71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. The House will come to order. Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today will be Father John Beveridge, Associate Fastor of the Cathedral of Immaculate Conception in Springfield. Father Beveridge is a guest of Representative Mike Curran. Will the guests in the balcony please rise to join us in the invocation?"

Father Beveridge: "Let us pray. Lord, God and Father, You revealed Your beauty in all that surrounds us, but in a most noble way in man and woman whom You've created in Your own image. You've given us the task and responsibility of subduing and dominating the earth in order to preserve our lives, provide for our fellow brothers and sisters and creative according to the wonder of our own nature. It is in this labor that we find ourselves expressing ourselves as persons. We find meaning in what we do, whether in our physical labor or in that effort of our creativity. Cur work finds value in that we, as persons, do it. Work is for man, not man for work. This day, Oh Lord, we ask Your blessing upon our work, the labor of our hands, minds and Keep before us those who labor, the father, our hearts. mother, the single person, old or younger, the teenager, each with their own needs, hopes and dreams. And with special gentleness, keep our hearts sensitive to those who have been deprived of that right to work. This day, Lord. guide our efforts that they will always be before us, that what we do will be for their good. We ask You this in the Name of Your Son, our Lord."

Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Bepublic for which it stands, one Nation

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. 116 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Bepresentative Greiman, do you have any excused absences?"

Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Christensen is absent by reason of illness in the family, and his key has been removed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vinson, do you have any excused absences?"

Vinson: "No, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you."

Vinson: "But several should be."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock on a Motion."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that House Bill 328, which is one of my Bills, be taken from the Table and placed on the Order of Interim Study."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman... Is this House Bill or Senate Fill?"

Hallock: "House Bill 328."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to take House Bill 328 from the Table and put it in Interim Study. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted, House Bill 328 Interim Study.

Representative O'Connell, for what reason do you rise?"

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to have leave of the House to take Senate Bill 171 from Consideration Postponed to Interim Study."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to take Senate Bill 171 from Postponed Consideration to Interim Study. Are there any objections? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman would hold that Motion for a few minutes."

Speaker McFike: "Representative Vinson, just to make it clear, it's the right of any Member to fill cut a slip at the well

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

to place his Bill that's on the Calendar in Interim Study without leave. That is a Member's right. Representative Vinson."

- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I understand fully that that is a Member's right. I'm just asking the Gentleman if he would postpone doing that for just a few minutes."
- Speaker NcPike: "Well, he agreed. He's coming over to talk to you. Agreed Eesolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 414, Oblinger; 415, Oblinger; 416, Oblinger; 417, Terzich O'Connell; 420, Madigan Democrat Leadership; 421, Topinka; 422, DiPrima; 423, Ewing Ropp; and Senate Joint Resolution 8, Eopp."
- Speaker McPike: "Bepresentative Matijevich on Agreed Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me get these in order first. House Resolution 414. Oblinger, commends Vernita Patton. House Resolution (sic -415), Oblinger, commends Russell Olson. House Resolution 416, Oblinger, extends our congratulations to the honorees of the Grand Chapter Order of the Eastern Star. 417. Terzich, congratulates Edward and Mary Soltis on their Golden Wedding Anniversary. 420, Madigan - et al, leave of We'll have the Clerk read that one, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution (sic - 421), Topinka, extends our congratulations to Reverend Menarik. House Resolution 422, DiPrima, congratulates Darius-Girenas American Legion Post 271_ House Resolution, Ewing, 423. the... congratulates the Lutheran Church in Floomington on its 125th Anniversary. House Joint Resolution, Ropp."

Clerk O'Erien: "Senate Joint Besolution."

Matijevich: "Or Senate Joint Resolution, Bopp, refers to a waste paper recovery and recycling program and urging Congress on that issue. And before I move to adopt, would the Clerk

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

read House Resolution 420, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, read the Besolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 420. Whereas, L. Michael Getty has served this Bouse as Farliamentarian and counsel the Speaker since January 12, 1983, consistently demonstrating his insight and fairness and: whereas. served... he also served this House and the people of his Legislative District with honor and distinction as a State Representative for ten years and: whereas, Representative Getty was a chief architect of the Determinate Sentencing Act and the author of numerous other pieces of legislation that sought to improve the state's criminal justice system and; whereas, he has been a leader in the nationwide search meaningful alternatives to incarceration and was a chief Sponsor of legislation to create statewide probation system in Illinois and: whereas. Representative Getty sponsored the legislation that established Dangerous Drugs Commission and Advisory Council and has served as Chairman of the Dangerous Drugs Advisory Council and; whereas, he also has served with diligence and distinction as Chairman of the Review Board of Attorneys Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois, as a Commissioner of National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and as Vice-Chairman of the National Alliance of State Advisory Councils for Alcoholism and Drug Abuse and: whereas, Representative Getty has demonstrated his capacity for legal scholarship as an author of numerous articles published in various legal journals and: whereas, amassed a wealth of experience in the criminal system in Cock County where he served as Chief of both the Felony Division and the Municipal Division of the Office of Cook County State's Attorney and: whereas, he is the

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

devoted husband of Terry and the proud father of Michael, Julie and Patrick. Therefore, be it resolved by the of Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate our friend and former colleague, the Honorable L. Michael Getty, on his appointment as a Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County. And be it further resolved that we commend Representative Getty for his past years of outstanding service to the people of Illinois, because he truly represented ... he representative of the best in all of us in this House. And be it further resolved that he leaves this House with our best wishes for the distinguished Judicial career for which he is also well prepared. And further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Representative Getty and family as a formal expression of our respect and esteem which he is held by the Members of this chamber."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Cn a point of personal privilege. Mike, I might be the oldest guy here, but I'm not the smartest. And I think you're still the smartest and the greatest. Thanks a lot for all your help all these years I've been down here.

Thanks, Mike."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a guestion of the Parliamentarian."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Mulcahey: "How many votes are required for the passage of this Resolution?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I wasn't going to speak on this Resolution, but we need some time to work the floor in order to get the necessary votes. Some of the rulings, of course, have caused that,

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

and we're sorry about that. Actually, the first vote that I ever cast in any place in this General Assembly was in Committee, Judiciary Committee, on a Getty Bill. I had just come in as an appointee, and it was the very first vote I ever made, and I voted against his Bill. I voted with the Republicans against his Bill, and I want to apologize for that. I've become much more partisan, as we both have over the years, but it has been one of the delights of my own service here to have the friendship and the... the wisdom of Mike Getty around. It'll be missed here, but it will go in a place where it's most needed. And it's a pleasure to serve with you here and maybe even a pleasure to appear before you there. Good luck, Mike."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having last year been the subject of an adverse ruling by our Parliamentarian who I grew up with, I understand the nature of that job particularly well. I want to say that Mr. Getty, in my judgement, has certainly acquitted himself with the highest degree of integrity in the job and tremendous professionalism, and I would certainly look forward, at some point, to practicing before him."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mike and I have been friends for many years. I served as his constituent before I came down here. We worked together. We ran against each other, and we were on the same side of the issue when it came to the... reducing the size of the House. We had two Republicans in our... of the four people. We had two Republicans on one side and Mike and I on the other side. Mike and Terry have been close friends of my wife and I for many years. And, Mike, I wish you and your wife and family the best of luck and may

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

everything good come to you."

