deuchler. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 471, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Representative Deuchler."
- Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 471 changes the procedure fulfilling vacancies and
 nomination for all public offices. Requires a vacancy to
 be filled by filing of petitions of nomination petitions
 signed by the number of qualified voters of a candidate's
 party, and the district required to have a candidate's name
 printed on the primary ballot for that office. I think

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

that many of us have spent months campaigning to be nominated, and then we find out that a candidate has been placed on the ballot as of September 1st, and it seems that... that candidates should have to circulate petitions and get the same number of signatures that we are required to provide prior to they're being placed on the ballot by a managing committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates she will yield."

Hastert: "With that affect... They still would not affect the duty of the nominating committee. Right?"

Deuchler: "No."

Hastert: "They would still have their jurisdiction."

Deuchler: "That's correct."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Taylor: "Representative Deuchler, what does Amendment #2 do to your Fill, please?"

Deuchler: "Yes, Amendment 2 gives fourteen days to file objections to certificates of nomination. It merely provides a mechanism which has been inherent in other legislation that has been on the statutes. If you have a procedure, you've got to have a mechanism to object to that procedure."

Taylor: "Does Amendment #2... It appears to me that it's the same as House Bill 472. Would that be that Bill?"

Deuchler: "Yes."

Taylor: "It would be. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd

like to speak to the Bill itself. With Amendment #2 on
this Eill, it makes a very bad Bill. County clerks from
all across the state, there were some twenty of them came

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

to file objections to that particular portion of the Bill. And it says that it... further complicates the procedure that they have today. And for that reason, I like to vote against and hope that you do not pass Bouse Eill 471. My own county clerk with many of the county clerks from downstate said this will cause them an awful lot of problems. Therefore, I move that you vote down House Bill 471."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?

Representative Deuchler to close."

Deuchler: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this wording that we have included in Amendment 2 to House Bill 471 that has just been referred to was the exact wording that was given to me by my Kane county clerk, and has been circulated with other county clerks who were very much in support of this wording. So I certainly feel that it is supported by the clerks, and would be a very good mechanism. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of this Bill will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this Bill, there are 80 voting 'ayes', 22 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 616. Mr. Huff. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Fill 616, a Fill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff."

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

House Bill 616 amends the Election Code to provide that
only person's registered to vote in a particular precinct
may apply to have a name removed from the register of
voters of such precincts. I know of no known opposition to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

this Bill, and I urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
Bill 616. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr.
Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse. Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Olson: "Representative Huff, can you give me the genesis of this particular Bill?"

Huff: "Yes. Under the present statute, Representative Olson, anyone wishing to challenge a particular register, can do so provided he lives in the ward. In the past election, we had thousands of people so challenged by one individual based on personal knowledge. When these individuals are questioned as to their personal knowledge, they just didn't have it. So this Bill will prevent those petitions from being perjurious on their face, because they just happen... they just do not have personal knowledge of the people they seek to erase. I think that by limited to the precinct, the personal knowledge would be more attainable at that level than ward wide."

Olson: "Doesn't our election authority currently provide for a number of entities to challenge, it's in place across the state precinct watch... poll watchers, election judges, county clerks, and deputies, how about units such as IVI, Project LEAP, and PUSH and all the others, was this an aberration of the last election that you referring to, Representative?"

Huff: "I... I agree with that word. It was an aberration."

Olson: "And doesn't the final authority rest with the election authority to make the determination of whether they dismiss a petition or otherwise?"

Huff: "Yes, they do."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Olson: "Well, is there any reason to change this because of a one time situation?"

Huff: "Yes, there is."

Olson: "What would the reason be, Sir?"

"Well, the reason is that the election commissioner Huff: obliged to pursue the challenge based on the affidavit signed by the challenger, based on his personal knowledge. number of people are being whatever This requires challenged to take time off from work to come in and evidence that they do live there. When the challenger is questioned as to how he came about this personal give you an example, there was one Ι challenger on the affidavit who went by a hotel that had five hundred people in there and instead of going to the desk, he just simply on the outside door and because no one answered, he challenged the five hundred registered voters that knocked him off the ballot. Eccause he filed the affidavit, the commissioner is obliged to give notice to those five hundred voters to come in and give evidence that they do live there."

Olson: "Do you have anybody that have reached you from outside the City of Chicago with regard to this subject, or is this an indigenous problem to Chicago in the recent election?"

Huff: "Well, as far as I know, it's indigenous to Chicago."

Olson: "Well, may I respectfully ask then would it be reasonable to change a well established election law, which is worked satisfactory across the state for this particular situation, or would it be reasonable to provide a Bill of this nature for counties in just over a million if that was the situation? Because we find in downstate Illinois that the current election law which regard to this works exceptionally well."

Huff: "Well, I... I don't know about downstate. I'm only

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

referring to a problem that, like you say, is indigenous to Chicago."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. May I suggest that perhaps the situation described by Representative Buff was a factor in the recent elections in Chicago, perhaps November, and perhaps in the Mayor's race. I respectfully suggest, however, that we have a well established practice in the state which permits challenges, which permits election authorities, election judges, precinct poll watchers, clerks, deputy clerks do the necessary jobs, and on that basis, I will suggest this is not a good recommendation. I would urge the defeat of Bouse Bill 616."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Nash."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Nash: good piece of legislation. All it merely does, it provides that a person who does not have knowledge of a person living in a certain address cannot go and knock him off the ballot. If someone wants to challenge someone - like Project LEAP - or somebody can bring it to the attention of the Board of Election Commissioners, or the What we have here is Judges, they can challenge. situation where people from outside the area come in and just take names off the mail boxes, or they will knock on the door and no one won't answer, and they'll just knock the people off the rolls. It can happen to the downstate happened in Chicago. just like it counties preventive measure, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fiel."

Piel: "Will the Gentleman yield to question, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Piel: "Representative Huff, the impression I have is that if a person does not live in a specific precinct, they would not

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

be able to remove them, correctly, a person challenging?"

Huff: "That's right."

Piel: "Okay. In other words, if you got... I would say probably the two biggest watchdog groups in the State of Illinois would be Operation LEAP and the Independent Voters of Illinois. In other words, with this Bill for Operation LEAP or the IVI to remove somebody from the rolls, they would have to live in that precinct. Correct?"

Huff: "I'm sorry, repeat that again."

Piel: "Under this Bill, I would say that the two biggest watchdog groups in the State of Illinois will be Operation LEAP and the Independent Voters of the Illinois, but for them to exercise their present authority to remove somebody from the rolls, they would have to, under this Bill, live in that specific precinct. Correct?"

Huff: "Well... Yes, but they would not be denied the opportunity to go to the Board of Elections themselves with the list."

Piel: "Yeah, but what you're doing, you're making it harder for them. You know, I think Operation LEAP and the IVI do an awful lot as far as the elections in the State of Illinois, and I think, you know, when you start denying them if... you know, this right to knock registered voters off of the list, I think you're really opening up a can of worms. And I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before you vote for something like this, you've got to think of the potential ramifications. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Bill. I think I know what he's trying to do, and it's a laudable cause. However, I think Representative Olson was absolutely right. The election machinery in places has worked beautifully for using years

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

and years, and T don*+ think this kind of a change is And let tell whv_ necessary. mρ VOII Everybody automatically assumes that vote fraud will take place in the City of Chicago. We all know tetter than that. Ιt takes place all over the State of Illinois. And despite Olson said, it does occur. This Bill if enacted into the law in some election precincts would require one vacant lot to remove another vacant lot from the voters registration list. It's a very bad idea. All of our districts and all election districts now contain watchdog groups, and the IVI and LEAP are only two. There are a bunch all over the state. I think it's a very bad idea, and we strenuously oppose this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brookins."

Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this Bill, because it is totally unfair for someone to come from another area unfamiliar with the streets and the situation and arbitrarily knock a person off the ballot, and therefore, depriving him of his right to vote. I, too, could go to a county in the southern part of Illinois, take a poll sheet and begin to knock people off the ballot, because I'm unfamiliar with the area and unable to find some farm house where they live. This is what has happened in the past. It can happen downstate. It can happen anywhere in the State of Illinois. For that reason, it is a good Bill, and I stand in support of it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of House Bill 616 primarily because of the fact that in areas like the Cabrini Green Housing Project, Stateway Garden, many times a person will have reservations about entering a building, and so they just systematically at random exclude potential voters from the list. So I

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

think this is a great idea, and I wish the lights for all the Members in this Body to stand in support of this fine piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. And Mr. Buff to close."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's absolutely criminal to allow an individual who don't live in the ward to make an affidavit that is, in my opinion, pejurious on its face to challenge thousands of people's constitutional right to vote. To those who have raised criticisms about this locks out the IVI, I would just simply state that the IVI and IPO can always challenge these people at the polls. I think the constitutional right to vote should be protected and takes precedence in every instance. I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nc'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this... Take the record. On this question, there are 30 'ayes', 80 'nos'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 14... Let the record show that House Bill 616 failed to pass and is, therefore, declared lost. House Bill 1455. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I remove the objection...well, Amendments to this Bill. And all it does now is raises the number of signatures for State Representatives and State Senators."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "What does the Bill do in its present form?"

Nash: "In the present form, it raises the number of signatures nominee... for a nominating petition for State Representatives from 300 to 600, and for Senators from 600 to 1,200."

• Speaker Madigan: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Fiel to explain his vote."

Piel: "Not to explain my vote. To ask the question of the Chair, where this Bill is on the Special Order of Business."

Speaker Madigan: "This number does not appear on the Special Order of Business, because it was inadvertently left off at the time of the preparation of the Calendar. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 82 'ayes', 28 'nos'. This Bill, having received... Record Representative Alexander as 'aye'. This Eill having, received 83 'ayes', and 28 'nos', and having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1460. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, do I have leave to bring this to Second Reading for Order of an Amendment?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Amendments filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Nash, the Clerk informs me that no Amendments have been filed."

Nash: "We'll take it back to Third Reading and proceed with it.

Could I have leave to take it back to Third Reading and

proceed... Can we take it out of the record for a second?"

Speaker Madigan: "We don't have to take it out of the record. We can just put it on Third Reading. Okay, so the Bill shall be on the Order of Third Reading, and Mr. Nash, do you wish to address yourself to the Eill on the Order of Third Reading?"

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill
1460 amends the Election Code. It requires the apartment
unit or room number, if any, of a voter residence be
entered on the voter registration card."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Bowman: "I believe there is an Amendment on this that requires reregistration following each decennial census. Is that correct?"

Nash: "I understand it's on there, I thought that was another Bill."

Bowman: "Okay. There is another provision floating around here somewhere, and I just wondered if it's in this Bill that requires an immediate reregistration next year for 1984.

And I wondered if... I hear over my shoulder advice that is coming up next. It's not on this Bill."

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

May 27, 1983

Nash: "No, it's not on this Bill."

Bowman: "It's not on this Bill. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Sponsor on that point, an additional question, if he will yield. Bepresentative Nash, it's our understanding... Mr... It's our understanding that the statewide mandatory reregistration was put in in a Committee Amendment. Is that true?"

Nash: "Yes, it is."

54th Legislative Day

Davis: "And so it is still on the Fill."

Nash: "Yes, it is."

Davis: "And that mandatory statewide reregistration in your Amendment occurs in 1991 and every ten years thereafter.

Is that correct?"

Nash: "That is correct."

Davis: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We are opposed to this notion. We don't think the statewide registration should be changed every year or every ten years. We think the election authorities themselves, and we think that respective parties themselves keep very close track of who is registered and who is not registered. ample opportunity is provided for reregistration and registration a person moves, or when somebody moves into town, and we know that in the good collar counties and suburban Cook County our party machinery makes sure everybody is registered in the proper form. And we don't see any need to go to the expense and to the troublesome and nettlesome discomfort for all the voters of Illinois to have to rereqister every year, every other year, or every ten years, or every hundred years, and we strenuously oppose the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Glson."

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

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

House. May I address a question to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Olson: "Steve, our analysis indicates that this Bill authorizes an additional tax levy of .02 of equalized access valuation counties other than Cock to pay for this. Is that correct, or is that analysis incorrect? This levy is not subject..."

Nash: "No, that is not correct."

Olson: "That is not correct? Is there any possibility that they may be in there? That's what we show."

Nash: "It's not my intent if there was."

Olson: "If the possibility exists all, would you agree that would be a bad possibility that downstate counties would have levy additional monies to provide a registration which already has been in place. I agree with Representative Davis that it's not necessary to do this."

Nash: "Representative Olson, if there is some leftover language that's in the Bill that... LRB left in there, I'd be glad to take it out in the Senate if this Bill passes."

Olson: "Would you be prepared to put it in Interim Study here,
Sir? Would you take it out?"

Nash: "Yes. Can we take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker?"

Olson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Take this Bill out of the record. The next
Bill will be House Bill 1485. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1485, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1485 was referred to in the conversation of the last dialogue of the people concerned with Mr. Nash's Bill. House Bill 1485 is a reregistration, and it, I think, is a necessary piece of legislation in the fact

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

that there hasn't been a reregistration in this state since 1943. During that time, forty years have passed, and many, many obnoxious remarks have been made regarding the City of Chicago in the State of Illinois as far as the voting patterns have become notorious. The reason for the Bill is forty years without total had because we've reregistration in this state, and in all those... In type of time, in that amount of time, a lot of people have been left on the voting sheets, polling sheets, and where they should be taken off, by mistake or whatever reason they we been left on. They haven t... There hasn't been a reregistration since a codification in 1943 of the Election Code of Chapter 46. In 1961, there was a mandate for a statewide reregistration, and it only affected the City of Chicago. The others opted out. In 1969, the Legislature reregistration for downstate optional authorized аn counties. There is no information available as to which counties exercised that option. Voter registration is a minimal protection against vote fraud. Theoretically, is supposed to prevent people from voting more than once. However, we are all aware of the mass of vote fraud uncovered by law enforcement agencies, investigative news reporters after the '82 General Election. Those fraudulent votes could not have been cast unless they were fraudulent obsolete voter registrations on the books that could and We have seen evidence of be use to commit vote fraud. voting in the names of people who are dead or long ago moved out of the precinct, but whose names never were removed from the registration rolls. We have seen evidence of multiple voting by one person under fictitious names in the same precinct or under his own name in different These illegal activities are not confined to precincts. the City of Chicago. For example, in 1977, the State Board 54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

of Elections pursuant to federal court orders conducted a registration canvass in a downstate election jurisdiction that resulted into the cancellation of eight thousand bogus registrations. I sit on the Elections Committee, and I believe the Lady from East St. Louis came in and gave us that information. The existing method of purging bad voter Frecinct canvassers registrations inadequate. are frequently find no one at home when they call, thus cannot verify registration in all addresses. Mail verification of registration only touches the tip of the iceberg. several people are illegally registered from a certain location and someone is there to accept the mail, verification notice will not be returned undeliverable, and therefore, not be taken off the polling sheet. The only method of purging, once and for all, the ghost and repeaters from among the six million registered voters in this state is through a statewide voter reregistration. This must be the first necessary attempt towards electoral reform in Illinois. There are several Eills now before the would tighten registration House and Senate which procedures on an effort to prevent false registration and While these Fills are commendable, fraudulent voting. terms of future address the problem in only registrations. What about the thousands ο£ bogus voters already on our registration rolls? Before there can be any meaningful reform in the administration of our voter the first remove registration laws, we must illegitimate voters from the current registration rolls. statewide accomplished bу а be This can only reregistration. If the Governor is as shocked and appalled as he says he is about the extent of vote fraud in the 1982 elections, and if his so called Committee on Election Reform chaired by two former Governors is not just another

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

public relations gimmick, he should endorse this legislation and prove that he is truly dedicated to election reform. I urge your "aye" vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Matijevich in the Chair. Bepresentative

Olson: "Speaker, will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Olson: "Representative, we've just had a massive, and apparently, a very successful registration drive in Cook County last November and this Spring. I assume that all those were valid registrations, and I think it would be a hardship on those people to have to again, or have an entity get those people back to the registration areas, which include libraries and places of that nature to reregister. So I... My question to you is that under that auspicies, don't you feel that it would be an unnecessary burden to have those people reregister again so very soon, at least, before the next election which is just a year in a half away?"

Laurino: "The concept of the Bill is to have a cross reference with your voters card as a meaningful piece of paper, not just something that you turn around and show to somebody and say, I'm a registered voter. This should have your social security number, so that's a cross reference in a binder of the Board of Election Commissioner polls. And as far as having a hardship, you know, it's just fitting that Memorial Day is coming up and people have died fighting for this country, and one of the basic elements that we're fighting for is the freedom to vote. And I think it's taken too lightly. So I don't think there is to much of a hardship by going down and reregistering properly."

Olson: "Well, while this subject isn't here, I understand within a couple of weeks we're going to be addressing a Bill coming over from the Senate which permits postcard

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

registration, registration at your friendly public aid offices, and unemployment offices, so I'm really concerned with that. Did your original Eill provide for a photograph?"

Laurino: "Yes, it did."

Olson: "And why did you remove that, Sir?"

Laurino: "Because this will prove just as effective as the photograph itself. And may I add, that why don't we worry about a Bill that's in the House and not something that's in the Senate coming over."

Olson: "Yes, Sir. That's correct. Is there any evidence, any place that you have that voter registration cards are used for fraudulent purposes, such as check cashing and things of that nature?"

Laurino: "Probably not, and because of the fact that there is no verifiable identification besides just a small piece of paper."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Olson: "Again, as we have just discussed on the earlier Bill which was taken out of the record, 1460, I believe that the State of Illinois, the various counties including Cook and DuPage and all the rest of us have demonstrated a reasonable ability to get people to the registration areas to register, I think it would be an imprudent burden and expensive one to signify that we would have to have a mass of reregistration. And I would urge defeat of this Bill."

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

Braun: "Representative Laurino, with regard to your... Would the

Gentleman yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Braun: "Representative Laurino, with regard to the reregistration requirements. If an individual is in ill health, are

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

provisions made so that person may register by mail, or register by some other method then physically going in for reregistration?"

Laurino: "No, we don't have registration by mail right now."

Braun: "Alright, so there's no provision. If a person is not informed of the reregistration requirements, then that person is just automatically stricken. Is that right?"

Laurino: "Pardon me."

Braun: "If the person is not informed that they have reregister to vote..."

Laurino: "I'm sure that if this Bill passes, they'll be well aware that they have to register to vote."

Braun: "Is there any method in this Bill provided for notification of voters that of this new requirement that they have to reregister?"

Laurino: "I'm sure the media will take care of that."

Braun: "The media?"

Laurino: "I'm sure that there will be sufficient ways in order to get this fact across to the people that they have reregister."

Braun: "But, as the elect... But the election authorities, which will be striking voters because they failed to reregister, have no obligation, under this Bill, to inform those voters of a new requirement that they have to reregister. Is that correct?"

Laurino: "That's correct."

Braun: "Representative Laurino, with regard to this Fill, are you not afraid that this Bill, if passed, would have the effect of disenfranchising a number of people purging the rolls of people who are entitled legitimately to vote?"

Laurino: "I think every red blooded American should have the ability and the entitlement to vote. This is not directed at them, this is directed at the ghost, the repeaters, the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

fraudulent people that are on the voting sheets right now."

Braun: "I... I understand that part of it, Representative
Laurino, but with regard to the affect of the Bill, there
will be... or is provision made for people who are purged
from the voter's rolls, who are legitimately entitled to
vote?"

Laurino: "Oh, that's absolutely true."

Braun: "Pardon."

Laurino: "It's absolutely true. They are entitled to vote right

Braun: "Okay, but if they fail to reregister, then they lose that entitlement?"

Laurino: "That's right."

Braun: "And there's no provision for notifying people, and there's no provision to let people get back on if an election, and they show up at the polls and discover that that..."

Laurino: "They'll have from the day that this Bill passes until 19... till the General Election of 1984. I'm sure that's enough time for you to let people know that they have to register, to reregister."

Braun: "So you suggesting that the whole voter registration initiative that's been started, particularly in areas of the City of Chicago, just start all over again."

Laurino: "Unfortunately, or fortunately, however you perceive it, yes."

Braun: "Okay. One last question, Representative. Is there a fiscal note on this Bill. Is there a cost?"

Laurino: "No."

Braun: "Involved... There is no cost involved in the actual reregistration, in terms of printing of new cards, or hiring of new judges, or hiring of judges to undertake the reregistration."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Laurino: "There was no fiscal note, and... requested. And if this Bill passes, we'll provide you one over in the Senate."

Braun: "And would the cost be borne by the state, or would it be borne by the local election authorities?"

Laurino: "Fy the state. It's statewide reregistration."

Braun: "Alright, thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Braun: "I think that this Bill would be... It will be a tragedy if this Bill were to pass. Unfortunately, I have... Representative Laurino was my seatmate last term, and I have a tremendous amount of respect for him. However, if in deed, we are going to send the message to the voters of this state that we want to purge our voter rolls, that we don't want people to participate in making Democratic systems work, I think we will be committing a grave error. Democracy requires active participation by as many people as we can possibly get to participate. To suggest to people that the rules will be changed in the middle of the game, to suggest to people that the rug will be pull from under them, to suggest that not only you have to register, but you have to do it again, and again at the whim of this Legislature, if you find out that this is a new requirement in the law, is a mistake. And I urge a *no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman... Representative Yourell for what purpose do you rise?"