Speaker McPike: "Bepresentative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Cullerton: "Is this Besolution germane? I'd like a ruling if I

Speaker McPike: "Perhaps you could give us the ruling."

Cullerton: "On behalf of the Speaker, I would rule that this is germane."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Yes, before moving the adoption, I believe I... Zeke

Giorgi wants to say a few words in behalf of his good
friend."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get too maudlin this morning, but, you know, as you go through life you run into guys that make an impression on you and change some of your thinking and change some of your bad habits. I got to say that Mike Getty's been that kind of an influence in my life. It's been a pleasure knowing him. Thank you, Mike."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Yes. Br. Speaker, when we heard of the, by Speaker Madigan, the announcement that Mike was qoing to be a Judge, I said my kind words in behalf of my good friend. Mike Getty. And I said then and I say again, and this demeans nobody else in this House, because I've met so many good people here. But I said I have never met anybody, anybody here in all my 17 years with a high level of character and integrity and also nobody that legislate like Mike Getty. He has had training for the Judgeship, as he well knows. I've never, you know, usually when you and I, many of us have a strong feeling against a Bill - and I know Mike has had some strong feelings against

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

some legislation — he still can sit down and work out a compromise. And I have never yet any... met anybody here like Mike who could find that middle ground. Even with his own Bills that he'd feel real strongly about, he always saw the other side. And what better Judge could we ever ask for? I sure would feel that any citizen in Illinois ought to feel comfortable when Judge Getty is on a case, because nowhere have I met a fairer man than Judge Getty. And it's proud to say Judge Getty for me. And now, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker McPike: "Bepresentative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the record, I would like to have my dissent recorded. We're all going to miss Mike. Mike was always a faithful Member of the Royal Grder of Mushrooms. I see he still has one of my stickers on the boxes down there. And I know John Cullerton's going to have a hard job to follow, but from all the mushrooms, Mike, we wish you the best of luck."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich asks leave for all Members to be added as hyphenated Cosponsors. Leave is granted. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Besolutions are adopted. Judge Getty."

Judge Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am indeed deeply honored and touched by the fact that you have not only adopted a Resolution in my honor, but by the very kind words that were spoken by many of you. I will try to acquit myself as a Judge in a manner which I believe will make you all proud. And you may be assured that the people of Illinois, in my courtroom, will have the benefit of my very best judgement on every issue. Thank you very much."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker McPike: "Mike said, 'Especially Democrats'. Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Eills following title, to wit; Senate Eills #1108, 1117, 1121, 1133, 1138, 1141, 1143, 1155, 1178, 1192, 1196, 1205, 1208, 1249, 1255, 1257, 1261, 1262, 1264, 1280, 1287 and 1293, together with the attached Amendments, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed the Senate as amended June 24, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker McFike: "General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 413, Terzich - McGann. House

Resolution 419, Nash - Leverenz."

Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 418, Braun - Eerrics, with respect to the memory of Rudy Lozano."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Besolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. The Chair would ask the Members that would like to nonconcur on the various concurrence Motions on the Calendar, those people that would like to nonconcur, we would ask that you come to the well and give us a list of the Bills that you would like to nonconcur in. We are going to start on Senate Bills Third Beading, page six of the Calendar, and we'll proceed until we have a list of nonconcurrence. Page six of the Calendar, Senate Bills Third Beading appears Senate Bill 22, Bepresentative Terzich. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 22, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Bepresentative Terzich."

"Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 22, this Bill specifies the investment authority of the Board of Trustees of the Public Retirement System and Fension Funds. It is the subject of exclusive right of the state jurisdiction. The Bill specifies that the Board of Trustees of the Chicago Teachers, the Chicago Firefighters. Chicago Police Officers. Employees* and Laborers* may not transfer their investment authority or transfer the assets of their Fund to any body for the purpose of consolidating or merging their assets with any other pension fund without the majority approval of the Fund's contributor. There is no fiscal cost impact. It has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission as well as all of the systems that are concerned, and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker McFike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 22. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall Senate Bill 22 pass?". All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Fill there are 102 'ayes', 2 *nos*, 5 voting *present*. Representative Bice *aye*. Representative Ewing 'aye'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Senate Bill 23, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. No. Gut of the record. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I'd like to have leave to put Senate Bill 23 in Interim Study."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to put Senate Bill 23 in Interim Study. Are there any objections? Bearing none,

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

leave is granted. Senate Eill 23 Interim Study.

Representative Ewing is now in the chambers and is marked

present. Senate Bill 25, Representative Farley.

Representative Levin. Yes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 25..."

- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Mr... Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Piel: "I was just wondering, with that being on the Special Order of Business, are we going to be hearing it now or on the Special Order of Business?"
- Speaker McPike: "Well, it doesn't really make any difference. I understand we have an agreement with Representative Olson to move the Bill. So, let's proceed at this point.

 Representative Levin."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 25, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to shared work unemployment benefits. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 25 is the work sharing Bill which came up briefly a couple of days ago. I think we've worked out the problems with it, and it is the intention of both the House and Senate Sponsors to put this Bill in Conference Committee and to leave it there till the fall pending a Resolution of whether or not the Federal Government will accept the Bill. This has, I believe, been worked out with... Representative Olson is agreeable to everybody at this point."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson on the Bill."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with Representative Levin and the arrangement that we have made. We expect to hear within a week from the Department of Labor in Washington relative to

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

the funding problem, and this is the groper wehicle with which to deal with this Bill. I recommend accepting House... Senate Fill 25."

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the rassage of Senate
 Bill 25. Is there any further discussion? There being
 none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 25 pass?'. All
 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk
 will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 1
 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 25, having
 received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Fepresentative Greiman in the Chair."
- Speaker Greiman: "Good morning. On the Order of Senate Bills

 Third Reading appears Senate Bill 26. Mr. Clerk, read the
 Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent Orange Study Act. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 26 does two things. It extends the life of the Orange Study Commission which has been in operation since March of 1982. Since that time, the Commission has had public hearings throughout the State of Illinois where we have elicited testimony from Viet Nam veterans and their families as to various physiological or emotional problems that they we had which they alleged to have been connected with their exposure to the defoliant Agent Orange while in Viet Nam. We've also had a hearing and are scheduling a nationwide hearing for medical practioners on the subject of the dioxin found in the Agent Orange And we're also in the process of distributing a questionnaire to as many Viet Nam veterans who are still residing in Illinois as possible of which we will review

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

and collate the answers to these various medical questions to assimilate whether further testing should be done on the Agent Orange has been a subject of some controversy. The State of Illinois is one of 17 states who now have Agent Crange Study Commissions. Our Commission is one of the lowest funded in the country, and we believe that we've been doing a very admirable job in trying to reach out to the Viet Nam veteran and the families to at least try to provide... help them provide some answers to the question. The Bill also establishes in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs a mechanism whereby they establish a Viet Nam veterans leadership program, outreach program, to assist in creating job opportunities the Viet Nam veteran. The unemployment rate amongst Viet Nam veterans... Viet Nam era veterans is estimated to be as high as 20%. Therefore, we believe that we can do something uniquely for the Viet Nam veteran. I'd ask for your favorable vote, and I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Eill 26.

On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Mays: "My comments are more directed toward the Amendment that was adopted to your Bill and not the Commission of which you are the Chairman, and you do a fine job. But on the Amendment that was adopted to the Bill, you put the jurisdiction for these programs under the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Why do you do that?"

O'Connell: "The essence of the Amendment is designed to obtain jobs, to elicit jobs. The Department of Commerce and

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Community Affairs is given that role in our Executive departments, and we feel that they would be the best qualified to assist in the job opportunities."

Mays: "Okay. Bow many field offices do the Department of
Veterans' Affairs already have to do some of these things?"

O'Connell: "They have 26. Bepresentative Mays, could I just
respond to that first question?"

Mays: "Yes."

O'Connell: "The reason why... One of the reasons why Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is that it's utilizing the job training partnership mechanism that has already been established in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. It would be attached onto that."

Mays: "Did... Does ECCA support this Fill?"

O'Connell: "Yes. In principal, yes, they do."

Mays: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Mays: "Well, I support the general thrust of the Amendment, but I think that it's a little misguided. The purpose clause the Amendment goes to increase the receptivity of employers in each community to hiring veterans. Now, that's that's okay, but I think the veterans... Department of Veterans* Affairs and other veterans* organizations throughout the state are already doing this. To encourage and help Viet Nam veterans make full use and support of all volunteer activities. Well, we've got that through the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans organizations offices throughout the state. And then to encourage and help Viet Nam veterans to make full use of all federal, state and community activities. What we're going to see with the adoption... or with the passage of this Eill is a separate division within the Department of Commerce Community Affairs directed towards the Viet Nam veteran:

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

and, under the terms of this Bill, it could even be directed towards all veterans. The next thing you know we're going to have the Attorney General trying to get program for veterans. Right, Ted? And then we're going to get the Secretary of State, the Lieutenant Governor and about ten other agencies going to help the Viet Nam veterans. The whole idea behind establishing Department of Veterans Affairs in the first place was many of the purposes entailed in this Bill. And I would believe that it would behoove us if we've got things we'd like to see them do to direct them in a more better fashion. I would urge defeat of this on the basis being duplicative of an existing government service."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just remind the Members that assuming that our analysis is right all... Is Committee... Let me ask a question then. Is Committee Amendment #1 still on this Bill which applies to a couple of the Commissions?"

O'Connell: "No. No, it is not. That was tabled."

Birkinbine: "Okay. That should be off. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Harris: "John, is this... Don't you feel this is more a national problem than a state problem? I mean, is the national... is the Veterans' Administration in Washington compiling these statistics?"

O'Connell: "No. The veterans... The reason why we and 17 other states established our own state Commissions is because it was our belief that the VA had been dragging its heals on this whole issue and to support our contention which we

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

two years ago. Last year, the Government Accounting Office, the federal agency given jurisdiction over analyzing such programs, came out with a report extremely told us and other veteran critical of the VA. The VA organizations that they wouldn't find an answer to the Agent Orange problem until 1987 or 1988, almost two decades after they stopped using the defoliant. That only led us to believe that the VA was indeed dragging its heals. The GAO agreed, the Government Accounting Office, the Federal Government Accounting Office took the investigation out of the hands of the VA and put it into the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. Secondly, not only do we believe that the VA was dragging its heals; but, as a lawyer, the Federal Government being both the prosecutor saw and the defender in what really is an adversarial relationship. So, we felt that the states could provide some objectivity into the situation by eliciting evidence from our own veterans and simply submitting that evidence to the overall question."

Harris: "And then what are we going to do with all the information that we compile?"

O'Connell: "We... We are submitting..."

Harris: "Who are we going to turn it over to?"

O'Connell: "We are... ₩e*ve already made on∈ report. preliminary report, eight months after We are now developing a questionnaire which is to go to as many Viet Nam veterans as possible in this state of which we will, with voluntary medical expertise, analyse the results, address ourselves to the individuals who we feel should go for more study, and we will submit that information to the Federal Government. Secondly..."

Harris: "Which agency of the Federal Government?"

O'Connell: "That would either be the Veterans' Administration..."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Harris: "Which is not taking any action according to you."

O'Connell: "No, they are. They are. They are the titular head of the entire study, but the CDC is doing the experimentation. They will not make the ultimate decision. The ultimate decision will be made by the Veterans' Affairs. I might add that Congress has instituted a sense of immediacy on the Veterans' Administration for their fcotdragging."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. CiFrima."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, the biggest problem we've had with veterans has been those from the Viet Nam War era; and, if there's anything we can do to help these kids, we should give our utmost for them because they gave their all for us for a war that was considered of no consequence. And these kids that were afflicted with this Agent Orange demand a little recognition, and let's try to help them all we can. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell, to close."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in closing, we're not asking for much. We're asking to help on an issue such the Agent Orange exposure that is uniquely addressed to the Viet Nam veteran and the families. We aren't preempting the Federal Government. We're just giving scme assurance that the Federal Government will indeed arrive at Secondly, with regards to the unemployment an answer. situation of the Viet Nam veteran, we recognize that Department of Commerce and Community Affairs has its own general outreach program, and it's doing an excellent However, the Viet Nam Veteran Leadership Program consisting of Viet Nam veterans is in a much better position to

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

address its own people. We are in a unique situation. The Viet Nam Veterans' Leadership Frogram will not overlap with the Department of Commerce and Community Affair's efforts, but rather supplement it and bolster their efforts and thereby, hopefully, reduce the 20% unemployment among Viet Nam Veterans. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 84 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no'. Curran 'yes'. 86... I'm sorry, 85, Mr. Clerk? Is that the count now? 85 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'nc', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 54. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 54, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Uniform Criminal Extradition Act. Third Beading of the
Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under current law, counties receive state reimbursement for extradition costs for felony cases. other cases, the costs are paid out of the county treasury where the crime was alleged to have been committed. This Bill expands the state reimbursement SO that upon certification... upon approval by the Governor and a warrant signed by the State Comptroller, expenses that counties incur in the return of fugitives would be expanded to include punishment of crimes requiring confinement of the criminal in the state penitentiary, county jail or other correctional facility. The Department of Law

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Enforcement currently has various rules and regulations governing expenses which may be reimbursed by the state to the counties. It will also be the case, under this Eill's language, so that it will be clear that only expenses within the Department of Law Enforcement guidelines will be reimbursed. I would ask for your support of Senate Bill 54."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 54. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Grieman: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "What do you think the cost of this would be to the State of Illincis?"