Yourell: "Yes, I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, proceed."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really don't know why some of the opponents to this legislation are suggesting that there would be any hardship placed on the backs of voters, if a voter,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

statewide voter reregist... registration should take place. The greatest public service this General Assembly can offer to the citizens is the opportunity to vote and to vote legally. You heard testimony from the Sponsor of this Bill that the last statewide registration that took place in the State of Illinois was in 1943. That's forty years ago, almost a half of a century. The last registration that took place in Cook County was in 1961. Certainly, we have registrations that take place from time to time. But in order to be effective to serve the purposes and to serve the needs of all the twelve million people in this state, it should be a statewide effort participated in by all the county clerks, and all of the machinery that it takes to see that we have up-to-date polling list of people that on those polling list and legal registered voters are the ones that are supposed to be there. We heard testimony that just a few short years ago in a downstate city more than eight thousand names were removed from the voters registration list in one city of 67,000 people - eight thousand names removed from one city. I think that's a tragic event. I think it spells out the need for a statewide registration in the State of Illinois. that we're doing the job and having completed or even initiated a reregistration in over forty years is a travesty on justice. The greatest public service that you as members of this General Assembly can do is vote 'yes' on this Bill to see that the next people who are registered in this state are the legal residents and voters that everybody talks about and would like to see. I think the best vote that you can provide in this Session is a vote on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Piel."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino, to close."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has been bandied around for a long time, the idea of the concept of it anyway. And It seems that when you are a member of the Democratic organization of the City of Chicago, you always perceived as being involved in Well, I'm here to tell you that I'm a member of the Democratic organization of the City of Chicago, and I'm for vote reform. And I think that this is the first and proper step to achieve voter reform. You know, it just takes a simple signature on a piece of paper indicating that you possibly live in an address, and that you are now a registered voter from that address. But when you go to get a voters... and a library card at your local library, you need two forms of identification to get a library card. There are not any plaques and wars settled because somebody lost their library card. But when you have to prove that you are a voter, you just walk in and sign your name, and that's it. You don't even know if it's your name that..., or somebody's name that's signing yours. This is going to eliminate that possibility of ever happening. Please give it an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Laurino has moved for the passage of House Bill 1485. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... Representative McAuliffe, do you want to explain your vote?

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

record. On this question, there are 23 'ayes', 85 'nays', 3 voting 'present', and House Bill 1485... Yourell 'aye', having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Announcement from the Chair, and I would hope that the Members would listen to this. Under the rules of the House, the Sponsor of any Bill on any Calendar shall have the right prior to the commencement of the debate on Third Reading to recommit his Bill to the Interim Study Calendar of the standing Committee in which It's obvious we're not going to get all of it was heard. our work done today. There are some forms here, so maybe some of you ought to come up here and sign some forms just in case, because if we don't get to your Bill, you have the right for that Eill to go to Interim Study. The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "For in... Mr. Speaker, for intent and clarification."

Speaker Matijevich: "Froceed."

- Mautino: "Before the final adjournment is submitted today, will there be a Motion at that time allowed by either the Leadership and the Members to take whatever Bills are remaining on the Calendar to be put in Interim Study?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "I don't... I'll have to check, but I don't believe so. I think that's going to be up to the individual Members, but..."
- Mautino: "My quest... My guestion is raised only because there are some of us who have pieces of legislation that may not get to for Third Reading."
- Speaker Matijevich: "That's just why I made that announcement.

 You should have a form filled out so you have it ready to
 put up to the well."

Mautino: "Fefore the adjournment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bight."

Mautino: "Okay."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Friedrich... Winchester, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have some Bills that
 have been removed from the agreed list since the
 Supplemental Calendars 1, 2, and 3 have been made
 available. Will those Bills on the agreed list be given
 the opportunity for hearing Short Debate today?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "We hope so. If we don't get... A

 Supplemental 4 is being printed up very shortly. And let's

 proceed so we can get to all these matters. The next...

 Representative Braun, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Braun: "Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the Clerk... the well has a form for putting any Bill that is now on the Calendar into Interim Study?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Correct."

Braun: "And that way, we will avoid having called or having wait for it to be called or whatever."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Braun: "Ckay. Thank you very much."

was on the agreed list."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The next Bill is House Bill 1558.

 Representative Cullerton, for what purpose do you arise?"

 Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that this Bill
- Speaker Natijevich: "I'll check with the Clerk. Mr. Clerk, is
 House Bill, 1558 was that on the agreed list? It... it was
 on the agreed... No. No, the agreed and the Election
 Reform Bills is what we're saying. The Vinson Motion.
 Evidently not. Representative Steczo on 1558."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Bouse. House

 Bill 1558 is an attempt to deal with certain questions...

 certain questions as they relate to the Election Code and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

provisions dealing with the initiation of public policy. One of the things that House Fill 1558 does was to provide that the limitation of three propositions per ballot shall apply only to public policy propositions initiated petition and would leave that number ... would leave the cap off of those initiated by various local governments. What House Bill 1558 also attempts to do is to try to clarify some of the language and remove some of the language that was with regard to questions of public policy that were either ruled unconstitutional by the State's Supreme Court or by Cook County Circuit Courts. What House Bill 1558 does too is to take out the requirement that those groups distributing questions of public policy be required to provide also copies. It's thought that this perhaps tantamount to a filing fee, and its quest... is on a questionable constitutional ground. So that provision is being deleted. In addition to that, we're also changing... We're also attempting to change certain questions as relate to various guestions and with regard to distribution of petitions and the whole question of whether or not those petitions should be signed by people in political subdivisions, or by counties or what have you. It's my understanding from talking to the Cook County Clerk morning that there may be some difficulty with regard to the proposition limitation, and with regard to the... There are some Sections of the Bill as they relate to the distribution of certain petitions. It's my understanding that those provisions will be worked on in the Senate if the Bill gets there and will not be moved unless all those I would be happy to answer any changes can be clarified. questions, and if not, would appreciate the support of the House on House Eill 1558."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved for the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

passage of House Bill 1558. On that, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Speaker, would the Gentleman yield please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Olson: "Terry, for downstaters on the subject of this petition drive option that we're looking at here citing the City of Springfield with its Board of Election Commissioners and the County of Sangamon, let's say for example, we had a petition drive in the county, and the county people collected petitions, and the city people collected petition, what do the county people do with theirs, if it applies to a question of the city?"

Steczo: "Myron, it's my understanding, if I understand question correctly, the Bill attempts to address the problem on statewide petitions, where we had said that petitions can only be signed by people living within a political subdivision. In nine places throughout the state, we do have Suburban County Boards of Election Commissioners, County Board of Election Commissioners, also the City Board of Election Commissioners. This Bill attempts, I think, although it may not address it properly, and that's one of the things we're going to work on is that the petitions then would be restricted instead of political subdivision to county wide. So a person who may not know whether he lives in the Springfield Board of Election Commissioners or the Sangamon County Board of Election Commissioners, but knows that he lives or she lives in Sangamon County could sign that petition and then once that petition's submitted, because in most cases, the City Board of Election Commissioners and the County Clerks Office are relatively close to each other, if there has to be some random sampling, et cetera, it would be rather easy to do. This Bill may not address that properly enough.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

be some conflicts of it. The... The... It's one of the questions we intend to take care of if we get it over there. We discussed that this morning with some other parties."

Olson: "Is the genesis of this out of a recent experience within the last three or four years on certifying petitions?"

Steczo: "That's the genesis of it, and there has been some difficulties, especially for those people who are serious about conducting certain petition drives, and the restriction placed on the petition signers, especially in those nine jurisdictions that have separate City Board of Election Commissioners and County Clerk Offices, and some residents who may feel that they're not certain as to which jurisdiction they live. So we want to clari.... The attempt is to try to clarify that, sort of come to a midpoint between what the Legislature passed a couple years ago, and the way it was for the time before that."

Olson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Mr. Speaker, move the previous guestion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman has moved the previous question. The guestion is, "Shall the main the question be put?" Those in favor say "aye", opposed "no", and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would just ask for a favorable vote. And, again, answering Representative Olson's questions, and I appreciate the time that he took, any problems that we encounter with House Bill 1558 and certain questions that has arisen will be taken care of in the Senate or the Eill will not be moved."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved for passage

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

of House Bill 1558. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Bepresentative Koehler to explain her vote."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had wanted to ask a guestion. Would the Sponsor just please nod his head yes or no on this guestion? I wanted to ask whether or not the petitions would have to... With this piece of legislation, would it remove the obligation of the people passing the petitions to file a copy of the petition with the local county clerks? Would it remove that provision?"

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "I could answer that. With thirty votes, it won't do anything, but go ahead, Terry."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker to explain my vote, maybe to answer Representative Koehler's question. It does remove that, only because under the present system with any group who wishes to distribute these petitions and have to file copies, especially a group that may not have much funds, sometimes the cost can come up to two or three thousand dollars. It's thought of that perhaps this is tantamount to a filing fee, which I think I explained in my opening remarks, and it's on questionable constitutional grounds. So the purpose was to delete that particular provision and probably save ourselves from..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 44 'ayes', 61 'nays', two voting 'present'. House Bill 1558, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2013. Clerk will read the Eill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Eill 2015."

Speaker Matijevich: "13."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Clerk O'Brien: "2013, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does is to provide... provides that the rotation of the State Board of Elections Chairmanship by a political party change every two years. The Bill as amended would also require rotation of the Chairmanship among all board members of the same political party affiliations. In other words, each Democratic and Republican Board member will have an equal opportunity to be chosen as Board Chairman instead of the same two Board members rotating as chairman and vice chairman merely by reason of their prior experience as chairman. That's all the Bill does, and I would be happy to answer any questions for you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved for the passage of House Bill 2013. Representative Harris from Cook County."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."
- Harris: "Representative Yourell, my analysis indicates that this
 Bill addresses statewide recounts. Am I incorrect?"
- Yourell: "Oh, wait a minute. I'm sorry. I'm looking at the Amendment that I didn't put on yet. Yeah, I'm sorry. That...that Amendment...that Amendment is going on in the Senate. Yeah, okay. I'm sorry about that. In the recent 1982 Gubernatorial election, as you know, the canvass vote difference between the two top candidates was 5000...a little over 5000 votes, roughly about, oh, .14 percent. The Democratic candidate sought a statewide recount by

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

petitioning the Supreme Court pursuant to the statewide recount provisions of the Election Code, Chapter 46. Court already declared the unconstitutional and threw out the petition. In regarding the contested elections for the Office of Governor and Lieutenant Governor, aside from that constitutional issue, the Court was very concerned about the expense involved in a statewide recount. Further, the Court extensively detailed supposed inadequacy in the lack of...particularly in the Democratic candidate's petition relying upon...oh, case law of questionable applicability. This Bill addresses the latter part of the reasoning, not the constitutional issue of whether a three Judge panel should conduct the statewide recount. what... I understand now that the Bill is going to be amended, should it get out of the House to include the language relative to the selection of the Chairman of the State Board of Election."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Davis: "Representative Yourell, I'm more concerned with the Amendment, which I...I'm a little confused now. I know that the Amendment is to be put on in the Senate, and we knew that there was some problems with this Bill, or at least thought there were. Could you...I know it's highly irregular. Could you tell us about that proposed Amendment again?"

Yourell: "No, that's not part of this issue, Sir."

Davis: "Then we'll have...then we'll have to oppose it, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think we... I think we better hold that.

Representative Yourell has moved for the passage of House
Bill 2013. Those in favor signify by voting "aye", those
opposed by voting "no". Representative Olson, for what

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

purpose do you rise?"

- Olson: "Well, I had my light on, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry it didn't come to your attention. I just had a question..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Your light...your name goes right over the light. That's the problem we have with yours. If you'll come here, I'll show you so you..."
- Olson: "No, I...I understand. In lieu of the fact that you already have lights up on the board, I will, perhaps, explain my vote as opposed to having you dump the Roll...in the interest of getting on with it."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 65 'ayes', 40 'nays', and House Bill 2013, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Bill called will be House Bill 2014, which has been removed from the Vinson Motion is now...and is now on this Special Call in it's proper order. House Bill 2014, Yourell. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2014, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, may I make an inquiry? You said this Bill was removed from the agreed Fill list?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "That's right."
- Yourell: "Okay, thank you. What this Bill does, it...it affect only the Democratic Party and comply with the newly revised rules of the Democratic National Committee. It is nothing to do with the Republican Party and the method by which that party selects its delegates and alternate delegates to the conventions. What it does is set up new rules and provides whereby 194 delegates will be elected and how they will be chosen. For those Democrats that are interested in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

will this there 116 elected from the issue, bе Congressional Districts, 39 at large pledged delegates, party and elected official at large pledged delegates, 21 party and elected official unpledged delegates. 1 state party chairman, 1 highest ranking female state party official and the 16 alternate delegates shall be selected as follows: 38 elected from Congressional Districts, 20 elected at large, 7 party and elected official unpledged. The 116 delegate and 38 alternate elected spots shall be apportioned among Illinois 22 Congressional Districts. Participated by women and minorities is encouraged by an affirmative action plan, but no quotas were imposed. is the revised rules as set out by the Democratic National Committee, has nothing to do with Flan A, which is the plan that the Republican Party will use in selecting delegates, and I would ask for Affirmative Roll Call on House Bill 2014."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Representative stated in his opening comments that this would apply only to the Democratic National Committee Rules, to adopt those. My question is, for the purposes of intent, would this allow the Republican Farty to have any other option that they do not currently have in adopting their rules?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "The only way that can happen, Representative, is if
your State Central Committee wishes to adopt the rules that
we are going to adopt. You don't have to do that. It's my
understanding that Alternate B is the ones that will be
affecting the Democratic Party and the Republican Party
will have Alternate...Alternative A. I suggest to you that
if you want to follow the rules of the Democratic Farty in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the selection rule of delegates, why, please do so, but this in no way binds the selection of the delegates to the Republican National Convention."

Zwick: "Okay. Would... Would we have to come...would the Republican Party have to come back to this Legislature then if we decided to adopt this option, and my concern is option B? In other words, does this Bill change what we would have to do to adopt option E, or does it only address... Is the intent of this to only address those new rules that were adopted by Democratic National Committee?"

Yourell: "Yes...no, that's not... If you want to adopt that plan, as I have indicated, you may do so, but you have your own plan, I think, one or two plans floating around somewhere that will take care of any revised rules, if there were any by your Democratic...or your National Committee. This in no way affects the Republican Party. You can do whatever you want to do relative to the selection of rules. What we do with this legislation is binding only on the Democratic Party."

Zwick: "It...it would definitely be binding only on the Democratic party. Is that what you said?"

Yourell: "I didn't hear you, Ma'am."

Zwick: "You...you just said it would only be binding on the Democratic Party?"

Yourell: "That is correct."

Zwick: "Okay, and it would not provide the Republican Farty with any options that they do not now have?"

Yourell: "If your State Central Committee wishes to adopt the rules that are contained in this...this plan, then you may do so, but you do not have to do that."

Zwick: "Okay, but, do we have...you are coming to this Body now to implement this Bill to conform with the rules that were adopted by Democratic National Committee. If Republican

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

National Committee decided to do something different than they are now doing, would this give them any options that they do not currently have, or would they still have to come back to this Body with a Fill like this to implement their rules?"

Yourell: "If this Bill...this Bill is adopted, it will not interfere in any way, shape or fashion with the Bepublican scheme, Alternative A."

Zwick: "Will it affect Alternative E? Alternative B is my concern."

Yourell: "No, no, absolutely not."

Zwick: "It will not, and it is clearly intended...The intent of this legislation is to implement for the Democratic Party their rules."

Yourell: "That is correct."

Zwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Piel."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Fiel has moved the previous question. The question is, "Shall the main question be put?" Those in favor say "aye", opposed 'nay", and the main question is put. Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the issue is well clear. It's clear to all of us. I would hope that this affects only the Democratic Farty and the revised rules of the Democratic National Committee as set out for the selection of delegates and alternate delegates to the National Convention. I move for Affirmative Boll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved for the passage of House Bill 2014. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nc'. Representative Bowman's light is on. I'm not sure...Have all voted? Have

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 92 "ayes", 6 "nays", 11 voting "present". House Bill 2014, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise? "Aye". House Bill 2266, 2266, Representative Eullock. The Clerk will read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative
 Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2066 (sic 2266) amends the Election Code and has been amended on one occasion. The Amendment provided that a person is not guilty unless they fail to take reasonable action to cancel out their registration, and it's important that in this particular legislation we, in fact, provide that any person who knowingly registers in more than one precinct is guilty of violating a Class E misdemeanor. I certainly think the Bill is understood. It has been discussed on Second Beading. I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bullock has moved the passage of House Bill 2266. The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will my good friend, the Sponsor, yield?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."
- Olson: "Larry, in looking at the essence of your Bill, the principle concern that I have, and I'm wondering if this is your clear intent, to reduce the penalty for perjury from a Class C felony to a B misdemeanor? Is..."
- Bullock: "Representative, you raised that on Second Reading. I

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

indicated then that that has nothing to do with the legislation that is before us. In answer to your guestion, it is not the intent of the Sponsor, nor is it inherent in this legislation that we change penalties in that regard."

Olson: "But does, in fact, it change penalties?"

Bullock: "No, sir, it does not."

Olson: "Our analysis indicates that it does, and under those circumstances, we would have a serious concern."

Bullock: "Well, I addressed that on Second Beading, and I addressed it further here today that this legislation does not. I think, perhaps, your staff analysis has an error in basically trying to associate 2266 with a fraud provision.

That clearly is probably what you staff is attempting to do."

Olson: "Thank you very kindly."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Would the Gentleman yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Preston: "Representative, what is meant by taking reasonable means to remove one's self from the place of previous registration?"

Bullock: "Essentially, I went over that also in Second Reading also, Representative Preston. For example, you are from the City of Chicago, and in the City of Chicago, when an individual moves from one location and goes to another, they would routinely fill out on the back of their card their name and address that they are going to, send that card in. That, to me, is a reasonable effort to change one's voting address."

Preston: "Does your legislation contain provisions for the registrants on election day to have some form for someone who is registering a new...in a new precinct to be able to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

cancel their previous registration?"

- Bullock: "Well, that's done...well, that's done routinely anyway,

 Representative. When you go to a rolling place, the
 judges, particularly, of all times on an in-precinct
 registration...of all times that's where it would be
 caught."
- Preston: "You mean right now the procedure is when you register
 in a new precinct that that is by...by definition
 inherently reasonable means of taking your registration off
 in the previous...previous precinct?"

Bullock: "No."

- Preston: "Well, I'm...I'm confused. I don't want people to start committing misdemeanors if they have done nothing other than to move from one precinct to another and register in their new precinct as they are supposed to."
- Bullock: "Yeah, Bepresentative Preston, let me run over it again so that perhaps you have a full understanding of what we are trying to do. For example, the person comes into the precinct. They register on...in precinct registration day. They tell the judges that they live at place B now. They originally lived at place A. The judges would routinely provide them the necessary forms to cancel out that registration. What the Amendment did to this legislation was to tighten up the provisions to make certain that individuals do not unintentionally fall within the jurisdiction of this Bill and thus be penalized."
- Preston: "And...and your legislation provides that their...that

 the Board of Elections shall provide those forms to people
 who register?"
- Bullock: "Not in this particular Eill, but it's inherent in the administration of the Act, particularly in the Chicago Board of Elections. It's inherent in their administration of the Act."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Preston: "Okay, thank you."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Flinn moves the previous question. The question is, "Shall the main question be put?" Those in favor say "aye", those opposed say "no", and the main question is put. Representative Bullock to close."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We are all familiar with the exorbitant increased in vote fraud, both in Chicago and throughout the State of Illinois. Perhaps one of the most unconscionable acts of violating the rights of all voters is when individuals take upon themselves the act to go and register in multiple precincts. That's a violation of the law. It's a violation of one man, one vote concept. This is election reform. I certainly would urge an "aye" vote in the passage of 2266."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bullock has moved for the passage of House Bill 2266. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Well, we oppose the Eill, and I'll tell you why. Because if this is election reform, then I'm...then I am an independent, I can tell you that. The truth of the matter is, Representative Bullock has introduced criminality into multiple registrations by providing a Class B misdemeanor. What he did not tell you was that when you sign that oath and when you...when you register in a precinct, you are subject to the laws of perjury, which is a Class 3 felony. Representative Bullock would seek to have that penalty reduced to a Class B misdemeanor, which is six months in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the pokey. He has admitted that the system is inherently correct in removal, that only flagrant violators at fact in an indictment and a trial would be convicted, and by George, if they do it, they ought to suffer the penalty of perjury in Class 3."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. Representative Eullock,

did you seek recognition?"

Bullock: "Well, my...my light was on and I wanted to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry. Have all voted who wished?

The Clerk will take the record. Bepresentative Taylor
'aye'. On this question there are 38 voting 'aye', 62

voting 'no', 11 voting 'present', and House Bill 2266

having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is

hereby declared lost. We will now revert back to the

Vinson Motion. The Vinson Motion, there are certain Bills

that have been read a third time, and on that, I call the

Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request that before we move to that particular Motion that you offer the Sponsor of - I believe it's House Fill 1996 - the opportunity to move his Bill back to Second for an agreed Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, we'll do that...House Bill 1996.

The Gentleman asks leave to return Bouse Bill 1996 to the
Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment.

Does he have leave? Leave. The Bill is on Second Reading.

The Clerk... Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Olson - Davis."