Cullerton: "Well, in Fiscal Year '83, a total of 205,000 dollars was appropriated to the Department of Iaw Enforcement for the reimbursement program. The Governor reduced that amount to 58,500. I don't know what the cost would be for this particular program, but obviously we're talking about, for all of the felonies, we're talking about only 200,000 dollars right now of which we've only appropriated 58,000. So, to expand it to misdemeanors, I think, would have a very small increase."

Friedrich: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. My analysis which came from the staff indicates an estimate of a million dollars, and I would remind you that's a million dollars we haven't got."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Well, I have to respond to that Republican analysis apparently. For the entire program right now for felonies, the... the Department of Law Enforcement asked for 205,000 dollars, and we only gave them 58,000. What that means is

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

if ... if a county doesn't have enough money to extradite somebody, that person, who might be a murderer or a rapist, just doesn't get tried. Now, what we're saving with this Bill is that it should be expanded to include misdemeanors as well. It certainly isn't going to cost a million dollars when they only spent 200,000 dollars... appropriated 200,000 dcllars for felonies. So, the cost is going to be minimal, and what we're talking about here is bringing criminals back to trial in the state. And that's... that's what it's all about. A person shouldn't be... go free just because they happen to commit a crime in a county that happens to be poor. That makes no sense at So, this is another Bill in my series of order Bills, and I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 76 voting... 77 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, Appropriations appears Senate Bill 131. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 131, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 131 is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Auditor General - stop that - at a level of 9,991,100 dollars. The Senate reduced it by 446,000, and we increased it by 74,000 dollars. I would move for the adoption... I'm sorry, move for the passage of Senate Bill

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

131. "

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Eill 131.

Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Champaign, Mr.

Johnson."

- Johnson: "I know this gets to be an annual request, but just for the assistance of everybody in their voting I wonder if you could ask the Sponsors of appropriations matters to indicate the differential between this year's appropriation and last year's appropriation. I think that would all help us vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Your suggestion is probably well taken, Mr.

 Johnson. Thank you. Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in..."
- Johnson: "I appreciate that my point is well taken. I wonder if

 Representative Leverenz could indicate..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ch, did you... Well, you would have to yield for a question, and he indicates he will yield for a question."
- Leverenz: "It would probably be within one or two percent of last year's total appropriation."

Johnson: "This is higher this year or lower?"

Leverenz: "A tad higher."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman (sic - Lady) from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Barnes: "Representative Leverenz, are the salary increases still omitted from this as they had been in the Senate?"

Leverenz: "That is correct."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed "nay". The "ayes"... Voting is now open. Have all voted

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on this Eill, there are 105 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'... Mr. Cullerton 'aye'. And this Bill... Mr. Matijevich 'aye'. 107? On this Bill there are 107 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Eill 161. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 161, a Bill for an Act in relation to liens for certain deliquent utility charges. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides that if a municipal or a public utility or cooperatively... or a coop furnishes water, electricity or artificial or natural gas service to a property owner or his agent, upon 60 days deliquency, the utility will have a lien on the real estate for the amount of unpaid charges, incurred penalties and attorneys fees. Mr. Speaker, I just recalled Representative Preston wanted me to amend this Bill. So, I would ask leave at this time to take it back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave? Gentleman has leave and leave is hereby granted. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Preston, amends Senate Bill 161 on page one."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Freston."

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

Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 161 merely sees to it that

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

cooperative apartments are not jeopardized by one tenant or one tenant cwner in the building not paying the utility bill and having utility... by virtue of that, having a lien on the entire building. I ask for your 'aye' vote"

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate...

Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 161. On that, is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Br. Jaffe. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman, Mr. Cullerton, the Gentleman from Cook, asks leave to allow... to waive the appropriate rule so that this Fill may be heard on the Order of Third Reading today. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Erien: "Senate Bill 161, a Bill for an Act relating to liens for certain deliquent utility charges. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you. This Act, as I said before, provides the utility with a lien for deliquent utility charges the real estate involved. With Representative Freston's Amendment and with an Amendment that was put on in the Senate, it does not apply to a situation where a tenant fails to pay his utility bill or a owner of the coop to pay his utility bill. There would be no lien on the building, ОB the owner's building under circumstances. Ιt does not apply to single-family, owner-occupied residences, but it does apply to a situation where the utility bill has not been paid by the owner. The

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

amount of money, for example, that the City of Chicago is losing on people that don't pay their water bills is phenomenal. A recent article in the <u>Chicago Sun-Times</u> indicated that the 'El Rookin' street gang, which owns some property on the south side, owe almost 40,000 dollars in water bills, and the water department, who normally would go in and turn off the service, is afraid to go into the buildings. They had to go with the gang crime south members to try to turn off the water service. It makes more sense to do it this way, to get the lien. We also put an Amendment on, Representative Greiman's Amendment, which said that if the lien is not filed within two years, that they lose their right to the lien. I think it's a very good Eill, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Eill 161.

On that, is there any discussion. The Gentleman from Cook,

Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to this Bill. You know, traditionally, we have used real estate liens very sparingly and very conservatively, and I think with this Bill we take a step really in the direction, when we... when we talk about putting liens on for public utilities. Usually real estate liens are put on only for improvements that really go with the land. that has been the tradition. And that has been the tradition of liens from the beginning of time. We put liens for improvements for people who come on and actually put things on the land. We have never in the history of American jurisprudence gone with the concept of putting liens on land for utilities. I think that what we're going to do, if we pass this Bill, is we're going to take a lot of real estate and screw up a lot of titles. You're going to have outstanding utility bills cn... on pieces α£

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

property. You're going to try to close deals, and you're going to find all of a sudden you can't close deals because there are all sorts of liens that exist by municipalities by utility companies. I just think it's a step in the wrong direction. I think that we should not pass this Bill, and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Br. Brockins."

Brookins: "I cannot agree more with the previous speaker concerning the tying up of liens and the punishment people because of ... because of one minor street gang in the City of Chicago. We have over 11,000 police officers paid very well in the City of Chicago: and, if we need to go and cut off some water. I would think that them gentlemen would be able to assist the water department in cutting off some water, turning off some lights or turning off some gas. Now, we're going to take peoples' property in the City of Chicago and other small towns, because someone failed or was deliquent in paying a utility bill. Also, with the new computers and they way they screw up the situation, there would be no problem for them to put a lien because of a computer went out. These things happen. think this is a bad Bill. I rise in opposition of this Bill, and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Br. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to suggest that putting a new classification of liens on real estate is something that should not be done and has never been done in the past and that the only liens that can be placed on real estate would be those liens that would be due and cwning construction on the buildings themselves - well. I it's true that there are many, many liens that are placed on real estate such as federal income tax liens. The

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

office that I work in, we file everyday many, many hundreds of federal income tax liens on real property for those individuals who fail to meet their commitment in that regard. So, I think that to extend this to include utility bills is fine. I think it ought to be done, and I'm in favor of the Fill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I respectfully rise to disagree with my seatmate. In downstate communities, we presently have the authority. except of course in certain situations during the winter months I suppose, we generally and basically have the authority to shut off utilities for failure to pay. That's very good remedy. If the water is turned off, the electricity, or the power, the gas is turned off, the customer comes right in to the power company and say, "What do I have to do to get the service turned back on? .. what that person has to do when the water is shut off is pay the cost of having it turned back on, pay the hill, pay the deliquency charge and the service is restored. Why should we clutter up the courthouse records? Why we force the county clerks to oren a new lien book in downstate Illinois? They have a separate book there's tract ... for, as Representative Yourell has indicated, federal income tax liens, state income tax liens, unemployment liens, sales tar liens, judgements, financing charges. Why should we clutter the ... the recorders records up with more work which will only result in paper work, involvement of attorneys. attorneys fees on both sides? The customer will have to pay the power company's attorneys fees and have to pay own attorney to get the lien taken off the books. Right now, all you have to do is shut the utilities off, and

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

they 'll walk right in and ask what they have to do to get them turned back on for all cf downstate. This is a Bill we don't need, and I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote." Speaker Greiman: "Lady from St. Clair, Ms. Younge."

Younge: "I also rise in opposition to this Bill that would attempt to put a lien on real estate for the nonpayment of utility bills. Downstate, the practices of the public utility companies right now is to harass land owners when tenants have not paid their utility bills. And with the past conduct of the utility companies, I think it might very possibly be that the utility companies, although they know it's a tenant's bill, will try to apply that bill to the land owner. And for that reason, I agree that we should not change the law and permit liens to be placed on realty for nonpayment of utility bills."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just reiterate a few What we're talking about here is a person who owns a building who doesn't pay his water bill. The current... The current practice - he has to be the current practice is to turn off the water which, in many cases I would think, poses a real hardship on the person who deliquent. I pointed out in Chicago this minor street gang called the 'El Bookins' owes 40,000 dollars in water bills, and they had to get the police to go with them to turn off the water. Now, what the Bill says is that instead of get the police to go with you to turn off the having to water, we're going to file a lien just like you file lien has to be filed according to the provisions of other liens, and when the property is sold, then the people to whom the money is owed would be paid. For example, the City of Chicago, we're talking about ... The City owns

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

the water system. The City, then, would get the money. It specifically says, on lines 14 and 15 and 16, this Section shall not apply to owner-occupied, single-family residences. So, we're talking about larger apartment buildings. Representative O'Connell tells me that in areas where he is from they do this now anyway. So, I think that it's clear that it's a ... it's a much better way of proceeding rather than turning off somebody's water to try to get the money by filing a lien, and I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signfy by voting "aye", those opposed vote "nay".

 Voting is now open. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm, to explain his vote."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to oppose the Bill.

 I see there's enough votes there, and I guess I won't take
 the time of the House. It's a bad Fill, and we should turn
 it down and reject it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shaw, to explain his vote."
- Shaw: "The only problem... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the only problem that I think that the Bill didn't go far enough, having worked with the utilities for about ten years, I think that where it should have been something added to this, an Amendment added to this Bill dealing with where the landlords cut off the tenants utilities after they have paid their rent. I think an Amendment like that should have been added to this Bill. And, therefore, I'm going to vote 'yes' for it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It appears that there are 68 people that have been intimidated into voting 'no', but I'm not afraid. I'm

71st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1983
- going to vote green, and let's give the Mayor of the City of Chicago his first Eill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to explain his vote."
- Cullerton: "I want to reiterate this Bill is supported by the City of Chicago. The Mayor of the City of Chicago is for this, because it will bring more money into the City of Chicago. If you want to vote with the 'El Bookin' street gangs, then you'd want to vote 'no'. But if you want bring money into the various communities that own their cwn water system, then you'd want to vote 'yes'. collecting money from deadbeats and gang members who haven't paid their bills. It's only after 60 days that they haven't raid their bill when it goes into effect, it doesn't apply to single-family residences. So, I once again would ask your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "I guess those words aren't as magic as they used to be. To explain his vote, Mr. Bowman."
- Bowman: "Well, with all due respect to the last speaker, I would just suggest that he look up on the board. I don't believe that this Bill is supported by the City of Chicago, and I don't believe he should be either."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 40 voting 'aye', 73 voting 'no', none voting 'gresent', and this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Fill 185. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code and amend the Ector Fuel Tax Law.

 Third Reading of the Fill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Neff, do you want to proceed on that or..."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Neff: "Take it out of the record."

- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Senate
 Bills Third Heading appears Senate Eill 189. Out of the
 record. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears
 Senate Bill 206. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Turner, are you going to take that?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner."

- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I'd
 like to have this Bill brought back to Second Reading,
 because I was informed that there's a technical defect in
 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves to return the... Gentleman asks
 leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Beading for
 the purpose of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have
 leave? Leave is hereby granted, and the Bill is on Second
 Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Bullock Turner, amends Senate Bill 206..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Again, this Amendment is just technical in nature. It only changes some wording in the legislation. I'd like to move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 206. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman moves to suspend

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

the appropriate rule so that this Bill may be heard at this time. Does the Gentleman have leave? Gentleman has leave, and leave is hereby granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 206, a Fill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Fill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Assembly.

This Bill is a Bill that's technical in nature. What it does is it amends the Juvenile Court Act to add the term 'alcoholic' as a description for an addicted minor. As you know, we consider drugs as an addiction. We just wanted to clarify the Juvenile Act and bring this definition into it."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 206.

On that, is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

Piel."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Piel: "Representative Turner, I noticed that one area of this

Bill clarifies the parental notification of drug addiction

or alcoholism. Is this correct?"

Turner: "You're correct."

Piel: "Can you explain to me why?"

Turner: "Exactly which line are you referring to,

Representative?"

Piel: "Well, the one point I have in here that clarifies some of the notice provisions to parents so that only custodial parents need to be notified pending a hearing, and it clarifies... clarifies the other related notice provisions. And I was just wanting to know exactly what we are clarifying on the notice provisions and why the parents had

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

to be notified if their child was going through a rehabilitation program."