Matijevich: "Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson, on Amendment #1."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 comes about as a request by Representative Cullerton to more actually define what our

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

intent was, and what Amendment #1 does, it removes the requiring...requirement of lodging house residents must vote by affidavit. It provides a Class 4 felony if lodging house owner does not file a list of residents with the Election Authority. So, in light of the fact that this is an agreed Amendment, I would move the adoption of Amendment #1 to Bouse Bill 1996."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say "aye", opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Gentleman from Dewitt,

 Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "In regard to that, I would ask leave for House Bill 1996...to use the Attendance Boll Call for 1996 to be considered on Third Beading today."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Leave that House Bill 1996 be heard on the Third Reading. Leave. Has that been read, Jack? Alright, alright. Will you renew your Motion, Representative Vinson?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that the following Eills on the Subject Matter of Election Reform be considered on one Boll Call. Those Eills are House Eill 856, 1203, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1565, 1566, 1812, 1898, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 and 2228."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. You've heard the Motion and the Clerk will read those Eill. You want to move to adopt that Motion?"
- Vinson: "I move...I move that the House now adopt that Motion."

 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves to adopt that Motion.

 Those in favor say 'aye', opposed... Representative Dunn,

 for what purpose do you rise?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm the only one who wishes to vote 'yes' on some of these Fills and 'no' on others. I don't want to be an obstructionist, but I would like an opportunity somehow to be recorded 'yes' on some and 'no' on others. And I think there are others in here who wish the same thing."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Madigan in the Chair. Mr. Vinson has offered a Motion and, Mr. Vinson, I apologize.

 I was preoccupied. Could you just state the essence of your Motion briefly?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the same list of Bills that I read before, and I'd be pleased read that again, if you so wish, with the exception of 2014, which we already acted on, be taken on one Boll Call."
- Speaker Madigan: "Alright, Mr. Vinson has moved to take a number of Bills on one Boll Call. Mr. Vinson, I would think that there would be general sentiment in support of your Motion. However, at the same time, I think there will be some Members who wish to be recorded probably "no" on certain of the Bills. And, therefore, the question to the Chair would how can we afford those Members an opportunity to be recorded 'no' on certain of the Bills? Mr. Vinson, we have two options available. Number one, Members could ask to be recognized from the floor. They could read into the record those Bills where they wish to be recorded 'no', or in the alternative, they could be asked to come to the well and file a statement with the Clerk. Now, obviously, filing the statements with the Clerk would be more expeditious. However, I would want all Members to be comfortable with that type of procedure before we would move to that type of procedure. Let us just try the filing of the statements and see how it develops. So the Gentleman has moved consider several Bills on one Boll Call. On the question

370

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

of the Gentleman's Motion, now this guestion does not relate to the passage of a Fill. This guestion relates to the consolidation of several Bills on one Boll Call. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Just one additional question of procedure, Mr. Speaker.

Are you suggesting that those of us who wish to vote for some Bills and not others vote 'yes' on the package and come down to the well and submit a list of 'no' votes, and then we will be recorded as 'yes' on the ones recorded on the...electronically, and 'no' on the ones we submit a list on? That's fine with me. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "That is what I propose. On Mr. Vinson's Motion, all those in favor will signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting "no". This is a Motion for consolidation of several Bills on one Boll Call. Have all voted who wish on the Motion? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 6 voting 'no'. The Motion carries. For what purpose does Mr. Brunsvold seek recognition?"

Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, what would be the time frame for this casting of 'no' votes for certain of these Bills?"

Speaker Madigan: "Not having given a great deal of thought to it,

I would think before the close of business today."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to have a list of those Bills read once more?"

Speaker Madigan: "If you wish. It would be the third time. Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what if, in the event enough
people change their "yes" vote on the board to a "no" vote,
that it changes the outcome of the Fill. Then where are
we?"

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The Eill would fail."

Flinn: "Okay, you're not going to announce that they all passed then?"

Speaker Madigan: "I think that's the reason why we should finish this before the close of business today. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, I don't think the Eill would fail because what would happen is that last person who would put that vote in to change where it would reduce the passage, could not change his vote, according to the rules, I believe. Well, somebody tells me we changed that rule. Alright, forget it."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, it seems to me that we could take a Roll Call and not declare the results until later in the day."

Matijevich: "I think that things...I think things are going to work out anyway."

Speaker Madigan: "Right. So, let us proceed to the main question. The main question is, 'Shall the Bills pass which have been enunciated...okay. Mr. Homer, the Clerk will proceed to read the Bills. So this will be another reading of the Bill numbers. Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for the accommodation. I have received a list of the Bills and as for me, I have no further desire to have them read."

Speaker Madigan: "But the Constitution does."

Homer: "Oh."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Clerk, read the Bills."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 856, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1203, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Eill 1236, a Eill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1237, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Fill 1238, a Bill for an

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1565, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1566, a Bill Codefor an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1898, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1983, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1984, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1985, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Bouse Bill 1987, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1988, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1989, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1990, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1991, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1992, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Beading of the Bill. House Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act in relation to disqualification from public office and public employment for conviction of election Third Reading of the Eill. House Bill 1996, a perjury. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1997, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The Bills having been read, the question is,

'Shall these Bills pass?' All those in favor of the

passage of the Bills will vote 'aye', all those opposed

will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

who wish? Mr. Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, it's kind of hard to explain a vote on 20 or 30 Bills at once, I suppose, and because of the process set up here. I want to clearly indicate that I'm going to go up and change my 'yes' vote to 'no' on a number of Bills. already are pushing prisoners out of the back door by trying to put more people in the front door. Director Lane indicated that we needed to build a new prison every eight weeks in order to keep up with the inflow of prisoners. Now, I would respectfully suggest that some of the Eills in here are going to increase the difficulty of getting election judges to serve. Little old ladies in my district who get paid \$45 a day and suddenly find out they are going to be subject to possibly a Class 3 felony for some activities are going to be extremely reluctant to...to serve as election judges or other things that could cause them to lose half their pay. I would suggest that everyone who is voting on this look at the entire list very carefully and select those that they want to vote 'no' on pursuant to the procedure set forth here."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record...Representative Alexander to explain her vote."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe this question...question is cut of line, but how will we, as Members of the General Assembly, know which of these Bills did receive the correct amount of votes and which may, by slips that are coming in now, would not have passed?"

Speaker Madigan: "I will...I will announce that before we close business today. Okay. Have all voted who wish?

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes' and 3 people voting 'no'. I will defer the announcement of the result of this Boll Call until the close of business to afford an opportunity to those who wish to record themselves differently than they are now recorded. The next Bill will be House Bill 2012, Mr. Preston. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Erien: "House Eill 2010..."

Speaker Madigan: "2012, 2012, Mr. Preston."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2012, a Bill for an Act relating to public financing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Freston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 2012 has been thoroughly debated in the past. What the Bill does is to create a new public financing of gubernatorial elections in Illinois. It puts limits on the amount of contributions that individuals, corporations, that labor unions, that political committees can make to candidates for Governor Lieutenant Governor in Illinois. It puts limitations on the amount of money that can be expended in the races for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Illinois. It requires that any funds left over from a gubernatorial campaign unexpended shall be returned to the General Revenue Fund and those funds may not be used for the personal expenditures of the individual candidates. This is a Bill that comes as a result of long and diligent bours Madigan, people in the Senate. Speaker bу bу Representatives in the House, by common cause, by many groups that are interested in seeing this type of election reform so that the public's perception of the influence that individuals have over the highest office in Illinois is not undue. We've debated this Bill. I encourage

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I'm not going to go through all the numbers and figures that I've used in the past few days to debate the However, I will say this, that I've sat down with a pen and a piece of paper and I've analyzed every figure been discussed on this Bill. that's I've used Preston's figures. I've used my own figures. I've used figures from the Federal Election Board and I can in no way figure how this fund will raise enough money to accomplish it's purpose which is to pay for gubernatorial candidates. Money will be required to come from the General Revenue Fund to pay for the next election of a Governor in this This is not a Bill which is going to be private state. check off funding. This is a Fill which is going to require involuntary dollars from taxpayers who decide they do not want a check off to pay for someone to be elected as Governor. This is a terrible Bill. This is a Bill which goes beyond what I'm speaking. This is a Bill which is a foothold in the door to complete public financing of all elections on the statewide offices. Now, perhaps, some of you think that maybe that's not such a bad idea. if we amend this Bill in the Senate, we can get to the point where those of us in the General Assembly will able to dip into public funds for our election campaigns, and perhaps, that would be a good thing. Because as I think about it, perhaps, the Members of the other side of the aisle...side of the aisle who sometimes worry about the independents and the Bepublicans challenging them in the City of Chicago might like to have some of those people financed by public funds. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I don't want to plow the ground any more than we have in two previous conversations. I just want reiterate to the Bill a couple of things that concern us over and above the fiscal impact that Bepresentative Churchill just made reference to. We are a little bit concerned with the service-in-kind type of application that might be offered to candidates with regard to canvassing, materials, manpower and things of that nature. We are concerned about the fact that in states where they have had this type of program in place it draws an unusually large field, and in effect, dilutes the process whereby the two political parties that basically represent the majority of people are given an opportunity to act as they might. the The fiscal note that was filed, as amended, addressed the issue of how the State Board of Election would appear this to be, and I would suggest that this is not the time the State of Illinois to go to a public financing concept. I believe that the proliferation PACs as has been exhibited at the federal level is an indicator of the things that we might exhibit here. while I have a tremendous amount of respect for the Speaker, who is the lead Sponsor, and the other Sponsors in this Bill, I...respectfully suggest that we look very hard at this and consider a 'no' vote on Bouse Bill 2012."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, people in Russia pay taxes to support candidates they don't like. I don't particularly want to do that, and I don't think we ought to be engaging in that in Illinois. Paying taxes to hold free elections is one thing. Paying taxes to support some candidate you don't want is another thing."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Freston to close."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, as I have said, is needed. It's needed now. There has been a clamor for this type of legislation so that we can feel comfortable that no group or individual or organization is controlling what appears to be undue influence over the highest office in Illinois. For that reason, I would encourage your 'aye' vote. This is not a tax Bill. The money is all provided by voluntary contributions of tax dollars. It's not an increase. So I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, 'Shall House Fill 2012 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "That would clearly be dilatory because the Bill is failing by five votes and there is only four absentees."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Leverenz seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "I'll help that out. Convert me to a green."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. Mr. Bichmond."

Richmond: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Richmond as 'aye'. Mr. Pangle."

Pangle: "Vote me 'aye', Mr. Speaker, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Becord Mr. Pangle as 'aye'. Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Stuffle as 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, would you proceed to a Poll of the Absentees?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Christensen, DeJaegher,
Kulas and Rhem. No further."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Becord me as 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Hannig as 'aye'. Record Mr. Kulas

54th Legislative Day

- May 27, 1983
- as 'aye'. Mr. Homer. Becord Mr. Homer as 'aye'. Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, you seem to be having about as much trouble with this Bill as Mr. Bullock, and I think a verification might be in order as a result."
- Speaker Madigan: "You request a verification I can...Mr. Yourell.

 Mr. DeJaegher would like to be recorded as "aye". Mr.

 Brunsvold would like to be recorded as "aye". Mr. Clerk,

 how many votes does the Bill have? 64 votes, Mr. Vinson.

 Mr. Clerk, would you read the affirmative votes?"
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Erockins. Erummer. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Cullerton. Currie. DeJaegher. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Parley. Flinn. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hannig. Homer. Hnff. Hutchins. Jaffe. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Marzuki. Matijevich. McGann. McPike. Mulcahey. Nash. O'Connell. Fanayotovich. Pangle. Pierce. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, how many votes does this have?

 There are 64 'aye' votes. Mr. Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified at this time."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mulcahey shall be verified as an 'aye'
 vote. There are 64 'aye' votes, Mr. Vinson. Do you have
 any questions?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Berrios."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Berrios. Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call. Gentleman is at the front of the Chamber, Mr. Vinson."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Vinson: "Mr...I beg your pardon? Oh, I see."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman is...restore Mr. Berrios to the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr...I'm sorry. Mrs. Currie."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie. In the rear of the Chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Domico."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Domico from the Boll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig is in the center aisle."

Vinson: "Mr. Huff."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Buff is in the center aisle."

Vinson: "Mr. Krska."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Krska is in the rear of the Chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Panayotovich."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Panayotovich is in the rear on the Republican side."

Vinson: "Mr. Butchins."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hutchins is in his chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Pangle."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fangle is at his desk."

Vinson: "Mr. Laurino."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Laurino. Mr. Laurino is at the Clerk's well."

Vinson: "Mr. Stuffle."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle. Is Mr. Stuffle in the Chamber?

Is Mr. Stuffle in the Chamber? For what purpose does Mr.

Cullerton seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "You might want to inquire of the Parlimentarian,
Representative Stuffle was in the Chamber and personally
changed his vote orally to 'aye', so he's already on the
record as..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle is in the rear of the Chamber."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Cullerton: "Hope that didn't take too long."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Taylor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor. Bemove the Gentleman from the Roll

Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Rea."

Vinson: "Mr. Turner."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner. Remove the Gentleman

from the Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Hea recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no"."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor is in the rear of the Chamber.

Restore Mr. Taylor to the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Leverenz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz is in his Chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Curran."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Curran is recorded as *no*."

Vinson: "Mr. Fierce."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pierce is in his chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Doyle."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Doyle is in his chair."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question, there are 62 "ayes" and 52 "nos". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McPike. The Chair recognizes Mr. McPike regarding a clarification regarding the posting for Committee consideration of Bills next week. Would the Members please give their attention to Mr. McPike?"

McPike: "The night before last we read a Motion into the record and just to clarify if there is...to make sure there is no misunderstanding, the Minority Leader has been consulted on this. The deadline for posting of Senate Bills will be

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

next Tuesday at the hour of twelve noon. Those Fill will continue to come to the House this afternoon, and they will... then they may be posted up until next Tuesday at noon, and as we said the other night, there will be no Bills...no Senate Bills posted unless a House Sponsor signs up for the Bill. And there are still numerous Bills on the Calendar coming...that have come from the Senate, and there is more in the well that do not have Sponsors. So, with that...with that only exception, the Motion I made the other night just should be clarified to make sure that everyone understands that noon Tuesday is the deadline for posting."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall now move to a consideration of Supplemental Calendar #2 and Supplemental Calendar #3, and on those two Calendars, we shall consider the category of Abortion. And on that category, the first Bill to be considered will be House Bill 671, Hr. Greiman. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 671, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First I would like to have this taken off of Short Debate and ask leave for Members to join me to have the matter removed from Short Debate."

Speaker Madigan: "It would appear as if you have a sufficient number, Mr. Greiman, so this Bill shall be considered on the Order of the Regular Debate Calendar. Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a problem often in having our feelings about various issues meeting the technology of a society.

Millions of women are unable to become pregnant and not because they're...they are infertile, but because, often,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

their Fallopian tubes may be blocked and...irreversibly so, so that they may not conceive, even after surgery. terms of men, often a husband has an extremely low sperm count and fertilization in the Fallopian tubes is often all but impossible. So science, to afford parents the right...the right to parent and I call it a right to parent, has developed invitro fertilization, fertilization of the egg, the coming together of the egg and the sperm outside of the body of the female. The process, basically, if I may, if I could have your indulgence, is to remove the ovum, to incubate the sperm, to inseminate and place them together or fertilize them, to observe the division and the cleavage of those cells and then to reimplant those cells, that fetus, because it is now a fetus, back into the uterus. And nine months hence, hopefully, a child will born, parents will be happy and grandparents will be even more so happy. In...in 19...I think '78 or '79, we passed a Section of our Abortion Act that dealt with invitro fertilization, and what it provided was an Act which suggested quite clearly that anyone who helps in invitro fertilization process somehow has a custodian...a custodial and a custodian responsibility to that fetus and then, subsequently, because there is no time limitation, to that child that is born. So the ... and I... I asked the Sponsor of that Bill at the time, could it...and I asked it kind of humorously, could a doctor who helps deliver or a nurse who helps in the...in the invitro fertilization process be somehow called upon years later to pay for appendectomy for a child, and the Sponsor of that Bill said 'ves'. He said 'yes', and that's in the record. It is a... It is indeed a chilling statute, chilling effect on invitro fertilization. There are parents in Illinois who have gone and sought, because of this statute, sought

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

invitro fertilization process outside of the state. A case recently filed asking that it he declared unconstitutional. Both the Attorney General of Illinois and the State's Attorney of Cook County suggested that they intention of enforcing it because it was somewhat had no unenforcable. And more or less on that basis, and on the basis that the process that the hospitals involved use was somehow a different process, because of that, the case dismissed. Nonetheless, legal cloud exists fertilization...over invitro fertilization in Illincis. To the Committee Hearing...at the Committee Hearing, who are...and, you know, I must tell you, I view this...I view this because I'm a parent of six children. have enjoyed being a parent of six children. It is frankly the most important thing in my life. But at the somehow it got not to the right to parent, but in the right to choice versus right to life, and there was a question of or somehow this Eill would allow whether nat At that time we got experimentation on fetuses. all and I said, well, it's not my intention to allow experimentation on fetuses, to change one icta statute with respect to that. And, in fact, this statute does not because all this is is a repealer of the fertilization. If you will follow me, because there are many who are concerned about this. the Abortion Act fetus as...it means a human being from describes а fertilization until birth. So that once the invitro fertilization has taken place, that is a fetus. The Illinois Abortion Act provides and definitely prohibits any person to sell or use any fetus in any either prior to or subsequent to experimentation aп Well, an invitro fertilization is abortion procedure. abortion, clearly prior to an so that Section

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

3...Subsection 3 of Paragraph 6 of the Illinois Abortion Act clearly would prohibit any experimentation with invitro fertilized fetuses. There is no question. It needs no further Amendment because...and frankly, if I had that out at the Committee Hearing, I would have pointed that out to the people at the hearing. In my judgment, there is no necessity for an Amendment because clearly Section 6, Subsection 3 would prohibit any experimentation on fetuses. Accordingly, make that part of the record here that it is not the intention of this Bill to vary the Abortion Act of Illinois one iota by repealing the invitro fertilization provisions. I am sensitive and I am understanding of the great differences and the great gulf that divide many of us on issues. But on the right to give people the opportunity to be parents, there is no gulf and I ask, therefore, that you give the appropriate number of votes, 'aye' votes, to House Eill 671. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was present for the hearing before the Judiciary Committee on this Bill and, fortunately or otherwise, this apparently is a pro-life issue. It is a decision between pro-life supporters and pro-choice supporters, and I'd like The law in Illinois does not prohibit to tell you why. invitro fertilization. The ACLU and other parties brought a suit in Federal District Court of the Northern District claiming that the law unconstitutionally prohibited invitro fertilization. The issue was not thrown out of Court on the basis that people do not have a constitutional right to invitro fertilization process. The case was instead thrown out of Court on the constitutional issue only because the Court held that the law did not prchibit the invitro process of fertilization. It was that simple holding that

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

results in making this a pro-life issue. If, instead, the Court had said that that was a ... an unconstitutional prohibition on the right to invitro. then we would talking a different issue. But because it has been held by the federal courts in Illinois not to prohibit invitro fertilization, that we are, in fact, confronted with issue other than what the Sponsor has told us, and that, frankly, is experimentation. The experimentation on fetus, on a human embryo can be done, if this Bill is passed, for therapeutic or for nontherapeutic purposes. question then becomes. ďο we want to allow nontherapeutic experimentation on embryos, on fetuses? even if you believe that that is a proper use of scientific process, then consider this question. Does State of Illinois, does this General Assembly want to give carte blanche to experimentation on fetuses? Remember. there is no limitation on the experimentation process if this Bill becomes law. Now, as I say, even if that that's proper, shouldn't the public be fully informed as the process of human experimentation is undertaken? Shouldn't the public of the State of Illinois be consulted, be informed on the issue of whether or not experimentation is going to progress? Don't we want to know what genetic engineers propose to do before they do it? It is a pro-life issue, and I ask you to vote on that basis, but if you cannot agree with that position, consider the public policy involved. If we do not say no to this Bill, then the experimentation, then the engineering goes without any public input, and I think that this is the quintessential area of public concern, the area that should be subjected to the most close public scrutiny before it takes place. So, I ask you to oppose the Bill. Thank you."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?

Bepresentative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Cosponsor of House Bill 671 for some personal reasons as well as for philosophical reasons. This, as the Sponsor said, is a Bill aimed at helping childless couples have a baby to hold and love and grow with through the years. the present time, even though the Court threw out what many interpret and hold...held that the law did not prohibit invitro because the law is still on the books, as Sponsor pointed out, it does have a chilling effect on the hopes of many couples to obtain this procedure in Illinois. The Illinois Abortion Law of 1975, Chapter 38, Subsection 81-2067 states in part that any person who intentionally causes the fertilization of a human owns by a human sperm outside the body of a living human female shall be deemed to have the care and custody of a child for the purposes of Section 4 of the Act to Prevent and Punish Wrongs Children. . That. to me, seems perfectly clear uncontrovertible evidence that that particular statute likely to cause many couples to hesitate and to have to travel outside the State of Illinois to obtain this I do not believe that passage of 671 gives procedure. carte blanche to experimentation on fetuses. I believe that the problem revolves around the definition of what is experimental and that in that case, because this is so new, the whole process is experimental, and might be properly defined as an experiment and, therefore, the whole thing could be thrown out. If you have been childless yourself for a number of years, and my husband and I were childless for seven years before we had a baby, you will know what I'm talking about when you say that it is a time in your life when you think that most everyone on the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

street either has a child or is pregnant, and you wish so very deeply that you and your husband might also become pregnant and be able to have child and raise children. And I think that probably all of us in this House know of couples who are trying desperately at this time to obtain a healthy pregnancy. A procedure has been developed to help those women who have blocked Fallopian tubes achieve a pregnancy, and I would ask in their name and for those babies, as yet unborn, who can be wonderful healthy kids, to vote 'yes' on House Bill 671."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Let пe just read what language Representative Greiman's Bill is striking. 'Any person who intentionally causes the fertilization of a human ovum by a human sperm outside the body of a living human female shall, with regard to the human being thereby produced, be deemed to have the care and custody of a child for the purpose of Section 4 of the Act to Prevent and Punish Wrongs to Children, approved May 17, 1877. That's what he is striking with this Bill. Then he added an Amendment. The Amendments says, 'No person shall subject a fertilized produced by fertilization by the human ovum process known...oh, that's right. I forgot. The pro-life movement said that they couldn't put this Amendment on. The Amendment was to make it clear that there could be no experimentation. If you come from a district where you have to vote with the pro-lifers, where you have no choice, then you have to vote *no*. If you come from a district where you have to vote with the pro-choice people, then you have to vote 'yes'. There's a few of us left who can actually vote the way we want to on this Bill, and I think it's a good Bill. And I would hope that those of you who

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

come from those districts where you can vote you conscience can vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fiel."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. Mr. Greiman to close the debate."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I would correct the Gentleman from DuPage, and I House. would point out that the case did not, in fact, find the statute was constitutional. Instead, it bypassed it and it said that the plaintiffs had no standing to because the Attorney General and the State's Attorney had decided that these specific plaintiffs would not presecuted. So that there is no opinion that has rendered this constitutional, and it may well be unconstitutional when the proper case is before the Court, but that's immaterial. There are legal, there are moral, there are judgmental problems that are raised by a new technology that we will have to deal with. Artificial insemination, surrogate mother, all that business, we will have to turn our attention to eventually, and we will hav∈ hopefully, in God's good time, give it thoughtful and intelligent analysis. But what we have here in this current Act that this Bill seeks to repeal is just a kind of a bizarre approach to ... "

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you...using some ancient statute to somehow dovetail in with a kind of a fear about a new...a new process. So that, we will have to give some attention to this, but this statute that we have passed four or five years ago just makes no sense, and I ask you just to give

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

671 an affirmative vote. Bemove that and let us go forward then, all of us together, and think about the problems that all of this...all of this new technology is presenting us. Accordingly, I ask that you vote 'aye' on 671. Thank you very much for your attention."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting "no". Mr. Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, less there be any doubt, you unequivocally state that the...number one, the right-to-life people are opposed to this Bill absolutely, and I guess Representative Cullerton delineated the situation there. But I...I would respectfully suggest that there are a lot of right-to-life people who may not live in districts that feel they have to politically vote right-to-life but they vote right-to-life because they think that's right. They think that life is precious, should not be used for experimentation. There is no protection within this Eill regarding experimentation, and I would respectfully suggest that those people that vote their conscience can also vote 'no' on this to protect the right-to-life."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie to explain her vote."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to make the point that this is a pro-life Bill, and the right position for those of you who are pro-life is to vote 'yes' on House Bill 671. The whole point of this process is to see to it that people who have problems of fertility can bear babies. This is a Bill that makes families. This is a Bill where people who care about life should be voting green."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hawkinson to explain his vote."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am for invitro. I am also pro-life. I'm disappointed in the pro-life stance on this

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill because they had a chance to make this a good Bill. They had a chance to offer an Amendment that would have prohibited all experimentation and they refused to do that, and I'm very disappointed that they didn't. However, because they did not prohibit experimentation and because invitro is not presently prohibited by the law and is, in fact, being done in Illinois, I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Dunn to explain his vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Dunn: House. I'm going to vote for this Bill on behalf of a couple who are well known to me in downstate Illinois. husband testified in support of this legislation at the Committee hearings, and I guess you'd call them pro-life because they feel that the only hope they have of having children is to subscribe to the waiting list at Mt. Sinai Hospital, which will cost, according to our analysis, about \$4,500 per attempt to have invitro fertilization. cannot get into any other hospital in the State of Illinois because they are afraid to proceed with this procedure because of the exposure to liability. I think if we would pass this Bill, it would make this procedure available to more people who are so pro-life that they would do almost anything to have children. I don't see how anyone can vote against this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Zwick to explain her vote."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I am really shocked to look up there at that Boll Call. I cannot believe that everyone of you sitting here are going to say that you don't think that someone who wants a child as badly as those people that are willing to go through the years, the tests, the trauma, the unbelievable experience of not being able to have a child and then having some hope, a very minute one, but a hope, the only hope that may

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

exist for them to have a child of their own and you are going to say that they can't do it? That ... that it would be wrong in some way? What could possibly be wrong about allowing a doctor to perform a medical procedure that has finally become a reality after years and years of trying to perfect something like this. Each one of you are willing to go home and say to those maybe very few people who live in your districts that are unable to conceive naturally that you don't think they should have the right to have their own child like most of us here probably do. Ι you to think about them, not the special interest groups who told you all kinds of things about what this Bill way It's a very, very simple Bill. It eliminates the crime that is currently in the Abortion Code. It is not a It is not ... It should not be illegal. It should crime. not be addressed in the Abortion Code. It has nothing to do with abortion. It is for those who want desperately, beyond belief to have children. Please, vote 'yes'. on."

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

who have children probably realize that the thrill of your first born, your second born and every other child that you have, that thrill goes beyond most of other life experiences. It is something that we should not deny to people who want so badly to be parents that they will go through this extraordinary effort. It's not easy to go this route. It is not certain to go this route. We should not be requiring that they have additional handicaps of not knowing whether the action they are taking is legal or unlegal. I think that we should provide them with a way of knowing that there is nothing clouded about the Illinois

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

law. If they choose to take this difficult route to bear the child that they care enough to have, that they are certainly going to care enough to care for. We have problems of people having children who do not have that kind of loving attitude, but certainly in this case, the extraordinary action that they have to take gives them a much stronger commitment to making a good effort to be good parents."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 47 'ayes', 63 'nos'. Mr. Greiman."
- Greiman: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Flace this Bill on the Order of Fostponed Consideration. The next Bill...Mr. Greiman."
- Greiman: "Let it...take the record and let...invitroly unfertilized."
- Speaker Madigan: "The...Gentleman withdraws his request for Postponed Consideration. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost.

 House Bill 720, Mr. O'Connell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 720, a Fill for an Act relating to the notice of abortions performed on minors and incompetents.

 Third Reading of the Fill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave at this time to bring House Bill 720 back to Second Reading for purposes of the...tabling Amendment #1 and adopting a second Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. John Dunn seek recognition? The Gentleman objects to your request for leave, Mr. O'Connell. Do you wish to move?"
- O'Connell: "I wish to move then, for a Holl Call vote to bring it back to Second Reading for purposes..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman...Mr. G*Connell moves to take this

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Motion to take the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 86 'ayes', 13 'no'. The Motion carries. The Bill is now on the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. O'Connell for the purpose of a Motion."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time, I'd like to table Amendment #1 that had been previously adopted."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Would the Sponsor explain what Amendment #1 does?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

O'Connell: "Yes, Amendment #1 provided language that will be contained in Amendment #2. If you wish, the language that is the subject of both Amendments provides that if a parent accompanies an unemancipated minor to perform the abortion, to have abortion performed that notice is not required. It was discussed. It was debated. That...that language, however, is included in Amendment #2 which I will purpose, which also has some technical language."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the guestion is, 'Mr. O'Connell's Motion to table Amendment #1?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, O'Connell - Terzich - Pullen, amends
House Bill 720."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell. Mr. O'Connell."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 again contains the language found in... in Section, on page four, Section... Mr. Speaker, the Amendment #2 contains the language that provides that if a child is accompanied by a parent to the abortion setting that the notice is not required for that particular parent. It also contains a good deal of technical language that cleans the Bill up in terms of grammatical correctness and also affords the Bill much more palatable."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Terzich, amends House Bill 720 on page..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, O'Connell, amends House Bill 720..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell. Mr. O'Connell on Amendment #4."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I do not have Amendment #4. Oh, yes,

Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 is also a technical Amendment

where it deletes 'and are', and simply inserts in lieu of

'are'. It corrects the Amendment #2 which needed one more

grammatical correction. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

54th Legislative Day

- May 27, 1983
- House. I would now move that it be to Third Reading. I'm sorry Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. John Dunn seek recognition?"
- John Dunn: "Well, I've heard two Motions. I object to whatever his Motion is."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has not offered a Motion. He was beginning to formulate his thoughts, so Mr. C.*Connell is recognized to speak to this Hill on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. O.*Connell."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, point of order, please. Is this to consider... Is this leave to move to have it considered on the same day, or are we actually beginning to debate on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell, you will be required to suspend the rules in order to consider this Bill on the Order of Third Reading, because the Bill has been amended today."
- O'Connell: "Okay, I so move then, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr.

 John Dunn."
- John Dunn: "And I object. Refuse to grant leave."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connell moves to suspend the rules to permit this Bill to be considered on the Order of Third Reading today, in light of the fact that it has been amended today. All those in favor of that Motion will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 74 'ayes', 32 'nos'. The Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. O'Connell to speak to the Eill on the Order of Third Reading."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill addresses the question of prenotification of an abortion on an

54th Legislative Day

Bay 27, 1983

unemancipated minor or an incompetent. This measure has been incorrectly confused with another Fill which is going to be before us this afternoon that deals with another subject matter. This Bill has to do with abortions. would submit to you that the seriousness of a minor child having such a procedure performed is one that justifies the inclusion in that decision with that parent who has ... that nondivorced parent, custodial parent should be included the decision as to whether this procedure should performed. The ramifications, the lifelong ramifications of an abortion are such that every child should be of ... allotted a full deliberative family decision. The question of privacy has often been raised with regards to the I would submit that if for those who notification issue. believe that a minor child has a right to privacy in lieu of the requirement that a parent be notified, should consider that there is something... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would submit that for those who feel that the question of privacy for the minor child outweighs the importance including a notification to a parent should be mindful of the fact that there remains a third person, a third party in this situation, that is the unborn child. Perhaps the issue is addressed more fully with the entire issue of abortion, and the question of the right to privacy of the woman over the preservation of the life of the child. is my belief, my opinion, my judgment that the guestion of privacy is secondary to the preservation of life. We abided by the laws set forth by the Supreme Court. This Bill is consistent with the Supreme Court's decision and other decisions rendered henceforth. I would simply all ask that you consider the rights of that third party in your affirmative votes which I hope you will cast. I'll be hap... happy to answer any questions."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eowman."

Bowman: "The Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Bowman: "Would the prescriptions in your Bill apply in the case of incest?"

O'Connell: "We have addressed the question of incest in that there is a provision wherein a court of competent jurisdiction, at the request of the unemancipated minor, could go before a court of competent jurisdiction and have the provisions waived. Certainly the question of incest would be likely, would find that it would be the basis for waiving the pro... the provisions of the Bill."

Bowman: "So, am I to understand that this unemancipated minor would have to go out and hire a lawyer, and seek out a court of competent jurisdiction, and then appear before the public at the bar of justice, and then have the court make a determination, and then somehow keep all of this secret from the family?"

O'Connell: "I... I don't think it's so impractical as... as been suggested. In other states, where this is law, it is done with rather expeditious results. The necessity to hire a lawyer is not required. Planned parenthood, I'm told, has afforded to children who seek their abortions information as to how to go about obtaining the necessary adjudication, and also the Bill re... and... has a provision that requests the Supreme Court to provide necessary rules and regulations as to set forth these provisions."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "It seems to me that the Sponsor of this Bill is presuming too much on our imaginations to have us believe that a child, someone who may be no older than twelve years

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

old, indeed could be even younger than that, would know how best to seek out these kinds of alternatives. and Gentlemen of the House, even a child knows to go to a doctor when she has a medical problem. And it seems to me that we are imposing an undue burden on a youngster, a child, a young girl, who may be the victim of incest. incest is one of the dirtiest, ugliest crimes that we have on our books, and it's very often in such cases the child is very reluctant to tell anybody about her problem, least of all, by the way, her mother, because she may be very fearful that her mother will not believe her story, will... that her mother will prefer to believe the husband instead of the child, that what you are doing with this legislation is dividing families in precisely those most difficult awkward circumstances that reg... require the utmost care and understanding. And it seems to me that the sort of thing that this legislation purports to do, actually is very destructive of family relationships in the time their most deep crisis; therefore, I urge those of you who are profamily to oppose this legislation as I do."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "I would just have a question or two of the Sponsor. I wonder if he would yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Greiman: "Generally in the law relating to minors, a minor can become unem... emancipated without a court proceeding.

Isn't that correct?"

O'Connell: "I... I can't answer that."

Greiman: "Well, if I told you that that were the case..."

O'Connell: "I would accept your legal opinion."

Greiman: "... you would not be shocked at that, so that this varies the law as to children. Is that right? So that a child who is otherwise unemancipated, generally

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

emancipation means one who is on their own, supporting themselves, living separate and apart from their parent, and not relying on the usual warmth and tenderness of the day-to-day living situation. You... that... that...

O'Connell: "Are you defining an unemancipated minor as one who's living apart from a parent?"

Greiman: "And supporting themselves, that... that is one of definitions you'll find in Illinois law."

O'Connell: "I would submit that I would believe that emancipated minor might fit that category..."

Greiman: "I mean emancipated, yes..."

O'Connell: "Well, you're referring to unemancipated."

Greiman: "Yes, emancipated minor, I'm sorry. So I guess what I'm trying to sugge... to question you about is... emancipated minor is one who lives separate and apart. Now is that what your Bill talks about? If some... If a young... If a minor comes in and says, 'I am emancipated. I support myself. My parents live in, you know, Hawaii, and I live here. And... And I live separate and apart. I maintain my own home. I'm seventeen years old,' and says that they are emancipated, will that be enough to release that medical person, the person performing the abortion, from liability under House Eill 720?"

O'Connell: "I think that the question of anything that concerns making a decision whether a child is emancipated or not rests upon reasonable belief of the medical pro... person who is to perform the abortion. I think..."

Greiman: "Still, oh, all right."

O'Connell: "Go ahead."

Greiman: "No, no, that... okay, so then what you're saying is that that minor could go in without having to go to court, if they could reasonable show to the person that they were

54th Legislative Day

Bay 27, 1983

emancipated under Illinois law. Is that correct?"

O'Connell: "I would say that the guestion of the offense purportedly committed by the medical practitioner would revolve around the questioning of knowingly performing an abortion on an unemancipated minor without the notification procedures."

Greiman: "Well, that's what the statute says."

O'Connell: "If... Would you let me finish?"

Greiman: "Yes, go ahead."

O'Connell: "If, in answer to your question, it would be a court of competent jurisdiction that would determine whether that child was emancipated or not, the court would simply determine whether the doctor or the practitioner had reasonable belief to know that the child was, in fact, unemancipated."

Greiman: "All right. So, then to conclude it, it would be reasonable for me to say that as a defense to a criminal prosecution a medical practitioner could show that he reasonably believed, and stating and setting out the reasons for his reasonable belief, that he reasonably believed that that minor was emancipated, and that would be a defense to this action."

O'Connell: "I would say that that would certainly be a defense.

Whether it would be accepted by the court, of course, is something that I can't answer."

Greiman: "Well, I mean is it... is it a legal defense? That's the question. In your opinion, you say it is."

O'Connell: "In my opinion, it is."

Greiman: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Dunn."

John Dunn: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

John Dunn: "Some place in this Bill it states that notice is to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

be given to the parent, I think on page two, lines about twenty-three to twenty-eight or so, that notice is to be given if parents are divorced to the parent with custody. I wonder if anything was changed with regard to this Section by the Amendments."

O'Connell: "No, the ... that Section is still intact."

- John Dunn: "And is it the intent of this legislation that if the parents of the child who is a subject of the notice both reside in the same community, and are... or different communities, both of whose whereabouts are known, but only one of those divorced parents has custody of the child, that the other parent of the child is not entitled under this legislation to notice of any kind or nature whatsoever about a pending abortion."
- O'Connell: "No. It provides that... or one parent is not... If
 the minor's or incompetent's parents are divorced, or one
 parent is not available to the person performing the
 abortion, in a reasonable time or manner, then notice to
 the parent with custody to the parent shall be sufficient.
 The question of the divorced parent is that the parent with
 custody would be entitled to the notice."
- John Dunn: "Doesn't the... the Act say that if the parents are divorced or one parent is not available, then notice to the parent with custody... there's an 'or' not an 'and'."

O'Connell: "That's correct."

- John Dunn: "And if the parents are divorced, the... the intent of this... the language of the purposed statute would read that if the parents are divorced notice to the parent with custody is sufficient. Isn't that ri... isn't that correct?"
- O'Connell: "Yeah, the intent is that it would be to the custodial parent."
- John Dunn: "So that the ... the noncustodial parent is entitled to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

no notice of any kind."

- O'Connell: "Under this Bill, there is no requirement to provide notice to the noncustodial parent."
- John Dunn: "And as a prolifer, doesn't that seem a little bit unreasonable if the noncustodial parent is around, who's whereabouts are known, that an important procedure like this is could take place without knowledge."
- O'Connell: "Well, first of all, there is no notice under present law at all. We're trying to provide at least some modicum of notice. Secondly, with regards to the decision as to whether one or both parents should get notice, it is the belief that the custodial parent is entitled by the nature of his or her custody should be the one to receive notice. As to the noncustodial parent, I... I would be... it would be my belief that we are trying to make this as palatable to constitutionally uphold, and we want to make it practical. And that's why we restricted it to the noncustodial parent."
- John Dunn: "Do you think that possibly a Committee hearing on this piece of legislation might have helped to make it palatable to the constitutional experts, and to the Members of this Body, and to the general public, and to the people who may be considering an abortion?"
- O'Connell: "Well, the... we're on a different issue now as to the Committee role, and we addressed that several weeks ago.

 The... The Bill has received a good deal of review from the pro-life organizations, and it really is in response to several court cases. I... I would concur that perhaps in the Senate, if it gets there, that a Committee hearing should definitely be held."
- John Dunn: "That's... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I think that's nice that... that there may be one Committee hearing on this Bill. I would just like the Members to know that this

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill, and all the other Bills in this package of abortion Bills, to the best of my knowledge, had no Committee hearings. Motions to discharge were filed several weeks before the Committee deadline in Judiciary Committee, and a specific time was set aside to hear these Bills, and they weren't heard in Committee, so we're rushing to judgment here with what we have before us. Perhaps, the Bills could have been made better. I really don't know. But I do think if you believe in the Committee system, you should be at least chagrined that such a volatile subject matter as this bypassed Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes. I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. The previous question is moved. Mr. O'Connell to close."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. matter has... It's not as controversial, I believe, some have made it out to be. If you wish to address it as a pro-life, pro-choice vote, so be it. The Bill. believe, affords a constitutional integrity to the abortion We... there has been some... some laws of Illinois. discussion by one of the previous speakers on the question of incest. Obviously, it is not our intent to distort the situation of an abortion pursuant to incest. We believe that the Bill addresses that question by providing for courts to waive the provisions of this Act. If ... If thinks that it is cumbersome to do so, we... we believe that the Supreme Court is in a position to provide for rules and guidelines to make that an efficient process. is also a minor aspect, a minor percentage of the... of unemancipated children pregnancies that occur to the awful

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

spectrum of incest. So let us address the larger picture. the larger picture which we're trying to attack in this particular piece of legislation, the rising number of abortions that are occurring on children, and, it's been mentioned the children at twelve years old. I would ask the previous speaker who raised the question how parents of a twelve year old, even if the pregnancy were caused from an incestuous relationship, how many mothers would not be aware of that fact eventually. So why not bring the parents into that auful situation? The Bill. I is a 'yes' or 'no'. I don't believe any further debate is going to change anyone's opinion. I would simple ask for a favorable Boll... wote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' A11 favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed those in Representative... by voting 'nc'. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 'ayes', 27 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Relative to Mr. Vinson's Motion to consider several Bills on one Roll Call, in order to complete the tabulation those votes, it will be necessary to close the opportunity for people to change their vote now. It's 3:30, and we had said that we would announce that Roll Call at the close business today, so that the Clerk shall be directed not to take any further changes on the Bills that were enunciated in Mr. Vinson's Motion for consolidation. The next Bill is the one you've all been waiting for, House Bill Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1612, a Bill for an Act relating to notification of parents when state funded agencies offer fertility control services to emancipated... unemancipated

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

minors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Eill 1612 provides that any agency or individual offering contraceptives or other fertility control services cr counseling unemancipated minors in programs funded by or through the state must notify the parents or quardians of that minor before providing the service. The Eill's aimed at one thing, to stop government funded agencies from hiding information from parents of the state about what they are doing to the children of those parents. The opponents of the measure want to talk about everything else under the sun, but it just amounts to one point. They think the government has the right to keep secrets from you about what they are doing to your children. I don't believe the government has the right to sneak behind the backs of people and invade the privacy of their homes, and I don't believe the people of Illinois want their taxes to be used to do anything with children in secrecy. Some people have used scare tactics, claiming that if parents are allowed to know what is being done with their children, more teenagers will be getting pregnant. But the state...one state that has put an end to this secrecy, the State of Utah, has reduction in teenage pregnancies. Others have said it's unconstitutional, but the Supreme Court said that the parent/child relationship, and not the state/child relationship, is constitutionally protected. agree that parents and teenagers should seems to communicate. This helps people make wiser choices. can they....can communicate when the government is hiding information from the parents? Now is the time for State of Illinois to promote communication between parents and teenagers by voting 'aye' for this Bill. Thank

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I address this Bill as one who has traditionally and intends in the future to support reasonable Bills, legislation designed to promote the American family and that, I quess, it can be designated without trying to use these words too wisely...or too widely as pro-life. But I don't think this Bill, in any way or fashion, is a pro-life Bill. If anything, and with all due respect to the Sponsor, who I is very sincere in this regard, if anything, the net result of this Bill will be to be an anti-life Bill. Because what I believe this Bill will do is to send us backward, in every sense, generations, to the place where in those unfortunate households, where the children and parents don't have the relationship that perhaps many of us do or wish we would, that those children, because of an inability to get information and education and specifically to have access to reasonable birth control devices, are going to become pregnant. And while statistics will probably be variable in terms of being able to document this, are going to procure abortions in many multiple numbers, greater than what they procure today. In my judgment, in addition, setting up a standard of cut off...of eliminating funds for a year for agencies - and I presume when you talk about state funded agencies or entities, that's a wide ranging thing, including our educational system, to employ that kind of a draconian measure, is absolutely ridiculous. And I think the bottom line of this legislation is going to cause ferment and unnecessary ferment within the American family to cut off the ability of parents and children to establish a dialogue under unfermented circumstances. And in addition to that,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

in those unfortunate households - and there are certainly many of them in this state and around the country where a parental/child relationship isn't what parents always try for it to be to cause those children, to cause those unemancipated minors such incredible emotional, and mental and physical trauma that the bottom line will be that when we look back in two years, if we were to pass this Bill, which, by the way, the Senate has already defeated, we'll wonder why we did it. We'll wonder why, as supposedly pro-life, pro-family Legislators, we did something that's more destructive to the American family, more promotive of abortions and more promotive of social dislocation than anything we could do in any other piece of legislation. Nobody, I think, looking at my record over the last seven years in this General Assembly, can accuse me of supporting abortions on demand or of opposing the pro-life movement. I think my record is clear in that regard. But I think obligation, more than talking about labels, or symbols or jargon, and whether you call it pro-abortion, cr pro-life, or family or anti one of those things, is to look at the issues with my conscience and to look at the issues terms of what I think we're doing to teenagers, families, to adults and to society. And in my judgment, the passage of this Bill, as well intended as the Sponsor is, would be one of the most negative and backward acts that this General Assembly could ever take. And for those reasons, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative White."