Turner: "The... As we... The intent of this Bill was to notify the respondents, including his parents, guardians or legal custodians, by summons or certified mail. The reason being is that if you're going to treat these young people, we thought that it would keep... It is right to serve a legal notice upon them."

Piel: "Well, you say it's ...

Turner: "The intent..."

Piel: "What you're doing, basically, is you're taking away the child's constitutional right of privacy themselves, and I'm wondering why you have to notify the parents when the child is going through a drug abuse program."

Turner: "I was hoping that we wouldn't get into the concept, or I should say discussing the constitutionality of children's rights, especially with some legislation that we've went through in the last few days."

Piel: "That's the exact reason I'm asking the question."

Turner: "Okay. Well, what the intent is in the notice portion of this Bill is to provide that only the custodial parents need actually be served to an adjudicatory hearing and that it allows the difficulty of locating the noncustodial parent to the drag out of the proceedings. The problem is in juvenile courts is trying, in some cases, to get the parents to cooperate, and we figured by serving public notice, that you have, in fact, at least tried to contact those parents."

Piel: "Eut I still have not yet heard exactly why. You know, what you're doing on one hand you're saying, 'No, we shouldn't have to notify the parents', and then in this Bill you're saying we should notify the parents. And I'm asking why."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Turner: "Representative, one of the problems you have is that in families where a child is an alcoholic, there's usually So, it's not like the mother and father family problems. or cooperating or willing to ccoperate with lau enforcement. In a number of cases, the parents are responsible or aid in the problem that the child is suffering with. So, this is the reason that we're serving notice so that we are, thereby, able to help that particular child with or without the help of the parent."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Piel. Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Do I understand that this... that we should have moved to table Amendment #1 when this Bill was on the Order of Second Reading?"

Turner: "That's right."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Bill will be taken out of the record on Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Beading for the purposes of tabling an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave. Leave is hereby granted.

Mr. Clerk, the Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. ... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Turner, moves to table Senate...

House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 206. On that, is there any discus... Mr. Fiel."

Piel: "Would the Gentleman mind explaining what Amendment #1 does before we table?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, indeed. Mr. Turner, would you like to explain?"

Turner: "Yes. Amendment #1 is the same as Amendment #2. There was a technical error in Amendment #1 that being that we wanted to change it on line 25 when, in fact, I wanted to

71st Legislative Day

change this Eill on line 16.

June 25, 1983

Accordingly, Mr.

- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Motion to table be...' Mr. Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. Is this on Second? I'm sorry."

 Speaker Greiman: "Yeah, this is on a Motion to table Amendment

 #1, Representative Jaffe. The question is, 'Shall

 Amendment #1 be tabled?'. All those in favor signify by

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

 the Amendent is tabled. Third Reading. Now, we don't need

 to proceed to receive leave since the Amendment was tabled
- Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the
 Eill."

rather than an additional Amendment.

Turner... Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Turner, the attention span is probably pretty good. You don't have to go in too big of a speech.

 Proceed."
- Turner: "I think the discussion was rather clear on this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I just ask that we move for the... for the adoption of Senate Fill 206."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks for the passage of Senate Bill 206. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill. I think this is really a great Fill. As we know, probably the greatest problem among teenagers is alcoholism, and we have really very few programs. And the few programs that we have we have not been getting the kids into these particular programs. What Senate Fill 206 does essentially is helps to get those kids into proper programs that will treat them for alcoholism. With regard to the

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

question with the notice provision under this Bill. I think it's a good notice provision. It provides that custodial parents are the ones that get the hearings and the notices prior to the hearings, but it doesn't rermit... or does not allow the difficulty of locating a noncustodial parent to drag out these proceedings. So, the parent who custody does get the notice, and he does go to the hearing and so on and sc forth; but, if you have a noncustodial parent who cannot be reached - under the present law you have to try to reach that particular individual. T f have to reach them, you're dragging out the proceeding, and you're not getting these kids into the programs that they should be in. It's an excellent Bill, and it really should pass overwhelmingly."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 209. MI. Clerk. read the Bill."

Ilerk Leone: "Senate Bill 209, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I would ask leave to bring this Eill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave?

Leave is hereby granted. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

lerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill:

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

209 ..."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

- :ullerton: "Yes, this Amendment changes the figure of 25,000 down to 15,000. This was a recommendation by the Department of Insurance. It represents a compromise that I'm willing to accept as well as Senator D'Arco, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate...

 of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 209. On that, is there any
 discussion? Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Tell me, Bepresentative Cullerton... excuse me, how this Amendment and the change in the figures alters what the Bill does. I mean, I'm not sure I understand what the Bill and the Bill as amended would do."
- Cullerton: "Alright. Okay. Well, I thought I'd explain that when I'd do it on Third Beading, but if you want me to. Basically, what the Bill does is it changes from 5.000 to 25,000 the amount of fire loss which is required before the insurance company... Let me start over again. Right now, if you have a fire loss of over 5,000 dcllars, before you before the insured can get reimbursed, you have can get... to get a certification from the city that the taxes have been paid and that any demolition expenses have been purpose of the Bill was to eliminate all of this paper work that's involved with these small... smaller losses to raise it to 25,000. The Department of Insurance thought and Representative... Senator D'Arcc agreed that maybe that's too high a jump. Maybe we'll just qc to 15,000. So, that's what the purpose of the Amendment is."

Johnson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "I'd just move for the adoption of the Amendment."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

ipeaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed
'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.
Further Amendment."

llerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Gentleman moves that the appropriate rule be suspended in order to have immediate hearing on Senate Bill 209. Gentleman have leave? Leave is hereby granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

- :ullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the As I had just indicated, what happens now is House. that if there's a fire loss that's over 5,000 dollars, and that is most fire losses, before the insured can get their money there has to be a somewhat involved process of to find out, first of all, getting an inspector to go out to see whether or not the building was demolished. takes some time. You go to the county. You have to pay ten dollars. You get a tax check. That takes another And during this time, the insured does not get their week. money. What we're saying is then with this Bill that we're raising that figure to 15,000. So, if a loss is under 15,000, you won't have to go through all that paper If it's over 15,000, then you would have to do that. would ask for the passage of Senate Bill 209."
- ipeaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Eill 209.

 On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Bave all

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

voted who wish? Yes. Mr. Fiel "aye". Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 107 voting "aye", 9 voting "no", none voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading ... Third Reading appears Senate Eill 241. Mr. Bullock. Mr. Panayotovich. Out of the record. We'll now move to House Calendar Supplemental #1. Senate Bills Third Reading, Short Debate appears Senate Bill 412. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

:lerk Leone: "Senate Bill 412, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cock, Mr. Nash."