White: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

White: "Representative, is this Bill designed to impact upon childbirth out of wedlock? Is this Bill designed to cut

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

down on teenage pregnancies?"

Capparelli: "I think it has. I think so. We have some statistics here that proved...in Utah since this Bill is...they worked it for three years, teenage pregnancies did drop. Yes."

White: "Well, if you... I would like to just speak to the Bill_ First of all, I have worked for the past 24 years in Chicago in the school system. And in my school alone, we have...we sustain about 10 youngsters, pregnant youngsters, youngsters giving birth to children, and they are children themselves. We're talking about 12, 13, 14 and 15 year old youngsters coming into this world and not being adequately equipped to raise themselves, but yet they have And I responsibility of trying to rear a youngster. just seem to think that if they have to report to their parents that they are involved sexually, I have a sneaking suspicion that these youngsters are going to, instead of having 10 or 12 out of a school, I simply seem to think that we are going to increase in number those youngsters who become pregnant. So I rise in opposition to this piece of legislation. I think this Eill should be soundly defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Feoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Move the question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Saltsman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli, to close."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think everyone knows how they are going to vote on this Eill. I was just going to say teenagers deserve to have laws to protect them, and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

this Bill will do that. I would ask you to vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Capparelli has moved for the passage of House Bill 1612. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, to explain her vote. One minute."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that several years ago, this House voted overwhelmingly to cut off taxpayer funding of abortions. This is the same type of thing. It is to cut off taxpayer funding of clinics that give contraceptives to children without their parents knowledge. It doesn't prohibit the clinics from doing it. It just says that they can't use tax money to do it. And I urge 'aye' votes, please, on this very good measure."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp, one minute to explain his vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In all due respects to the Sponsor of this Bill, we can talk about where our tax dollars want to be spent. I think we can get far more value and far more benefit from the tax dollars being spent in this manner than we can in ADC payments. I vote 'no'."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Turner. One minute to explain his vote."
- Turner: "Thank you, Br. Speaker. I had a few guestions that I wanted to ask the Sponsor earlier, but the red lights have changed my mind on those questions, and I'm glad to see that the...this Legislative Body is acting in accord. I'm asking all that we all vote 'no' on this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative O'Connell, one minute to explain his vote."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, because of my

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

sponsorship of the previous Bill, I think it's important to draw a distinction. And I think it's important that those of us who support pro-life legislation should set forth the reason why we do it, at least in my case. When you say that you're pro-life, you're talking about preserving the life of an unborn child. This Bill is not addressing the life of an unborn child. This Bill is raising the guestion of privacy. It's raising the guestion of morality. It's raising the entire question of what, I believe, should be a matter..."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"
- O'Connell: "...Between parent and child. I don't think we can have it both ways. I, therefore, will vote 'no' on this Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McAuliffe, one minute to explain his vote."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise briefly in support of Representative Capparelli's Bill. I think he has got a good thought here. He's got a good notion. I don't think that we should be giving...the state should be supplying birth control devices to children without having the parents know what's going on. I think the parents have the right to know what's going on in their family, and I would strongly support Eouse Bill 1612."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 53 'ayes', 57 'nos', 2 voting 'present', and Representative Capparelli asks for a Poll...No? This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1399, the Clerk will read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1399, a... a Bill for an Act to amend

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Illinois Abortion Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to be brief, but first I must ask leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for a technical Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady asks leave to bring 1399 back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does she have leave? There is objection. The Lady moves to return House Eill 1399..."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen, for what purpose do you rise?"

Pullen: "Well, the Motion... the Amendment is technical in nature, and I'm sure can be taken care of elsewhere..."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Pro..."

Pullen: "... rather than take up the time of the House, I will simply ask you to read the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed with the Bill. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Has it been read?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I think it has been. Hasn't it been read?

Yes. Proceed."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 1399 amends the Illinois Abortion Law in three
specific ways. It reduces the number of hours in the
waiting period from twenty-four to twelve. This is to
respond to court problems with the waiting period at
twenty-four hours, and I'll be happy to answer questions
about that related to the twelve hour waiting period that
is in this Bill. It also would expand the number of people
that could give her the information involved in informed
consent, so that not just the physician who is to perform
the abortion would be re... could give the information, but

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

also the referring physician or his agent, or the physician performing the abortion or his agent. It also provides... It makes a change to the part of the law that requires that the women must be supplied with a true copy of her pregnancy test result to add if such test has been employed, because there are women who are entering clinics for abortions who are at advanced stages of pregnancy where their pregnancy is quite clear from physical apperception, and it is not necessary to perform a lab test on such women, so this would make that unnecessary. I would be happy to answer any questions and ask for an "aye" vote." Matijevich: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 1399. On that the Gent... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of questions. Ms. Pullen, this actually makes... would make abortion easier. Is that right? The difference of the twelve hours, reduced from twenty-four hours, is that right?"
- Pullen: "It is designed to perform a more reasonable requirement."
- Greiman: "You feel that the twenty-four hour requirement then wou... previously was in the law, you... that was unreasonable then you assume, right?"

Pullen: "Yes."

Greiman: "So you're trying to make it a little more reasonable.

Now, does the... does the person who... Can a woman go to a

physician in one place and get the test, and then go to the

person who is to perform the procedure, and can that person

rely on the procedure without giving a new test, or without

making a new... without going through the rigmarole of

retesting that person?"

Pullen: "Under... under this Bill, yes."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Greiman: "So, in other words, a woman in Springfield who was pregnant, we... we have no... I don't know if there's places that provide this kind of facility in Springfield, but could get is a test from their physician here in Springfield and then go to Chicago or St. Louis, or you know, Madison County, or Alton, or some place, and then get a... use that test as the basis for the procedure. Is that correct?"

Pullen: "Yes."

Greiman: "And there would be no liability on the doctor who performed the test, as long as that was an appropriate test done by an appropriate laboratory or doctor. Is that right?"

Pullen: "And the result was valid, and all those sorts of things."

Greiman: "Yes, well, we... you know, I... I... I can... I assume the pregnancy of the woman, yes. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Ccok, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Cullerton: "Representative Fullen, in the past, I have personally tried to pass a Bill requiring a waiting period, and the basis for my Bill was in the belief that before there's any kind of an operation, there should always be a delay between the time of the diagnosis and the time of the operation. In the past, the courts have struck down these twenty-four hour waiting periods, because they felt that they were imposing a burden on the woman, and that their intent was to discourage abortions. Now, my guestion to you is, is the purpose for making this a twelve hour waiting period, is the purpose of it based on the medical belief that is medically safer to have a waiting period

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

between the time of a diagnosis and the time of an operation, or is the purpose of this twelve hour waiting period to discourage people from having abortions?"

Pullen: "The intent is that a reasonable waiting period is standard and good medical practice, and so we are providing for that in this Bill."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Fiel."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Fiel has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no', and the main question is put. Representative Fullen to close."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is to clear up some problems with the Illinois Abortion Law, to make it more reasonable. I have explained the specific provisions, and I ask for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Fullen has moved for the passage of House Bill 1399. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and House Bill 1399, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Consent Calendar Third Reading Second Day, the Clerk will read the Bills. Oh, they have been previously read. He will identify all of those which are still on the Calendar, Consent Calendar Third Reading. The Clerk will read those Bills or identify them, the ones that are still on the Calendar. All of them

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

have been read."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 854, House Bill 1473, House Bill 1611,
House Bill 1805, House Bill 1939, House Bill 2244, and
House Bill 2287 remain on the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?'

Those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Bave all voted who wish?

This is the Consent Calendar. Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman...

Representative Wolf, from Madison. Bepresentative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, was there a House Bill 2194 on that list?"

Speaker Matijevich: "21 what?"

Wolf: "2194?"

Speaker Matijevich: "It got knocked off. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 101 'ayes', no 'nays', 10 voting 'present', and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. The Speaker of the House, Michael Madigan, in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #3, we shall move to a Order of Consideration entitled Badioactive Waste, and on that guestion House Bill 2106. Representative Nelson."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2106, a Bill for an Act concerning Midwest Interstate Compact on Low-Level Radioactive Waste.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think that by now most Members have some familiarity with this Bill, because we did debate companion legislation on Second Reading. I would like to clearly explain what House Bill 2106 does, answer any guestions, and then take a vote on it. I believe that by voting 'yes'

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

on House Bill 2106, we, Legislators, have a chance to vote for a long-term solution to a problem of modern society, and that problem is the need to safely and permanently dispose of low-level radioactive waste, byproducts of industrial processes, research laboratories, and medical facilities, which are increasing in volume while disposal sites are decreasing in capacity. Bouse Bill 2106 would ratify the Midwest Interstate Compact on Low-Level Radioactive Waste. This is an agreement with other states region of the United States to share the responsibility and share the liability for safe disposal on a regional basis. By joining the Compact, Illinois adopts a framework of cooperation. The Compact creates a Midwest Interstate Commission, which is comprised of one member from each party state. The party states appoint and finance their own members. Any Commission actions require a majority vote of its members. Already three states have ratified the exact language that we are looking at in House Bill 2106: Michigan, Iowa, and Indiana. And because those three states have already ratified, the Commission will come into existence July 1st of this year. It is understanding that Minnesota has this week passed the Compact legislation through its House and Senate and needs only be signed by its Governor. After the Commission is created, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, a regional management plan to safely and efficiently manage low-level waste generated in the party states occurs. Before the plan is adopted, a draft is made available to the These were some of the questions that were for comment. raised when we had hearings in Committee, and the questions that were raised had to do with the public's ability to comment on the legislation. Eut I would like you to know that the House Bill 2106 is a beginning, not an end, and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

there is built in time for public comment, time for environmental impact studies, and the like. It is the possibility that Illinois could become a host state. No one is arguing that that is not possible, but what I would say is that in any rotation system, eventually every state would take a turn. If you look at the language of the Compact, it talks about being a host state for twenty years, or for the life of the site. I believe that by ratifying this piece of legislation, we are taking a step toward a long term solution for a problem that faces Illinois today and will be with us for the foreseeable future. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an important issue. I would ask that the requisite amount of Members join me in taking this off of Short Debate."

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be... The Bill shall be taken from the Order of the Short Debate and placed on the Order of the Regular Debate Calendar. Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is probably one of the most important votes you're going to cast as it pertains to the State of Illinois. The Low-Level Nuclear Waste Compact Act, as presented by the Congress of the United States and embodied in the subscription to join that Compact, is in House Bill 2106. My personal feeling is that no state should join a Compact if it is not willing to be a host state. The position of the administration and the Governor, as well as many members of his Cabinet, is that there is no objection by those individuals at this time that the state be... the State of Illinois becoming a host state. The alternative is to go it alone, such as California or other possible states who are generators. But I quess what I'd like to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

address is that the... is, is this the right avenue for the State of Illinois to take? Is the Compact membership the best solution for Illinois' low-level radioactive waste, or is the Compact membership just strictly a political proposition for federalization and regionalism as it pertains to low-level waste? Clearly, those low-level wastes last more than the 300 years that has been presented by some of the Sponsors and supporters of this provision. Perhaps the most fatal error in judgment of the Compact promoters is that they have, in their... in their movement, a very implied lack of trust in the public's ability to judge the merits of the Compact. From the outset there has been virtually no public input into the acceptance, rejections or the ramifications of joining the Compact. What are the chief problems of the Compact? The basic problems that exist in that Compact and throughout the substantive language of the Compact relate to the guestion of state and local rights versus those of the Commission and the Compact. That's a very important issue. Once the State of Illinois, in my judgment, joins the Compact we are putting total authority into the Commission and the Compact with virtually no protections, financially or otherwise, for this state. I say that because in Article VII, Section (C), page 14 states that, *No law, rule or regulation of a party state or any of its subdivisions or instrumentalities may be applied in a manner which discriminates against the generators of other party states. • Ladies and Gentlemen, that is a very important provision built into the federal law as well as this legislation. The powers of the Commission and the Compact should cause some pretty great The provision for allowing the concerns. financing from any institution, person, firm or corporation clearly is unacceptable. A similar provision was removed

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

from the Northeast Compact. Almost ironically. Commission powers are extensive and its liabilities very Presently, Illinois is being asked to join a Compact with absolutely no knowledge about the management plan that will run that Compact and that Commission. There is no specific provision requiring the host state or the site selection bе based upon extensive geological and That's included in hydrological studies of the region. another Bill. There is no mention of any protections for the public health and safety or aguifers of the host state. It is also my contention that since Illinois has one site that is now licensed for low-level nuclear wastes, although not operating, the line of least resistance would be for Illinois to become a host state. I am opposed to the concept of Illinois becoming the host state. I am opposed to the concept that does not present public health and safety aquifer protection to the citizens of this great state. I would like to point out as well that Illinois, being the most populated of the Compact states, gets one vote on the Commission and the Compact - the same vote that is given to lowa and other states even though the interest we have is much greater than others, in my estimation. know you've all heard this before. I would assume that the Members in this House of Representatives have a concern for their great state, for the citizens of that state. only that public hearings be held on this question, that we do not rush into it and we protect our citizens. For that reason, and because of my concerns of the powers given the Commission without any consideration for the state, that House Bill 2106 in its current form be opposed and voted down. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Bill, and I think it's no... no news to everyone on the Every Member of the Democratic contingent Environ... in the Environment Committee was opposed to this strictly for some of the reasons that Representative Mautino has enumerated to all of you. We consider the pushing of this thing out of Committee not a very timely or wise decision. We have until July 1st of 1984 to make this There are no penalities for ... for decision. waiting, and it would give us the advantage of having meetings around the State of Illincis and delving into it, even into the extent with other states to find out where going and find out just how far we're committed. The Sponsor of the Bill said that three states have already joined the Compact, which makes it legal, and I presume that's true, but I also want to point out to you that two states, North Car... North Dakota and South Car... Dakota, have already refused. The language in 2106 is vague. It's ambiguous, and very, very inconsistent. As I said before, the Bill bearly got out of Committee with the mini... maximum of nine votes, and only... and only after vigorous It does nothing to protect working of the Committee. Illinois, and I'd like to read you, on page ten of the Bill, under Article VI, Development and Operation of the Facilities. 'Any party state may volunteer to become a host state, and the Commission may designate that state as a host state upon a two-thirds vote of its members.4 The point I want to make to you is that they also have the authority to name you a host state with the same amount of In Section B, "If all votes, if you don't volunteer. regional facilities required by the regional management not developed pursuant to Section A or ... , on plan are page eleven, ... upon notification that an existing regional facility will be closed, the Commission may

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

designate a host state. We don't feel that that's enough safeguards for the Stat... for... for the State of Illinois without any guarantees going along with it. It doesn't give us any protection even in the vote. We... I presume it's going to... we're going to have ten or eleven states in this Compact, and each state is going to have one vote. That means that if there's eleven ... eleven states, Illinois could be, the possibility of being voted out ... going against ten to one. And any attempt to recoup or regroup to be... could be... could be voted overwhelmingly. The host state, in my opinion, should have a weight vote, weighted vote. If we're going to have the site, then we should have the offices, and we should have a weighted vote as to how we're going to run it. Further, in the... if the legisl... in the legislation, there aren't even any provisions for getting paid for the building, the maintenance, the operation, and the closure of the... and the closure maintenance of the facility, if we're chosen. We are still subject to refusal through the majority vote. It also makes no provision for wage limitations for its one member, named by the Governor, and I presume the skys the limit. It's been purported that every state... oh, she said, 'The Sponsor of the Bill main... purported that every state would have to take its just time. And that's not true, at least as I read it in the... in the... in Bill, and I've read the Bill from cover to cover. In my area, and also Representative Davis' area, we have the Joliet Arsenal, and there's... it's a federal... federal installation where we used to make bombs, and shells, antitank mines, and there is a provision in the Bill that exempt, quote, 'Certain defense activities of the Federal Government or the Federal Research and Development Activities. It's on page one, line... page... page one,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

line twenty and twenty-two. We are afraid, or at least I'm afraid, without any further safequards that maybe the Federal Government might come in there and start research, some kind of research, and they would... they would bury there on the... on the property, and we wouldn't even know about it. In that regard, there is no clarifying language about storage. In fact, as far as any produce... producer is concerned, there is... there is a specific exemption in a provision for per... personal storage if they manufacture material on their property. And if anybody's interested at all, it's on page thirteen, line thirteen and fourteen, and once again, on the same page, as this ... as the Bill affects the federal, lines twenty and twenty-four. I wish that some of you would pay attention to what I'm saying, and as I'm going through this, actually look at the Bill, because I'm not adding anything to it. I'm just telling you the flat out truth, as it's listed in the Bill. There are many, many more inconsistencies and guarantees for Illinois. I, for one, don't want my future in this type of situation, and I believe the Bill should go back to the Committee for hearings this summer. I would... I would so move, if I had that authority. As Ch... As the Chairman of our Committee, that's what I advise our Committee to do. As I said before, in my dissertation, every Member of the Committee of the Democratic contingent agreed with that. We thought not only would it b∈ conse... conscientious of us to do that, so that we would know where we were going, but, it would be good for the people of the State of Illinois. Let the Department of Nuclear Safety, as it's... as it's stated in Representative Currie's Bill 2234, with our Amendment on it, do the negotiations and the... the working out of the agreement for the pact. can do this, as I said before, without any, any, any

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

penalties on us before July 1st of 1984. And as Representative Mautino has said before, I see no reason in the world why we should rush into something as serious as this without any knowledge of what's going to happen to the State of Illinois, and I solicit your 'no' vote very fervently. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. Representative Pierce to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, we can walk away from this problem and leave it to future generations the way in the forties and fifties Congress failed to cope with a permanent depository for high-level nuclear waste, spent nuclear fuel, and today our generation is faced with that problem. I don't want it to be said of this General Assembly that... that we did the easy thing. We said, let someone else worry about disposing of low-level waste. Sure it's produced in our hospitals. Sure the Illinois Hospital Association supports this Bill. Sure it's produced in radiology that saves people from cancer. Sure it's produced from research at the University of Chicago, University of Illinois, but I don't want to have to deal with where it goes. There are several ways of solving the problem. One is to let Uncle Sam do it. of us believe... some of us believe that the role for the states, and Congress set up a method of regional disposal facilities. The other way to go would be that each of the fifty states have fifty low-level nuclear waste sites around the nation, and one of them, of course, would be in Illinois, because we're a big producer. If you vote 'no' 54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

on this Bill, you're quaranteeing that Illinois will be the host state for at least forty percent of the spent nuclear fuel in... of the low-level radioactive waste in the middle west, produced by hospitals, medical research, and so on. We'll have to have our own disposal site, if don't join in the Compact. Now, true, if we join the Compact, there's a very good chance, and there may be a fifty-fifty chance that we would be the host site. Out of this Compact, we have the absolute right to withdraw from the Compact and refuse to serve as a host state. what's going to happen if we do nothing? The 'Hanford' Washington site and the 'Barnwell' South Carolina site will be closed to Illinois within the very near future. We'll then... We'll then suddenly have to find a site for our low-level waste. And again to repeat, we're not talking about spent nuclear fuel from power plants. We're not talking about those... yes, high-level waste. We're not talking about the waste from the atomic program, bomb program, the Federal Government. That's high-level waste. We're talking about hospital, medical research, and some low-level waste from power plants. It's our responsibility to dispose of it for future generations. Here's a... Here is a sensible way of doing it on a regional basis by the states of the midwest. The Compact is in effect. Let's be Let's not fail future Let's join us. responsible. generations. Vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Madigan: "The guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Farley to explain his vote."
- Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have concerns. I know that Representative

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Mautino mentioned that we should have hearings. I also understand and appreciate Bepresentative Van Duyne's concerns, but I think this Bill should be passed over to the Senate. I think there are Senators over there that will be able to use this Bill to hold hearings and to provide a complete answer for our problem, and I would vote "aye"."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Marzuki to explain his vote."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am in support of a Compact as the only logical way to solve the problem of low-level waste. This pact creates a great deal of risk on our part to getting a bad midwest Compact. I have no illusions that we should not become the host state. Indeed, I think we may have a responsibility to become that host state. The way this Bill has come out on this floor without adequate discussion, without adequate study, I blame the Governor for most of this. And we should turn this ever to the Commission that has given us the original Bill. I can't in good conscience do this; and therefore, I have to vote 'no' on this important Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fangle to explain his vote."

Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, all the green votes, I want you to understand that there's no guarantee as to how long we're... if we are picked as a host state that we will have the nuclear waste, so forth, coming into our state. There's no guarantee in this Bill as to how long we will have it. Number two, this state will... we will be in charge of all liability for all such stuff coming into the state. So I want you to consider that when you vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Bave all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

there are 79 'ayes', 30 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like to make an announcement at this time, if I could have your attention. I'm very pleased to be able to announce to you today, and I'm sure that you will join with me in my joy and great satisfaction, that true to the many predictions that were offered in this chamber for many, many years and during the most recent days the Supreme Court of Illinois, in its wisdom, has appointed the Parliamentarian of the House of Bepresentatives, L. Michael Getty, as a Circuit Court Judge in Cook County.

- Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker... I am very grateful for the Supreme Court's appointment, and to Mike Madigan and many others who have supported me in the request for that appointment, and to you, who I've had the privilege of working with. And the bad news is I'm going to stay until the end of the Session. The appointment will become effective on July 7th. Thank you all very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "I'm not sure what makes Mr. Getty think that the Session will be concluded before July 7th. Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "On behalf of the Speaker, Br. Speaker, Rule 65(j) indicates that honored guests can be introduced only in conjunction with special occasions. In my opinion, I believe this is a special occasion, and I will file my concurring decision."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, frequently we have had occasions in which we have disagreed on issues, and I've been here now for nine years; and, during all of those nine years, I've had the pleasure of serving with Mike Getty. And I can truthfully tell you that the real benefit in serving in the General Assembly,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

other than serving the people of Illinois, is the people that you meet. And, Mr. Justice Getty, we are going to not only look forward to your many years of success on the bench and expect years of success on the bench; but, as you ascend the ladder — and I know you will go further than the Circuit Court as far as we're concerned — as you ascend, you will do so carrying the pride of all the Members of the General Assembly, because you are truly an individual that represents the best in all of us. And we offer you our greatest congratulations and much happiness and success."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "I just want to offer my congratulations and just want to give proof again that the merit selection system does work in this state. That's real merit selection on behalf of the Supreme Court."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of all of those on this side of the aisle and, frankly, personally for me because of my close friendship with Mike, I have never seen anybody in this House - and I've served with a lot of people here - who has a better legal mind than Mike Getty. Nobody that I've ever met in all of my lifetime deserves to be on the bench. I, frankly, believe that he's going to go places on the bench in the future. And I'll miss him here, but I know the public is going to be better served by being where he rightfully belongs, where anybody who is an attorney knows that the ultimate is to serve in the Judiciary. God bless you and good luck, Mike. We're all with you."

Speaker Madigan: "The next Bill will be House Bill 22... For what purpose does Mr. Giqlio seek recognition?"

Giglio: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to say that, in all sincerity and truthfulness, Mike comes from my township, and his district

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

is part of my district. And he's been a tremendous asset to me, a great inspiration and also a great political ally. Now that he's been placed to go on the bench he can't buy no tickets anymore. You're right, Al. I'm going to lose him politically, and he can't get involved. But we're going to miss him dearly, and he did help tremendously in the township. And, Mike, God willing everything goes well in good speed."

Speaker Madigan: "The next Bill will be House Bill 2234, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2234, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the management of low-level radioactive waste. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2234 does establish for this state a comprehensive policy for the management, treatment, storage, and disposal of low-level radioactive wastes. However one voted on the recent Compact legislation, there are... there are reasons to adopt House Bill 2234, for with or without the Compact state might have sconer or later this responsibility for the large amount, the large volume of low-level radioactive waste we produce. Presently, not have in our statutes any kind of management technique, any kind of assurance, that should we find ourselves dealing with that problem on our own or in conjunction with other states in the region that we have on hand and on board the kind of techniques that will adequately protect the public health and safety. Should we, in fact, join the Compact, I am hopeful that House Eill 2234 will provide the kind of guidance to the Compact conferees about what kind of strict regulations should control in their management In fact, I think this is an important adoption plan.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

message to the Compact, if Illinois belongs, that this is the kind of waste management plan and only this kind of waste management plan that the citizens of Illinois will put up with. In the event that we find ourselves going alone, House Bill 2234 establishes the kind of... of treatment and disposal requirements that mean that... that the public will be protected and low-level radioactive waste can be treated efficiently and safely. I urge your support of the legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although I voted against the Compact Fill, I would urge you to support this Bill that has been developed by Representative Currie. I think it offers the only guidance that that Commission may get, and it would be very important to the people of Illinois. Most certainly, the production of our previous Bepresentatives has not been very good, and we do need this companion piece. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' There are many Bills to be considered, Representative Currie.

Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "It's a good Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Well done. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 106 'ayes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1661, Representative Braun. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1661, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1661 restores medi... medical benefits for poor people to the level that existed a year ago, before the emergency budget cuts. It addresses a critical need going to the humanity of our society. Without this Bill, poor people will die, victims of a money driven genocide denies them life saving and needed medical services. With this Bill, we'll be able to provide a no frills level of medical services. I urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker and Sh... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might ask the Sponsor a few specific questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Topinka: "Yeah, Representative Braun, what would be the cost of this Eill, please?"

Braun: "Representative, the cost figure in the analysis, or the fiscal note, refers to a starting over of the program. If we put the dollars back in, if we just start the program like it was, before the emergency budget cut, it will be an increment of about twelve million. Overall, the program a year ago cost thirty-two million. I guess for inflation and the like, it will go up, but again this presumes that we just put the program in at the previous level. So it's not a new, it's not new dollars... a new start up cost. This is the dollars that were already being expended in the state."

Topinka: "Maybe I'm misunderstanding the fiscal statement, can
you explain the total cost of one hundred and fifty seven
point three million dollars which is shown by the
Department of Fublic Aid's fiscal note here?"

Braun: "I haven't... Representative, I haven't seen it. Oh,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

okay."

Topinka: "This is a fiscal notice of May 19th, on House Eill 1661 as amended."

Braun: "That relates to the issue of whether or not we're going to go with the total elimination of the program, or whether or not we're just going to keep it... keep the program at the present level, or at the level it was before the emergency budget cuts. The fiscal note is written as though we were starting from step one when, in fact, we're not."

Topinka: "I see, and is there any federal reimbursement with respect to any of the st... these state funded programs?"

Braun: "There is no federal reimbursement for general assistance or for aid to the medically indigent."

Topinka: "Very fine. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Would reinstating this money to this program deplete monies from other programs?"

Braun: "Well, no more than any other part of our budget to the extent the general revenues are tied in together. But this program is... is the health care program for the very poor that we've always had, alright, and it was cut out as a function of the emergency budget Act. This... This just says that the services will be provided on the level that it was provided previously. To the extent that it takes up a dollar of the state's budget, then that's obviously not a dollar that's available for other programs, for education, or whatever. But again, Representative Brunsvold, I say to you, we can't afford to have people dying from lack of medical treatment either."

Brunsvold: "So, if we reinstate this at the thirty-two million, that would mean a few dollars would have to come away from

54th Legislative Day say education."

May 27, 1983

Braun: "No, no, Sir. Again, it depends on which budget you're looking at. If you had a budget book from last year, this program would be in it. If you had the doomsday budget for next year, the program's not in it at all. Okay? Based on... on the uncertainty frankly of our state's fiscal condition, a lot is going to depend on whether or not the revenues are available as we go into the next fed... fiscal year, whether we can fund anything. Okay. So..."

Brunsvold: "The money's not there, then this... won't be in effect."

Braun: "Right. If the money's not there, it's not there, and you can't fund programs of deficit financing in the state. I mean, you just can't do it, so we would expect..."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Braun: "... however, that the money would be there and the Governor will veto it, if the money isn't there."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun to close."

Braun: "I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of this Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 64 'ayes', 45 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 207. Representative Currie."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 207, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to public assistance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. May I have leave to bring House Bill 207 back to Second Reading

54th Legislative Day

May 27. 1983

for purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests leave to bring this Bill back to the Order of Second Beading for the purpose of Amendments. There is objection. The Lady moves to take this Bill to the Order of Second Beading for the purpose of Amendment. All those in favor of that Motion will signify by voting "aye", all those opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 94 "ayes", 13 "nos". The Lady"s Motion carries. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Topinka..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, wait, pardon me... We have to have Amendment #5 on first, I believe, and that's not my Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. is there an Amendment #5?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Currie."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #5. Representative Currie."

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

Amendment #5 merely incorporates the changes that were made
in the Bill in Committee, changes that bring the original
Bill into a 1983 context. The reason the Amendment looks
so big is because it does incorporate the entire original
Bill. It's been enrolled and engrossed. It is not all new
language. I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment

#5. On that question the Chair recognizes Mr. John Dunn."

John Dunn: "Well even though the... cemented... it's what, ninety
pages long? What does this do? A hundred ninety, they
say."

Currie: "Representative Dunn, it is the... an Amendment of the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

original Bill. The reason that it is so large is only for ease of reference with respect to further Amendments. There was a lengthy Amendment adopted in Committee, and we thought it would be easier for the Members to understand the Bill if those... if those Amendments were incorporated at this point."

John Dunn: "When will we have a detailed explanation of this Bill as amended? Will you do that on Third, or are you going to do that now?"

Currie: "Yes."

John Dunn: "Okay."

Currie: "On Third, if that's all right with you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?

Bepresentative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I think we can assuage Representative Funn's question about

Amendment #5, because Amendment #6 should take care of
that, and it's rather easy to explain."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". The "ayes" have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Topinka."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 essentially removes all the items in House Bill 207 which would have any cost impact on the state and/or on local units of government. The effect of the Bill is now primarily one of reorganization which consolidates the administration, income assistance, and child support Sections where there currently scattered throughout the Public Aid Code, in other words, it really puts all of this together and makes a pretty nice Code for

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Public Aid to finally have to work with. For those of you who have had problems with 207 in the beginning as I had, this Amendment maintains the current system for general assistance for townships that do not receive state funding. Por all intents and purposes, that means townships right now are left exactly as they are at present. It makes no changes to them. It returns abortion funding prohibition language. It maintains the current workfare program as is. In the original Bill, this was mandatory, and this was increased. Now this maintains the current workfare program as we now have it, and it also maintains the current language concerning child support. Emergency assistance would become available to recipients of general assistance and aid to the aged, the blind and the disabled, who are just currently now recipients of AFDC. And equal access will be provided to Chicago and to downstate receiving units with a cap placed on the total amount of funding available for energy assistance and two million. I move for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read this Bill on the Order of Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 207, Currie - Topinka - Rhem - White and Bullock, a Bill for an Act to revise a law in relation to public assistance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Currie."

Currie: "May I have leave, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to hear this Bill on Third Reading today?"

Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted."

Currie: "House Bill 207, I think has been well explained by

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

virtue of the adoption of the Amendments. It's the result of the Commission to rewrite and revise the Illinois Fublic Aid Code. The Commission has spent two years at work. The reforms are in the Bill, although it is true that the Amendments recently adopted do not retain the programs that would have required additional new state expenditures this year. The present Code 207 is in no way more restrictive than the present Code. In fact, it does permit a cohesive and coherent interpretation of the Illinois Public Welfare Law. We establish General Assistance Advisory Committee, permit the Department to spend greater sums on emergency assistance, and I urge the House the support of House Bill 207."

Speaker Madigan: "The... Let the record show that the Sponsorship on this Bill would be Representative Currie -Topinka, rather than what is shown on the Calendar. The question is, 'Shall this Fill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 83 'ayes', 20 'nos'. This Eill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill 539, Representative Barnes. Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 539, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that all of the Members are well aware that this is the child pornography Bill, and what brought about the typing of the language was that last July 3rd, the United States Supreme Court in New York stated that the New York statute was constitutional and that child pornography is not

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

protected by the first Amendment, even if it is not obscene. Child pornography has turned out to be a multimillion dollar business and taking advantages of small children from 16 on down in actual photographs and movies, and Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, very briefly. Representative Barnes, I know you tried to amend the Bill. I still thinks it has some deficiencies. I'll just point out to you on page two, you'll read it, it says, 'A person Section 1120-1. Ιf commits the offense of child pornography who depicts represents any child under the age of 16..., you go to the next page,who has portrayed an act of touching another That is it. You could literally be person or animal.* charged with an offense if you showed a book of a child There is no mental state in that petting an animal. particular Section. There is in others, but not in that Section. I just would recommend a 'present' vote until the Bill is cleaned up."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr... Would the... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady indicates that she will yield."

Yourell: "In the Amendment... When this Bill was on Second Reading, did the Committee Amendment #1, which would provide an affirmative defense for librarians, does that still remain in the Bill?"

Barnes: "Yes it does, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Eepresentative Piel."

Piel: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

be be moved?' Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous guestion is moved.

Representative O'Connell to close."

- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that this is the product of the Illinois Investigating Commission study on Child Abuse. It eliminates the controversial Section of the removing of the affirmative defense for librarians. It also provides that there isn't necessarily mental state, despite what Representative Cullerton said. If there are further problems that we can address in the Senate, I would please encourage, not a 'present' vote, but an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 7 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Mr. Ebbesen seek recognition?"
- Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, when we were voting on House Bill 2106, I inadvertently hit the 'no' button instead of the 'present' button, and due to a possible conflict of interest in the handling of hospital waste, I wish the record, House record to show that."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman needs leave. Is there a leave?

 Leave is granted. Was there objection? Pine. Mr. Ebbesen and all of the Members should be advised that the rules do not permit the changes of that nature, but the Gentleman did get leave. So you can sit down, Mr. Ebbesen, your mission has been accomplished. We shall return to the Calendar on the Order of House Bills Third Reading. The next Bill to be called would be House Bill 1396, Mr. Keane.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1396, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1396 as amended, Amendment became the Bill. Amendment #1 has two provisions. It deals with the assessment level, the real estate tax assessment level. As you know, it's presently at 33 and a third. The Bill would move... reduce it to 30%. And the only other thing that the Bill does is. it exempts the Bill from the Mandates Act. We do not touch homestead exemptions or a circuit breaker. This Bill is in the works, so that in the event, there is a income tax increase, and it's the wish of this Body to provide real estate tax relief. Along with that, we can so do it by use of manipulating the tax assessment level. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1396. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On that question, there are 102 'ayes', 9 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. That Eill, having been placed in a category of Froperty Tax Homestead Exemption, the next Bill called will be within the same category, and that will be House Eill 1489, Mr. Terzich. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
House Bill 1489 amends the Section of the Revenue Act to

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

provide for exemption for property taxes of property of not profit HMOs which would put them in the same category hospitals. The service employees union of the president, which is Gene 'Motts'. has for their employees program that is urgently needed under this Eill. cleared it through the Committee. It came out of Committee 8 to 1, and what it does, it would provide that property for nonprofit health, maintenance organization, which have to be certified by the director of the Department Insurance under the provision of the House Maintenance Act. And the typical HMO property would be clinics which are part of a hospital, and I would appreciate your support." Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the rassage of this Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 'ayes', 14 no. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same page of the Calendar House Bill 1561, Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1561, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, would you read the title again, 1561?
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1561, a Eill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. House
 Bill 1561 amends the Bevenue Act in order to furnish upon
 request to the owners of exempt property an affidavit form
 as to change an ownership, or use of such property, or the
 status of such owner. It's a simple Bill. It was produced

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

by the County Assessor's Office of Cook County, and there is no opposition to the Bill. And I would certainly appreciate a favorable vote.

- Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 110 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1562, Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1562, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Badigan: "Mr. McGann."

- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

 This is a similar Bill. It's been requested by the Cook

 County Assessor's Office. And it has to do... It requires

 the title holders of exempt property, where there has been
 a change in use or transfer of such property to notify the

 County Chief Assessing Official within thirty days of such

 change, and I would certainly appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 102 'ayes', 7 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Yourell 'aye'. House Bill 2103, Mr. Hastert. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2103, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hastert."

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

Bill 2103 is an administration Bill. It's a clean-up Bill

on the investment tax credit which takes place and goes in

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

House Eill 703,

track the language of the federal legislation, and it actually tightens up the Bill a little bit in defining what property actually is eligible for investment tax credit."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional

effect July 1st. What it actually does is track federal ...

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 703, a Bill for an Act in relation to family resource centers and fighting for grants, therefore.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Representative Younge. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, change the score board.
Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 703 would create the Family Resource Center Authorization in the Community Development Finance Corporation Bill, and this would authorize this corporation to make grants for centers for family resource development, or places where families in trouble could go and get help in finding employment, and money management, and helping to keep the family together, and I ask for your support of this matter."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are trying to accommodate as many members as possible. This is an accommodation that shouldn't be made. And just for the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

record, we oppose this Bill as does the Governor, as does many members of the people of the State of Illinois. And this Bill shouldn't pass, and if it does, we'll verify it."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 49 'ayes', 56 'nos'. Representative Younge.

Younge: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1009. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act relating to investments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you. House Bill 1009 is an Amendment to the Community Development Finance Corporation Bill. The Bill which was signed into law on the 2nd of February, 1983, authorized the establishment of ten million a dollar sale of stock of the corporation, and this Eill would give a 15% tax credit to those purchases of the stock. And I ask for your support of this Eill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "The same speech as before, including the verification."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of this Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 48 'ayes', 57 'nos'. This Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2010. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2010, a Bill for an Act to provide for the Metropolitan Exposition and Auditorium Authority.

Third Reading of the Bill."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2010 would establish the Katherine Dunham Exposition Hall Authority. It would be authorized to issue only revenue bonds, and the seven members of the Board would be appointed by the Mayor of the City. Amended into this Bill has been a request that the Aurora Exposition Authority be tax exempt, and also the Will County Exposition Authority be tax exempt. I ask for your support in this matter."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fiel."

'Piel: "Same speech, third time, verification."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of this Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Younge to explain her vote."

Younge: "Yes, this is a very critical Fill, and it will help to spur economic development in my area. The larger exposition halls have already been built, and there are a series of smaller communities that could use the presence of these centers to promote their economic development.

And I'll ask for the eight more votes that I need to make this a reality."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 53 'ayes', 48 'nos'. This Bill shall be placed on the Order of... For what purpose does Representative Younge seek recognition?"

Younge: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Madigan: "Sure. Mr... The... Ladies and Gentlemen, the Lady... The Lady is within her rights under the rules.

The Clerk shall poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Earnes, Christensen,
Domico, Doyle, Ewing, Homer, Huff, Leverenz, Mulcahey,
Rhem, Richmond, Slape. I'm sorry, not Richmond or Slape.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Stuffle, Vitek, Winchester. No further."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Younge, would you prefer Postponed Consideration?"

Younge: "Yes."

- Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2040. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2040, a Eill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Feading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Eill would make it against the law to place a landfill within a thousand feet of a state park and, also, in a very densely populated area.

 And I ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, we've beaten this Bill once. I would urge
 the Body to do it again and request a verification if
 necessary."
- Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of this Bill will vote "aye", all those opposed will vote "no". Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 55 ayes", 46 "nos". This Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1772, Mr. Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1772, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Beading of
 the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1772 as amended... First thing I need to do, Mr. Speaker, is bring 1772 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted that the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment simply clears up a problem that the Minority Spokesman had at the time this Bill went through Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The
Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave for immediate consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted. Nr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1772, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Eill."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1772 as amended amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. What this Bill does is simply to place the responsibility of tax refunds on the Illinois Department of Revenue. It changes the deemed denied provision to deemed approved. A very simple suggestion. I ask for a positive Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the Amendment did was to accommodate the Department of Revenue to a degree. Now it's a mutual consent that the period of time is extended beyond the six month limit, and the... that was an agreement with the Sponsor of the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1760, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1760, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a Department Bill. The responsible relative Act provides now that regardless of how much money you have, the responsible relative is only responsible for a hundred dollars per month, and this puts it into a system where it will be... the rules will be promulgated by the Department and approved, of course, by the Administrative Rules Committee. And I move its... move the approval of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote "aye", those opposed will vote "no". Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 98 "ayes", 12 'nos". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared pass. House Bill 2242. Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2242, a Bill for an Act creating the Crime Stoppers Advisory Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to Representative Churchill, from Lake County."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a Special Order of
Business of Crime Stoppers, I'm happy that we finally got a
chance to call this Bill. I've discussed the Bill with
most of the Members on my side of the aisle. It's a Bill
for advisory, and I suggest you vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, just so you don't think we're under any misapprehention, the rules do not give you the authority to declare Special Orders. I know you're well intentioned. Those in favor of the passage of this Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? For what purpose does Mr. Freston seek recognition?"

Preston: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm rising in opposition to this Fill, and I want to point something out. There are a number of organizations, community organizations as well as other organizations involved in statewide programs besides the Crime Stopper Program. By the General Assembly putting its... of an approval on one specific program, you're wiping out the ability of organizational efforts and their crime And I'm going to prevention programs. ask for verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll be extremely brief. The successful Crime Stopper Programs in Illinois do neither need nor want this advisory council."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask Bepresentative Preston a question, if he'd like to respond. Have you read

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Calendar in the last half hour, Mr. Freston?"

Speaker Madigan: "All's well, that ends well. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 92 'ayes', 16 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2079, Mr. Winchester. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk O'Erien: "House Bill 2079."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winchester."

- Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act in relation to the conveyance of public lands. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a land conveyance Bill for Alexander County. It will result in a net gain to the Department's properties of \$227,000. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Eill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 109 'ayes', one person voting 'no'. This Eill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1610, Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's very simple Bill to allow township in my county to acquire an airport if they choose to do it. There is an Amendment on for Representative Stuffle at the request of townships in Vermilion County, and I recommend the passage of 1610."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1610, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Township Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Dunn."
- Dunn: "I haven't found an analysis on this Bill yet, but a

 Session or so ago, we had legislation about a very

 controversial airport acquisition. Is this that one or

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

some other one?"

Davis: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question, but it doesn't relate to what you're talking about. I can guarantee you that. This is a whole different issue. It's very local and very restricted. It has nothing to do with airport acquisitions of C'Hare or anybody else."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, does this give the townships a power of eminent domain and authorization to own and operate airports?"

Davis: "Yes, it does. And if I could have isolated to Frankfort
Township, I would have, but I can't and no... They're
requirements in the Bill that say that it has to be
approved for expansion by the FAA, approve for expansion by
the Illinois Aeronautics Board. It has to be approved by
everybody before anybody can do it."

Brummer: "It would be applicable to any township in the State of Illinois that met those requirements."

Davis: "That's true. That's true."

Brummer: "Do townships currently have power of eminent domain?"

Davis: "No they do not for this purpose. I can only say to you,

if I could have isolated Frankfort, I would. I don't

believe any of the townships would ever do this, except the

one I'm talking about. This Eill passed the House last

year with a hundred and forty-five votes."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this guestion, there are 82 'ayes', 24 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #4, there appears House Bill 1753, Mr. Winchester. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1753, a Bill for an Act to amend the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is sponsored by Bepresentative McFike and myself for the new car truck dealers here in the State of Illinois. It is a small business Bill, it protects small business from big business, and I will ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well, that was a very simple explanation to the It made it very concise. I will just point out, I think, that this Bill ought to be opposed. I know if you go back in your district, you 'll find dealers who are for it, who don't want competition. They may have a valid point at I think we ought to look at it from the other times. angle. We keep talking about free enterprise, and free enterprise means competition. I think we ought to think about it in that sense. I stood here two years ago and opposed the Sunday closing Bill because of the free competition issue and the free enterprise issue, and I stand in opposition of this Eill for the same reasons. T think we need to have competition. We need to have We need to have the ability to be diverse. I selection. think those who single-mindedly say, "We're going to put some out of ... one out of business, are wrong when they suggest that this Bill ought to be passed. And for those reasons, and the reasons advanced then, with regard to free enterprise which I think are valid, which were advanced on a Sunday closing issue, they ought to be advanced today as well. They ought to be considerate of the consumer, and we ought to defeat this Bill for those reasons.

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eirkinbine."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You should know that this Fill sets a radius limit where a new dealership cannot establish in the Counties of Cook and DuPage. I think that will be ten miles. other counties, it would be fifteen miles. Just thinking of my own hometown in Northfield, if indeed we had, Chevrolet dealership there, and if this law were to be passed, no other Chevrolet dealership could be set up Glenview, Northbrook, Frospect Heights, parts of Deerfield, all of Winnetka, Kenilworth, Wilmette, part of Evanston, all of Glencoe, part of Highland Fark, Morton Grove, Village of Golf. Think of what a ten mile radius actually does, and how many towns it extends to. You would cutting off people access to a competing dealership in areas like that. Last year, you may remember that due pressure that was brought to bear on the us from dealerships back in our area, we woted and passed out Sunday Closing Act. I don't know one person who voted for that Bill who didn't do it holding his nose. Everyone admitted it was a bad Bill, and we got into trouble because of it. I suggest to you that we not do the same thing this year, that we give this a red vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the things that strikes at the basis of this Bill is that an agreement between the manufacturers of cars and car dealers provide for a term call relevant market area. This term relevant market area has never been defined. There have been lawsuits over it, and there is no standards by which the dealers can determine what this means in their own agreement with a manufacturer. This Bill provides that definition so that those court cases don't have to exist. That's the prime reason for having

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Bill, and I suggest its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the previous question say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 35 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. eight of the Calendar on the Regular Call House Bill 1402, Mr. Pierce. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to authorize a taxpayer to enter a negative amount as income so as to permit the carrying forward of the lose in one year to a future income tax year, future income tax liability. If future income exists in taxable amounts on a return, returns file subsequent to a lose, such lose can be then excluded from taxable income. It passed unanimously out of the Revenue Committee. Bepresentative Hastert is the Cosponsor of the Bill, the Minority Spokesman, and I urge the adoption of House Bill 1402."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Brummer: "What is the estimated cost of this to the state?"

Pierce: "They don't have an estimated cost on this. It's not going to amount to very much. What it does is carries out

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

what happens on the federal return into the state return. Most people think that the law provides it now, but apparently the Department of Bevenue hasn't been always interpreting that way. And all you're doing is showing the figure you have on your federal return for the year on your state return, which we all thought you would do anyway, but the Department of Bevenue hasn't approved of showing negative income. If you have a lose, you have a lose. You should show it."

Brummer: "Well, would it enable you to file an income tax return showing a loss and then carry that forward to the following year, is that..."

Pierce: "That's right. If you make money the next year."

Brummer: "Well, that... that undoubtedly has a significant cost to the state."

Pierce: "Well, the Department of Revenue didn't think it did.

Maybe it's, you know, it's Third Reading now. It's not fiscal note time, but... If the Governor thinks it does, he can dispose of it, but Representative Bastert and I think it's a wonderful Bill and so did the unanimous vote of the Revenue Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 98 'ayes', four 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1405, Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1405, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Br. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. This
House Bill 1405 is similar to House Bill 387. It was

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

passed out of this Assembly by great bipartisan support. What this Bill does, it pertains... 387 pertains to the fire pension. This pertains to the police pension - the Chicago Police Department. What it does, it increases the multiplier over a period of five years in order to bring up the amount needed to fund the unfunded liabilities that exist presently. The multiplier now in effect is not sufficient to meet the normal cost plus interest on the unfunded liabilities. This, House Bill 1405, passed out of Committee 10 to nothing. It has been approved by... And I request a favorable vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 'ayes', 48 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1414, Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Illinois Fension Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 1414 would reduce the age by three years at which a
Chicago police officer can retire with 23 years of service.
Police officers currently have to work till they're 53.
This would lower the pension age to 50. They have to have
23 years of service."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Van Duyne: "Is there anything in here for the General Assembly pension system?"

McAuliffe: "No not now, no."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

- Van Duyne: "Well one of these days... One of these days I'm going to guit voting for all of these."
- McAuliffe: "Well I'll vote for any you got for the General Assembly pension system."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor... Mr. Neff."
- Neff: "Just a second there, Mr. Speaker. This is a good piece of legislation, and I hope we will give it a lot of green votes."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 68 'ayes', 38 'nos'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We shall now call all appropriation Bills on the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 82, Mr. Bowman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill... House Bill 82, a Bill for an Act
 making appropriation to the Department of Agriculture.
 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Br. Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill appropriates 398,000 to the Department for exhibition hall on the Winnebago County Fairgrounds, and \$225,000 from the Ag Premium Fund to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of rebuilding the grandstand at the Marion County Fair. I move its passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Dunn."
- Dunn: "In the event, this Bill receives the requisite majority, I will ask for a verification."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if this Bill does get enough votes, I would ask for a verification. I think that everybody should know that this

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

fairground building had no insurance coverage whatsoever, and we are asking for \$398,500, which is a lot of money. It's not in the budget, and we may be setting a precedent. And other people won't have their buildings insured and expect us to pick up the tab for them too. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. When you come and you want your roof for your little fairground, we always find a way to take care of you. I would hope that you would find a way to take care of this Bill. Vote green."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Eowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would respectfully suggest to those people who are seeking a Roll Call, or a verification rather, that they withdraw their request. First of all, the hour is late, and we do have other business to do before we adjourn. And the other thing is that I think that it would be wise to have some House Bills over in the Senate for purposes... further consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman, I understand your intent which is to provide for House... for Democratic sponsored appropriation Bills in the Senate, and unfortunately, you're not joined by all of your colleagues in achieving that objective, so maybe you just should ask to take the Bill out of the record. Mr. Yourell."
- Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that
 Representative Dunn wants to be recognized, and I would
 hope you will do that now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn."

54th Legislative Day May 27, 1983

Dunn: "I will withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Please change my 'nc' vcte to 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Becord Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. Representative Satterthwaite, are you seeking recognition? Mr. Shaw, you seeking recognition? Mr. Fouman, I would... DeJaegher. Mr. Shaw. Record Mr. Shaw as 'aye'. Mr. DeJaegher 'aye'. Mr. Davis wants to be recorded as 'no'. Mr. Neff is 'no'. Mr. Friedrich is 'no'. Mr. Bowman. I suggest you take the Bill out of the record, so that we can consider a few more Bills and then adjourn. The Bill shall be taken from the record. House Fill 2144, Mr. Vinson. Mr. Clerk, take House Bill 82 out of the record. We shall call House Bill 2144, Mr. Vinson. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2144, a Bill for an Act to provide for staff assistance for the General Assembly. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The staff, in analyzing the General Assembly Act, has discovered that there is a problem in the statute, which was enacted under the old Constitution. And under that it... under that problem, theoretically, there may be no justification nor ability to hire legislative staff when the General Assembly is not in Session. This Bill would simply cure that problem and provide authorization for staff to be hired by the legislative Leaderships of the respective parties during the period when the... after organization and until the General Assembly adjourns seine die. I would simply move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2144."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, there's a problem here, a very serious

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

problem; and, that is, we've seen a build up in staff which I think may be a good thing, even though it's apparently cost us a secretary of our own. As money has gone more and more to Leadership staff, the Members have been deprived of their individual secretaries. But I think where we go too far is when we hire staff and then we label it as partisan House Republican Press Office, 600 State Capitol and we send out press releases attacking a Member's integrity, calling them illegal, calling the Speaker's actions illegal, unprecedented, unconstitutional, inexcusable all on state-paid-for stationery, state-paid-for state-paid-for staff, bringing the credibility of this Legislature, when there's no election going on, into dispute throughout the state. That's an abusive staff, and I'm standing up here today not necessarily that this is a bad Bill, although it does allow ... it does allow people to stay on after the Session for the purpose of blasting right through the election. Now, it may be more proper to blast during the election, but we have a staff sitting up on the fifth floor here blasting us when there's no election going on, calling sixth floor, right next to Matijevich up there I guess, calling us unconstitutional, unprecedented, illegal, inexcusable and so on and so forth, misleading the public, bringing discredit upon the Members of the General Assembly - things you couldn't even do on the floor of the House. What you do is you have this paid staff sit on the sixth floor and send out releases to Members' districts attacking them rersonally in nonelection year. And who pays for this? The taxpayers pay for this. Every one of those people up there are the state payroll. The stationery's paid for by the state. The stamps are paid for by the state; and, in my opinion the state's attorney or the U. S. Attorney ought to look

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

into the use of public funds for political purposes. It's... It's misappropriation of public funds. Public funds are being misappropriated through political purposes, only way we have to showing how we feel is to defeat this Bill. I have nothing against flacks, not hacks, political flacks sending out press releases if we think we need them, if we can't compose our own press releases, but let's not have them sending out partisan political items on stationery saying House Republican Press Office, paid for by the taxpayers of our districts, paid for bу paid for taxpayers of our state with stamps hν the taxpayers, misappropriation of state funds, while the Members here, both Republican and Democratic, have been deprived of their individual secretaries. Why are deprived of your individual secretaries? So that these flacks can sit up there and be hired at high salaries, kept throughout the year sending out press releases, and we don't have secretarial service to even answer the press releases. We have to... We have... First time since 1971, we don't even have ... I don't even have my own secretary to sit down and answer these releases as they flow out to the district. So I ask everyone here, ask everyone here... course, no one would print this anyway, if they saw the source. But no one printed it. But let me say this, let's defeat this Bill and send a lesson. Ee'll find ... I'm sure he'll find a Conference Committee Report to tack it back on later on. Let's defeat it here tonight, and that's all I have to say."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "After that speech, I think I tetter give my press office a pay raise."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly is probably

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the best bargain the state's got. It costs one-third of one percent of the total state budget. Frankly, I thought it was a mistake to take away the secretaries so the individuals Members could take care of their constituents, but that's another matter. But the final matter is that if Mr. Pierce knows someone that's using their money illegally, then he ought to be prosecuted, and I suggest he go to the state's attorney."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Fill will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 42 'ayes', 57 'nos'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. We have two conveyance Fills on the Regular Calendar, Bouse Fill 2210 (sic -2221) by Mr. Hannig and House Bill 2105 by Mr. Balph Dunn. The Chair would suggest that we take both Bills on one Roll Call. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Those in favor of the passage of the Bills will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. John Dunn has a guestion."
- John Dunn: "Why don't we read the Bills a third time. And what are they?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bills."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2105, a Bill for an Act to authorize the director of Central Management Services to convey title to a certain parcel of land in exchange for title to another parcel land. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have you read one of these Bills?

 Alright, 2105 has been read. Who is the Sponsor of the

 Bill? Mr. Ralph Dunn. Mr. Eunn, present your Bill."
- Dunn: "Thank you. Thank you. This involves no money. It's a swap of land that lively grow for a micro wave tower. The state now owns a five acre tract, it's real narrow and

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

long. They can't put the... It doesn't have anything for Rock Island someone told me. It is a strip of land that's to narrow to put a tower on and to guide wire it, and so they are going to swap some off each end off of one end to a farmer for some land adjacent. That's all it is. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Alright, for purposes of the record, we shall proceed one Bill at a time. We are now on House Bill 2105 which is sponsored by Mr. Balph Dunn. Mr. Leverenz, are you seeking recognition? Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Leverenz: "Is there a reverter clause should the property not be used for that which you state is the intended use? Will it revert to the state so that we do not get into a posture as we did a few days ago with the property up near Elgin that is going to be purchased for \$202,000 by the RTA apparently?"

Dunn: "I... I don't know if there is a reverter clause on here or not. It trades two acres of our ground for one acre of the farmer's ground, so be can..."

Leverenz: "Eut it should come back to the state, wouldn't you agree, if it's not used for the intended purpose. Some of these have the reverter clause in, some do not."

Dunn: "It does not in this Bill."

Leverenz: "That's your intent then?"

Dunn: "That's our intent, and I would be glad to..."

Leverenz: "Fine."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, quick question. Are there any Amendments on your Bill, Mr. Dunn?"

Dunn: "No."

VanDuyne: "Thank you."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman. The guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Giorgi would you come to the podium. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2221, Mr. Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2221, a Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey certain land in Montgomery County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This
Bill pertains only to Montgomery County, conveys certain
properties. It came out of Committee 13 to nothing. I
know of no opposition. I would ask for your 'yes' vote."
Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield? Could you state what the purpose of the property will be, and does it have a reverter clause in it?"

Hannig: "It will give the property to the City of Litchfield, so they could use the land to help maintain their silt pond."

Leverenz: "How many acres?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eowman."

Bowman: "Was this Bill amended today at all?"

Hannig: "No, no it was not."

Bowman: "Fine. I support it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, I like to know how much land is being given away here? Four hundred what?"

Hannig: "Approximately four hundred acres... near the silt pond,
the lower end of the lake. It's unimproved land. It's...
And I just appreciate your 'yes' vote."

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote
'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Bave all voted who wish?

Bave all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question, there are 71 'ayes', 29 'no'. This Bill,

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Br. Nash, do

you wish to call House Bill 1454? It's an Amendment to the

Election Code. We did? I'm sorry. Thank you. Bouse Bill

1500, Mr. LeFlore. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1500, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 1500 is a simple Bill. It passed Committee with 13 votes. No opposition. It requires the director of the Department of Insurance to maintain records whenever there is exams given, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'ave', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. question, there are 109 'ayes', no one voting 'no'. Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby The Chair wishes to announce that the passed. Bills which were taken on one Boll Call under the Motion of Mr. Vinson. Bills which amend the Election Code, all have a sufficient number of votes to pass. I will ask the Clerk to read into the record the count on each Bill. And then the Clerk can read that the Eills have received Constitutional Majority, and therefore, they have been declared passed. He will do that in Ferfunctory Session. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. Is there anyone who has a reason why we should not adjourn? The Chair will like Mr. Brummer if you would stay in the chamber. The

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Chair will like to adjourn upon a Death Resolution. It would be a Death Resolution concerning the death of Representative Richmond's son. Before we proceed to that Order of Business, we must first adopt the Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 50, resolved by the House of Representatives the Eighty-Third General Assembly of the State of Illinois the Senate concurring herein, when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, May 27, 1983, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 1, 1983 at 12 o'clock noon, and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 27, 1983, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, 1983 at 12 o'clock noon."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The
Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, read the
Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 48. Whereas, the House of Representatives was greatly saddened to learn of the death Randall Richmond, the beloved son of our distinguished colleague, Bruce Richmond, and his wife LaCleeta; and whereas, Randall was a graduate of Murphysboro High School and Southern Illinois University; and whereas, Randall was an outstanding student, participating in the President's while attending Southern Illinois Scholar Program University; and whereas, Randall was a respected graphic designer, recognized by his peers as a gifted artist; and whereas, Randall's creative spirit was revealed by his written works, which displayed uncommon talent and skill; and whereas, this House of Representatives realizes that a

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

child is irreplaceable; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Third General Assembly, the Senate concurring herein, that the most sincere and heartfelt condolences are extended to our distinguished colleague, Representative Bruce Bichmond, and his wife, LaCleeta, and their family on their loss of Randall Richmond; and it be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of the preamble and Resolution be presented to the Honorable Bruce Richmond and family, and it's of further token of our respect, the House does now stand adjourn."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of the Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, one week ago today, my friend, my office mate, my seatmate, had the saddest news anybody could ever get. I do not wish to ring him out emotionally anymore than he already has been. I attended the funeral on behalf of all of you, and I would ask all of the Members of the House to join in sponsoring this Besolution. I would ask for passage of the Besolution."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there a leave that all Members of the House become Sponsors of this Resolution? Leave is granted. All Members of the House of Representatives shall be added as Sponsors of this Resolution. Mr. Flinn moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. The House stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 1 at 12 noon, providing time for Perfunctory Session."

Clerk O'Brien: "The following are the vote totals on the Bills on the agreed list. House Bill 856, 100 'ayes', 6 'nos', 8 voting 'present'. House Bill 1203, 102 'ayes', 4 'nos',

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

and 8 'present'. House Bill 1236, 92 *aves*, 13 *nos*, 9 'present'. House Bi11 1237, 101 'ayes', 'nos', 'present'. House Bi11 1238. 99 *aves*. 'Dos'. 'present'. House Bi11 1565. 99 *aves*. 7 'ncs'. 'present'. House Bill 1566. 100 'ayes', 7 'nos'. 8 Bill 1812, 101 'ayes', 'nos', 'present'. House 3 10 'present'. Bill 1898. 102 'ayes'. 4 'nos'. House 8 'present'. House Bill 1983, 96 'ayes'. 9 'nos', q 'present'. House Bill 1984, 95 'ayes', 14 'nos', 'present'. House Bill 1985. 94 'ayes', 13 'nos'. 7 'present'. Bill 1986. 'aves'. 'nos'. 7 House 92 15 'present'. Bi11 1987. 90 "nos", 6 House 'aves'. 18 'present'. House Bill 1988, 87 'ayes', 19 onos. 8 'present'. Bill 1989, 94 'nos', 9 Bouse 'ayes', 11 'present'. Bi11 1990, 92 'ayes', 15 .'nos', 7 House 1991, 'present'. House Bill 94 'aves'. 14 'nos', 6 1992, 'present'. Bill 94 'ayes', 12 'nos', Я House 'present'. Bill 1994, 92 'ayes', 'nos', 7 Rouse 15 7 'present'. House Bil1 1995, 91 'ayes'. 16 nos', 'present'. House Bi11 1996, 92 'ayes', 14 'nos', 1997. 'present'. House Bill 98 *aves*. 'nos'. 'present'. House Bill 2228. 100 'ayes', 6 'nos'. 8 'present', and these Bills have been declared passed. Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. *Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House οf to wit: Senate Eills #1332, 1336, 1343, Representatives, 41, 58, 1347, 1349, 2, 22, 23, 29, 33, 37, 63, 71, 1258, 1260, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1266, 1298, 1300, 1308, 1311, 1312, 1319, 1320, 1325, 1160, 1177, 1185, 1199, 1201, 1222, 1228, 1234, 1237, 1251, 1257, passed by the Senate May 27,

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. • Senate Bills First Reading. Senate Bill 42, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 243, Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the care and treatment of certain mentally deficient persons. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 403, Mays, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 431, Mautino - McMaster, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the acquisition of the Illinois and Mississippi channel. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 448, Van Duyne - Mautino, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois and amends an Act in relation to the concentration and storage of radio active waste. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 477, Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to taxation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 478, Mautino - Slape, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the interest on certain tax refunds and memoranda. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 479. Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Pirst Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 506, Stuffle - Hannig, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Fension First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 515, Dunn -Code. McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Fublic Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 516. Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 524, O'Connell, a Bill for an Act in relation to the offense of voluntary manslaughter. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 526, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create Sanitary Districts. First Reading of the Eill. Bill 550, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act in relation ta

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

transfers of juvenile offenders to adult division. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 565, O'Connell, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 586, Keane, a Eill for an Act to an Act providing for the registration of farm names. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 591, Matijevich, Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 624, Mautino - Breslin, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the construction, operation, regulation and maintenance of a system for toll highways. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 628, McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Pirst Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 649, Homer, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 690, Nash, a Eill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 697, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to land surveyors. First Reading of the Senate Bill 717, McGann, a Fill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 727, Christensen - Pangle, a Bill for an Act authorizing conveyance of certain land owned property to city of Manteno. First Reading of the Fill. Senate Bill 728, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 739, Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers and Salesmen License Act. Pirst Reading of the Bill. Bill 740, Hicks - Olson, a Fill for an Act in relation to the recreational use of land and water areas. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 745, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 768, McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Senate Bill 772, Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend Township Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 789, Breslin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. First Beading of the Senate Bill 807, Mays - DiPrima, a Bill for to amend the law regarding hunting and certain fishing license. First Reading of the Eill. Senate Bill 808, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the retirement system of state employees. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 809, Neff, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 811, Pedersen, a Bill for an Act to release easements and restore access rights to certain described First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 812. Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 814, Dwight Code. Friedrich - Zwick, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the regulation... provide for and regulate the First Reading of the Bill. administration of trusts. Senate Bill 1815 (sic - 815), Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1817 (sic - 817), Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 821, Brummer, a Bill for Act making an appropriation to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 822, Piel, a Bill for an Act in relation to state police. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 827, Klemm, a Bill for an Act to authorize Lake County Forest Preserve District, Lake County, Illinois to sell and purchase certain land in Lake County, Illinois. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Eill 832, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Pirst Reading of

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Senate Bill 840, Taylor, a Eill for an Act the Bill. amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 847, Kirkland, a Bill for an Act relation to municipalities and counties. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 851, Van Duyne, a Bill for to amend the Illinois Fension Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 852, McCracken, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 862, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend an to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 866, Stuffle - Ronan, Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to nursing. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 873, Koehler, Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of Senate Bill 876, Barris, a Bill for an Act to the Bill. amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 879, Kirkland, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illincis Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 886, Steczo, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 887, Reilly, a Bill an Act to amend the Child Care Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 891, Saltsman, a Bill for amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 895, Hutchins, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 896, Johnson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 903, McGann -Doyle, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Fill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 904, Ronan, a Bill for an Act to amend

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 913, Reilly - Mays, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to punish fraud or extravagance in the expenditure monies appropriated for public improvements. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 915, Vinson, a Bill Act to amend the Illinois Fension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 917, Karpiel, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 931, Rea, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of Senate Bill 926, Terzich, a Bill for an Act in relationship to tax on replacement vehicles. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 932, Rea, a Bill for an Act amend an Act concerning public utilities and the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 933, Hicks, a Bill for an Act requiring the Department of Agriculture to promote the use of qasohol. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 937, McAuliffe -Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle First Reading of the Eill. Code -Senate Bill 938. Madigan, a Bill for an Act relating to public financing qubernatorial campaigns. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 941, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 942, Currie, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Corporation for Science and Technology. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 943, Saltsman - Tuerk, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to foreign trade zones. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 945, Barris, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 946, Barris, a Fill for an license foreign bank representative offices. First Reading

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Senate Bill 947, Topinka, a Bill for an Act of the Bill. in relationship to the payment and disposition of First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 948. Leverenz, a Bill for an Act in relationship to workers! compensation claims by state employees. Pirst Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 949, Beilly, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to CORS State Project Fund. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 950. for an Act to amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Bill Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Olson, a Bill for an Act in relationship to admitted assets in authorized investments for insurance companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 952, Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to payment disposition of monies. First Beading of the Eill. Senate Bill 955, DiPrima - Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to layoffs and reinstatements of state employees. First Reading of the Eill. Senate Bill Leverenz - Doyle, a Bill for an Act to establish high impact training services program. First Reading of Senate Bill 1003, Leverenz - Doyle, a Bill for an Bill. Act making an appropriation to the State Board First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1004, Education. Satterthwaite - Giorgi, a Bill for an Act in relationship to certain technical training programs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1005, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1006, Pierce - Mulcahey, Bill for an Act in relationship to the creation of the Illinois Young Minds Program. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1010, Bicks - Christensen, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1011, Bullock - Pangle, a

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill for an Act to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1014, Breslin - Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois State Park Foundation. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1015, Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Youth Conservation Corps. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1016, Younge, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the Department of Conservation. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1018, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1019, Younge, a Bill for making an appropriation to the Department an Act Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1021, McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Beading of the Eill. Senate Bill 1022, Keane - McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Tax Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1023, Curran - BeJaegher, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of Senate Bill 1024, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Industrial Development Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1025, Bicks, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1026, Mautino - Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Small Business Division of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1027, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1028, Satterthwaite - Giorgi, a Bill for Bill. Act to amend the Illinois Agriculture-Engineering aп Internship Program. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1029, Capparelli, a Bill for an Act making an

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

appropriation to the Higher Education. First Reading of Senate Bill 1030, Bicks, a Bill for an Act to amend the Small Town Commercial Zone and Improvements Act the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1033, Berrios - Kulas, Bill for an Act to create the Illincis Neighborhood Corps Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1034. Bicks -Christensen, a Bill for an Act to amend the Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1035, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1037, Kulas - Berrios, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Environmental First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill Financing Act. Rea - Hannig, a Bill for an Act making an 1038, Department of Energy and Natural appropriation the Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1045, First Resources. Act in relationship Steczo, a Bill for an urea-formaldehyde foam. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1047, Dwight Friedrich - Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend the Foreign Banking Office Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1048, Reilly, a Bill for an Act to amend the Professional Service Corporation Act and the Medical Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1049, Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1054, Bicks, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the State Fair and county fairs. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 1059, Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading Senate Bill 1061, Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1064, McAuliffe, a Fill for an Act to Bill.

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

amend an Act in relationship to the medical center district in Chicago. First Reading of the Fill. Senate Bill 1069, Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 1078, Churchill, Bill for an Act to amend the Pharmacy Practice Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1079, Dwight Friedrich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 1088, Hastert, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1093, McCracken, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1096, Olson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1106, Terzich - Huff, a Bill for an Act Bill. in relationship to taxation receipts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1107, Terzich - Huff, a Bill for an Act to amend the Act in relationship to gross receipts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 1116, Mautino - Marzuki, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1123, Karpiel, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning federal block grants. First Reading of the Bill. Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil 1124, Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1132, Panayotovich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1133, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1134, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1136, Johnson, a Bill for an Act regarding the disposition of certain criminal penalties collected from motor carriers and other persons. First Reading of the

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Bill. Senate Bill 1144. Ronan - Barnes, a Bill for an Act relating to professions and occupation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1146, Birkinbine, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the School Code and the Enterprise Zone Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1156, Mautino - Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the State Fire Marshal and the Act relating investigation and prevention of fire. First Reading of the Bill. Rill 1176, Winchester, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Eill. Senate Fill 1232, Peterson - Steczo, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the use of public funds to provide day care services for not-for-profit and for profit day facilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1233, Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to certain investments of public funds by public agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 1254, Satterthwaite - McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1268, Hastert, a for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Bill First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1313, Farley a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to First Reading of the Bill. the Chicago Park District. Senate Bill 1317, Kulas - Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Residential Construction Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1354, McGann, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Department Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. The House will now stand at ease awaiting Senate Messages."

Clerk O'Brien: "Further Introductions and First Readings. Senate
Bill 22, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois

54th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 23. Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 29, Greiman. a Bill for an Act to amend the Bingo License and Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 37. Alexander, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 41, O'Connell, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to criminal jurisprudence. First Beading of the Fill. Senate Bill 58, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 71, Van Duyne, a Bill for an Act concerning the Illinois National Guard Armories. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 1199, Klemm, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Chain O Lakes -Fox River Waterway Management Agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1201, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Supreme Court. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 1228, Roman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of Senate Bill 1237, John Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to welfare of wage earners. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1251, Breslin, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission and the Attorney General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1257, Christensen, Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the interstate compacts and agreements concerning nuclear First Reading of the Fill. Senate Bill 1258, Christensen, a Bill for an Act in relation to the handling of spent nuclear fuel. First Reading of the Fill. Senate Bill 1260, Homer, a Bill for an Act to amend Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill.

,4th Legislative Day

May 27, 1983

Senate Bill 1262, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the State Revenue Sharing. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1266, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary contingent expense of the Department οf Rehabilitation Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1300, Yourell, a Fill for an Act in relation to voter registration. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1308, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act to create the Hospice Program Licensing Act. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1311, Greiman, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the income tax deductions to businesses. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Fill 1312, Terzich, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Occupation and Use Taxes on high rise fire safety systems. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1320, Brookins, a Bill for an Act Bill. making an appropriation the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1332, Currie - Madigan, a Fill for an Act relation to access to public records. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1343, Ronan, a Fill for an Act to amend Bill. the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1347, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to adult and continuing education. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1349, Hastert, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to child abuse prevention shelters and multidisciplinary teams. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 902, Nelson - Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Beading of the Bill. Senate Bill 762, Mautino - McMaster, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. The House will stand at ease. No business, the House now stands adjourned.

12/08/83 13:34

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

MAY 27, 1983

	MAI 27, 1983		
HB-0032	THIRD READING	PAGE	93
HB-0082	THIRD READING	PAGE	221
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	223
	RECALLED	PAGE	197
HB-0207	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	200
	THIRD READING	PAGE	94
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	201 96
	THIRD READING	PAGE	146
	THIRD READING	PAGE	207
HB-0720	RECALLED	PAGE	157
	THIRD READING	PAGE	160
	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	180
HB-0856	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
	THIRD READING	PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	208 18
	THIRD READING	PAGE	85
	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
HB-1203		PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
HB-1236		PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
HB-1237		PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	133 24
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	26
	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
	THIRD READING	PAGE	38
	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	42
	THIRD READING	PAGE	45
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	46 48
	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
	RECALLED	PAGE	50
	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
	THIRD READING	PAGE	55
	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	THIRD BEADING	PAGE PAGE	57 204
	THIRD READING	PAGE	175
	THIRD READING	PAGE	218
HB-1404	RECALLED	PAGE	61
	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	THIRD READING	PAGE	219
HB- 1414		PAGE	220
	THIRD READING RECALLED	PAGE	102
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE PAGE	103 106
HB- 1473	THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-1473		PAGE	180
HB- 1485	THIRD READING	PAGE	106
HB- 1489	THIRD READING	PAGE	204
HB-1500	THIRD READING	PAGE	229
HB-1558		PAGE	117
HB-1561 HB-1562	THIRD BEADING	PAGE	205
HB- 1565	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	206
TD 1303	THERE DESILES	PAGE	137

r ١

STATE OF ILLINOIS
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF BEPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

2

MAY 27, 1983

	uat 27, 1303		
HB 1565	MOTION	PAGE	133
HB- 1566	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1566	MOTION	PAGE	133
	RECALLED	PAGE	63
	THIRD READING	PAGE	66
	THIRD READING	PAGE	214
	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
	THIRD READING	PAGE	180
	THIRD READING	PAGE	169
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	10 194
	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
	THIRD READING	PAGE	215
	THIRD READING	PAGE	212
	RECALLED	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING		
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE	180
HB-1812	THIRD READING	PAGE .	137
HB-1812	NOTION	PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	FRGD	
HB-1898		PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	180
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1983	HOTION BEADING	PAGE	133
HB-1984	THIRD READING	DACE	137
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	133
HB- 1985	MOTTON	PAGE	133
HB- 1986	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1986	MOTION	PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1987	MOTION	PAGE:	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB- 1988		PAGE	133
	TUIBN BEWATAR	PAGE	137
HB- 1989		PAGE PAGE PAGE	133
	THIRD READING		
HB-1990	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	133 137
HB- 1991		PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE .	137
	HOTION	PAGE	133
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1994	HOTION	PAGE	133
HB- 1995	THIRD READING	PAGE:	137
	MOTION ,	PAGE	133
	RECALLED	PAGE	132
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB- 1996	HOTION	PAGE	133
HB- 1997	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
HB-1997	MOTION THIRD READING	PAGE . PAGE	133 12
HB-2014	THIRD READING	PAGE	208
	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
HB-2014		PAGE	124
HB-2014	MOTION	PAGE	93
HB-2040		PAGE	210
HB-2046		PAGE	13
HB-2079	THIRD READING	PAGE	214
HB-2103	THIRD READING	PAGE	206
HB-2105		PAGE	226
HB-2106	THIRD READING	PAGE	180

12/08/83 13:34

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 27, 1983

PAGE

3

				4	
HB-2144	THIRD	READING		PAGE	223
HB-2184		READING		PAGE	15
HB-2194		READING		PAGE	11
HB-2202				PAGE	22
HB-2219		READING		PAGE	16
HB-2221		READING		PAGE	228
HB-2228		READING		PAGE	137
HB-2228 HB-2234				PAGE	133
HB-2234		READING READING		PAGE	11
HB-2242		READING		PAGE	193
HB-2244		READING	ı	PAGE PAGE	212 11
HB-2244		READING		PAGE	180
HB-2266		READING		PAGE	128
HB-2287	THIRD	READING		PAGE	11
HB-2287	THIRD	READING		PAGE	180
SB-0022		READING	•	PAGE	242
SB-0023		READING	•	PAGE	243
SB-0029	FIRST	READING	•	PAGE	243
SB-0037		READING		PAGE	243
SB-0041 SB-0042		READING		PAGE	243
SB-0042		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0038		READING READING		PAGE	243
SB-0243	FIRST	READING		PAGE PAGE	243 233
SB-0310		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0313		READING		PAGE	3
SB-0328		DREADING		PAGE	6
SB-0328		READING		PAGE	9
SB-0329		READING		PAGE	3
SB-0348		READING		PAGE	4
SB-0403		READING		PAGE	233
		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0448 SB-0477		READING		PAGE	233
		READING READING		PAGE	233
		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0487		READING		PAGE PAGE	233 3
SB-0498		READING	•	PAGE	3
SB-0506		READING	• •	PAGE	233
	FIRST	READING	*	PAGE	3
SB-0515	FIRST	READING		PAGE	233
		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0524	FIRST	READING		PAGE	233
SB-0526		READING		PAGE	233
SB-0550 SB-0564	FIRST	READING		PAGE'	233
	FIRST	READING READING		PAGE	2
SB-0586	FIRST	READING		PAGE	234
SB-0591	FIRST	READING		PAGE PAGE	. 234 234
	FIRST	READING		PAGE	3
	FIRST	READING .		PAGE	234
SB-0628	FIRST	READING		PAGE	234
SB-0643	FIRST	READING		PAGE	4
SB-0649		READING		PAGE	234
SB-0652				PAGE	4
SB-0653		READING		PAGE	2
SB-0690 SB-0697		READING READING		PAGE	234
SB-0699		READING		PAGE	234
SB-0717		READING		PAGE PAGE	3 234
SB-0727		READING		PAGE	234
SB-0728		READING		PAGE	234
SB-0739	FIRST	READING		PAGE	234
SB-0740	PIRST	READING		PAGE	234

12/08/83 13:34

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

MAY 27, 1983

SB-0745	PIRST	READING		PAGE	234
SB-0751				PAGE	3
		READING		PAGE	244
SB-0768				PAGE	234
SB-0772				PAGE	235
SB-0789				PAGE	235
SB-0791				PAGE	4
SB-0803				PAGE	4
		READING:		PAGE	4
		BEADING		PAGE	235
SB-0808				PAGE .	235
SB-0809					
SB-0811					235
				PAGE	235
SB-0812				PAGE	235
SB-0814				PAGE	235
		BBADING		PAGE	235
SB-0816				PAGE	4
SB-0817				PAGE	235
SB-0821				PAGE	235
		READING	•	PAGE	235
SB-0827			A	PAGE	235
SB-0832	PIRST	READING	-	PAGE	235
SB-0840	FIRST	READING		PAGE .	236
SB-0847	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0851	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0852	PIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0862	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0866	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0873	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0876	PIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0879	PIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0886	FIRST	BEADING		PAGE	236
SB-0887	PIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0891	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0895	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0896	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0902	FIRST	READING		PAGE	244
SB-0903	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0904	FIRST	READING		PAGE	236
SB-0913	FIRST	READING		PAGE	237
SB-0915	FIRST	READING		PAGE	237
SB-0917	FIRST	READING		PAGE	237
SB-0926		RBADING		PAGE	237
SB-0931		READING	•	PAGE	2 37
SB-0932		READING		PAGE	237
SB-0933		READING		PAGE	237
SB-0934		READING		PAGE	2
SB-0937		READING		PAGE	237
		READING		PAGE	237
		READING	•	PAGE	237
		READING	•	PAGE	23 7
SB-0943		READING		PAGE	237
SB-0945		READING		PAGE	237
SB-0946	FIRST	READING	•	PAGE	237
		READING		PAGE	238
		READING		PAGE	238
		READING		PAGE	238
		READING	•	PAGE	238
		READING	,	PAGE	238
		READING		PAGE	238
		READING		PAGE	3
SB-0955		READING		PAGE	238
		READING		PAGE	3
		READING		PAGE	3
SB-0983	FIRST	READING		PAGE	3

PAGE

MAY 27, 1983

481 27, 1903		
SB-0991 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0995 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
· SB-0996 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0999 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1000 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1001 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1002 FIRST READING	PAGE	238
SB-1003 FIRST READING	PAGE	238
SB-1004 FIRST READING	PAGE	238
SB-1005 FIRST READING	PAGE	238
SB-1006 PIRST READING	PAGE	238
SB-1008 FIRST READING SB-1010 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1010 FIRST READING SB-1011 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	238
SB-1014 FIRST READING	PAGE	238 239
SB-1015 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1016 FIRST BEADING	PAGE	239
SB-1017 FIRST READING	PAGE	233
SB-1018 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1019 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1020 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1021 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1022 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1023 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1024 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1025 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1026 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1027 FIRST READING	PAGE	239
SB-1028 FIRST READING	PAGE .	239
SB-1029 FIRST BEADING	PAGE	239
SB-1030 FIRST READING SB-1031 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1031 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1033 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	4 240
SB-1034 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1035 FIRST BEADING	PAGE	240
SB-1037 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1038 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1045 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1047 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1048 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1049 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1054 PIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1056 FIRST BEADING	PAGE	4
SB-1059 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1061 FIRST READING SB-1062 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1062 FIRST READING SB-1064 FIRST READING	PAGE	2//0
SB-1069 FIRST READING	PAGE	240
SB-1070 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	241 3
SB-1078 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1079 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1088 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1093 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1096 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1106 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1107 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1111 FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1116 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1123 FIRST READING SB-1124 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1132 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1132 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	241 241
SB-1134 PIRST READING	PAGE	241
SB-1136 FIRST READING	PAGE	241
		- · ·

12/08/83 13:34

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

MAY 27, 1983

SB-1144	FIRST READING	i	PAGE	242
	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
	FIRST READING		PAGE	2
	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
SB-1199	FIRST READING		PAGE	243
SB-1201	FIRST READING		PAGE	243
SB-1228	FIRST READING	· .	PAGE	243
SB-1232	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
SB-1233	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
SB-1237	FIRST READING	 	PAGE	243
SB-1251	FIRST READING		PAGE	243
SB-1254	FIRST READING		PAGE	2
SB-1254	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
SB-1257	FIRST READING		PAGE	243
SB-1258	FIRST READING	;	PAGE	243
SB-1260	FIRST READING	i	PAGE	243
SB-1262	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
SB-1266	PIRST READING		PAGE	244
SB-1268	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
SB-1300	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
SB-1308	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
SB-1310	FIRST READING	i	PAGE	2
	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
SB-1312	FIRST READING	;	PAGE	244
	PIRST READING		PAGE	242
	FIRST READING		PAGE	242
	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
	FIRST READING		PAGE	4
	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
	FIRST READING		PAGE	244
	PIRST READING		PAGE	244
	PIRST READING		PAGE	244
	FIRST READING	1 4	PAGE	242
	ADOPTED		PAGE	17
HJR-0048			PAGE	230
HJR-0050	ADOPTED		PAGE	230

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND PAUL J. EVANS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	. 1
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICE IN CHAIR	PAGE	15
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	56
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN CHAIR	PAGE	109
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	134
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICE IN CHAIR	PAGE	172
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	180
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	231
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	231
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	232
PERPUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	244