- This Bill amends the Public Aid Code in relation to work requirements. It codifies current sixty day sanction for failure to comply with work registration or work participation orders in relation to general assistance recipients. The Department of Fublic Aid supports this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 412. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."
- the next few days we're going to be dealing maybe with income tax matters, and in every case with general assistance in massive amounts, I want to ask these questions, and I think everybody should understand the answers to the question when they vote on this. Tell me if I'm wrong. Under current law, an individual who is receiving general assistance, who refuses to participate in workfare or other job search programs, can be suspended for ninety days from his general assistance receipt. Is that

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

right? Is that correct?"

Nash: "That is correct."

Johnson: "Now, am I correct in saying that this Bill would reduce from ninety days to sixty days the allowable length of time for sus... suspending benefits on general assistance for refusal to either seek jobs or participate in the workfare program. Is that right?"

Nash: "That's cor... That's for aid to dependent children."

Johnson: "Pardon me."

Wash: "For aid to dependent children, people receiving ACC can be suspended to sixty days."

Johnson: "Well, our... our analysis indicates that the effect of this Bill is to quote, 'Beduce the length of sanction period for recipients of general assistance who refuse to participate in workfare from ninety days to sixty days.'

That's the way I read the Bill."

Nash: "Even though they have authorization to suspend up to ninety days, by Department rule, they only suspend them for sixty days."

Johnson: "Well, speaking to the Bill, and with all due respect to the Sponsor, who's a good friend of mine and normally has General assistance is something apod Bills. different from what AFDC and other public aid programs are. And quite frankly, it's my feeling, and I think some others, that general assistance is a program that involves massive amounts of state dollars and is almost entirely a program for the benefit of males under twenty-five or in a totally different category than thirty who are dependent children and others. And I would suggest Representative Getty, myself, and a number of others voted for, and worked for, and passed a workfare program, modeled after the Hawaii statute and other statutes, that really for the first time in Illinois say, if your going to

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

receive and the taxpayers are going to fund Eill massive amounts of public dollars, then you cught to have to pay for it in terms of doing work for the community. And the workfare Bill was a Fill that after much debate and much analysis. I think has received a lot of acclaim as one that really directs itself to that qual. And what we're doing by this Bill, regardless of what they've been by rule in the past, as a matter of public policy, we're saying, if you vote for this Fill that it's ckay to not participate in workfare programs or other job search programs. At least it's okay to the extent that me re going to cut almost in half the length of time the government can cut you off for benefits when you re... when you refuse to participate in those programs. I think we're talking about the possibility of a tax increase, I think when we're talking about programs and... and various proposals that involve general assistance that the public policy of this state, of this General Assembly ought to be that if you•re able-bodied and the various requirements of this program, and you can go to work, and you don't, and you don't participate in a workfare program, you don't participate in job search program, that you ought be suspended from public benefits. And it ought to be increasing it from ninety to a hundred eighty days. than reducing it from ninety to sixty days. I think it's a bad policy, and if you vote for this Eill, even though it's on Short Debate, and... and apparently had little debate at an earlier stage, your taxpayers, particularly if you vote for a tax increase and whether you do or not, are going to wonder why, when you've been running around the state for five years saying that able-bodied people ought to have participate in various public service programs, you've been saying that in your election campaigns, and yet

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

you turn around on a vote like this and say you ought to reduce the penalty. I think people are going to consider you hypocritical, and they ought to consider you hypocritical, because it's the opposite direction we ought to be headed. And with all due respect to my good friend Representative Nash, I think this is a had Bill, and particularly in light of what's going to happen in the next five days, everybody ought to vote 'no' on this Bill."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Eill is on the Order of Senate Bills Short
 Debate, and Er. Johnson, I take it, stood in opposition to
 the Bill. Others are seeking recognition. If, perhaps, it
 might just be better if... if we let them explain their
 vote and that would appropriately give them a chance to air
 their views. Ar. Nash to close."
- Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This Bill is supported by the Department of Public Aid, and
 I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

 Ms. Currie to explain her vote."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the prior speaker made this sound like some heavy ideological issue. Of course, it isn't at all. This Bill codifies exactly the rules and requirements of the present Department of Fublic Aid. We had a meeting on another Bill, another Public Aid Code Bill. Township supervisors had a good deal to say about that. Township supervisors did not want a ninety day sanction for GA recipients who failed to meet the initial work requirement. They and the Department of Public Aid are comfortable with the sixty day requirement that is the present reality and codification that will be imposed by Senate Bill 412. It's a good Bill. I think there's been misrepresentation about

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

what the actual effect of it is. The effect of this Bill is just to say, yes, let's gc right on doing what we've been' doing. People who refuse work will be sanctioned for sixty days. That's what happens right now. It's adequate, and this House should agree."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, workfare is working. For the first time in Illinois we've got this thing going, and it's working. In Centralia we've got people who are on general assistance who are going out cleaning up the parks, the streets, and everything else.

And it's work that would not be done otherwise. These people need jobs, and this provides them something to do.

It... it also compensates the government at the local level for participating in the program. I think there ought to

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cock, Mr. White."

be more of it, not less."

explain his vote."

White: "Oh, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of this Fill. Matter of fact, the Illinois Public Aid Department is in support of this piece of legislation. Right now general assistance recipients receive a hundred and forty-four dellars a month. Вy they are supposed to receive two hundred and forty-two dollars a month. Effective July 1, one hundred thirty-nine thousand of those recipients will be without benefits. I think it's only fair that we should stand in support of the Illinois Public Aid Department's policy of reducing the penalty from ninety days to sixty days. T think it's a fair measure. I think it's a humane way of treating those who are on the lower rung of the ladder, I ask for more green votes on this piece of legislation." Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two speakers on the other side of the aisle have got up and said that the Department of Public Aid is in favor of this Bill. That is incorrect. They have taken no position on it. That is quite a bit different from supporting the Bill. All of you should know that in making your vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman (sic Lady) from Cook, Ms.

 Alexander, to explain her vote."
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not a Gentleman from Cook. I'm a Lady from Cook. To the General Assembly, there are really two parts to this Bill. It says that sanction shall be imposed for failure to gain employment. That's the part that I'm interested in. Those individuals who have gone out religiously and looked for employment and have not been able to find employment should not have a ninety day sanction placed upon them. Those who are offered workfare programs and fail to participate in them, I have mixed emotions on that, but don't penalize those who really have gone out and looked for work, couldn't find it, and now have to remain ninety days with a sanction on them. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The identity crisis is my problem, not yours

 Ms. Alexander. I apologize. The Lady from Champaign, Ms.

 Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if this workfare program is, in fact, a good route for us to be going with general assistance recipients, then it seems to me that penalizing for a sixty day period and at the end of that sixty day period renewing the opportunity for that person to get into the workfare program is a very good route to go. If we want them to be participating in these public work projects, sixty days seems to be enough of a sanction to give them a second opportunity. If they

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

realize that punishment is there because they have not cooperated, then allowing them to rethink that and to decide at the end of sixty days to become a part of the program is indeed an appropriate route to go. Certainly, if they still refuse at the end of that time, they can be sanctioned again and have that support removed. But I think a sixty day penalty is a reasonable one, and certainly, if the workfare program is a good idea, then we want to encourage those people to be getting into the workfare program, and I urge an "aye" vote."

- ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rice, to explain his vote."
- lice: "Point of information. At ninety days with the proper reapplication that a recipient has to make, it takes up to basically a hundred and twenty days. So with the sixty days, as this Eill as introduced, it's still ninety days."
- ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, to explain
 his vote."
- lash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good piece of legislation. I was the architect of workfare when I was in the Senate, and at that time a lot of people opposed it. And it saved our state the first year in operation nineteen million dollars. What this Bill does, it forces people to look for jobs or go on workfare. It's a good Bill, and I ask for more 'aye' votes on that board."
- Thite: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Fresently it is the rule of the Illinois Public Aid Department to provide... to suspend general assistance recipients for sixty days if they refuse to participate in the workfare program. They need this Bill, plus there were several Amendments that are

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

attached to some Bills that we presently... that are present before this House that will codify their position on the sixty day suspension, sc I stand as Chairman of the Comm... of the Human Services Committee on the statement I made earlier, that they are in support of the sixty day suspension."

- privilege. Have all... the Gentleman from Bock Island, Mr.

 DeJaegher, to explain his..."
- YeJaegher: "By this Bill we are not, we are not eliminating the workfare program. All we're doing is reducing the amount of days that a person would be fined or taken off of public aid. Especially those supervisors or those people that are associated with township government, I want you to realize that with the harsher sentence imposed, it could have a drastic effect on township general assistance. Now, you're not, you're not eliminating the workfare program. This is what you've got to realize. You're taking the days down, but the workfare program is still being enacted."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 48 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'nc', 1 voting 'present'. Mr. Nash. The Gentleman requests that it be placed on the Order of Fostponed Consideration. Yes, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Vinson: "For purposes of a verification."

peaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks... the Gentleman is within his right. Mr. Wash requests a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Capparelli..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Vitek, did you ask... were you seeking leave to be verified? Mr. Vinson. Mr. Vitek.

Leave for verification of Mr. Vitek?"

finson: "Yes, I told him..."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "All right. Thank you. Proceed."

Clerk O'Erien: "Poll of the Absentees. Capparelli, Christensen,
Krska, and Panayotovich."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Foll of the
 affirmative votes."

:lerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative."

:peaker Greiman: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

steczo: "Mr. Speaker, may I please be recorded as "aye"?"

Speaker Greiman: "Becord Mr. Steczo as 'aye'. Proceed Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander, Berrios, Bowman, Braun, Breslin, Frockins, Brummer, Bullock, Cullerton, Currie, DeJaegher, DiFrima, Domico, Doyle, Farley, Giorgi, Greiman, Bicks, Buff, Butchins, Jaffe, Keane, Kulas, Laurino, LeFlore, Leverenz, Levin, Marzuki, Matijevich, McGann, McPike, Nash, Pierce, Preston, Rhem, Rice, Bonan, Saltsman, Satterthwaite, Shaw, Slape, Steczo, Taylor, Terzich, Turner, Vitek, White, Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "As Mr. Vinson questions the affirmative Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Berrios."

:peaker Greiman: "Mr. Berrios is in his seat."

finson: "Mr. Bullock."

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

speaker Greiman: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Domico."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Domico is at the Mell."

'inson: "Mr. Farley."

speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley in the chamber? Mr.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Farley is at the door."

Vinson: "Mr. Keane."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane. Mr. Keane in the chamber? Mr.
Keane. Remove the Gentleman."

linson: "Mr. Krska."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Krska. Mr. Krska in the chamber? How is
 the Gentleman recorded? I believe Mr. Krska did not vote.
 Is that right?"

:lerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

'inson: "Mr. McGann."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann is at his seat."

finson: "Mr. Slape."

ipeaker Greiman: "Is the Gentleman from Eond, Mr. Slape in the chamber? Mr. Slape. Mr. Keane is returned. Beturn Mr. Keane to the Roll Call. Mr. Slape. Remove Mr. Slape from the Roll Call."

/inson: "Mr. Pierce."

ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Fierce, in the chamber? Mr. Fierce. Remove Mr. Fierce from the Roll Call. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Bea, for what purpose do you rise? Mr. Bea "aye". Mr. Freston, for what purpose do you rise? Pardon? Mr. Freston requests to be verified. You are verified, Sir. Froceed Mr. Vinson."

finson: "Mr. Terzich."

speaker Greiman: "Mr. Terzich. Terzich. Mr. Terzich is standing, talking to Mr. Ropp. Mr. Vinson, how we doing?"

finson: "Mr. Brummer."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Brummer is standing at his seat."

finson: "Mr. Saltsman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Saltsman is in his chair."

finson: "Mr. DeJaegher."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeJaegher is in the aisle."

'inson: "Mr. Giorgi."

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giorgi is in the aisle."

(inson: "Mr. Bicks."

Speaker Greiman: "Is Mr. Hicks in the chamber? The Gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Hicks? Bemove the Gentleman."

Vinson: "Mr. Doyle."

Speaker Greiman: "Mayor Doyle is in his seat."

Vinson: "Mr. Marzuki."

Speaker Greiman: "Mar... Mr. Marzuki is in his seat."

Finson: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady's in her seat."

finson: "Mr. Rea."

ipeaker Greiman: "Mr. Rea change... just changed his vote and is over at Ms. Satterthwaite's seat."

'inson: "No further questions."

*peaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, what's the numbers? Mr. Brummer.

Vote Mr. Brummer 'no'. Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig 'aye'.

Mr. Brummer. M... the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle.

Mr. Pangle 'aye'. On this Hill, there are 47 voting 'aye',

65 voting... 63 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Mr.

Nash asks for Fostponed Consideration. The Hill will be on

the Order of Postponed Consideration. On the Order of

Senate Hills Third Heading Short Debate on Supplemental

Calendar #1 aprears Senate Hill 492. Mr. Clerk, read the

Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 492, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Insurance Law Study Commission to finance powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Br. Nash."

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

Senate Bill 492 extends the reporting date for the
Insurance State Laws Commission to July 1, 1985, and it
enlarges the membership by one from each side of the aisle

- 71st Legislative Day June 25, 1983
 from both Houses."
- peaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill
 492. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from
 Cook, Mr. Bowman."
- Jowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."
- Journan: "Representative Nash, I don't have... the synopsis is not up to date, and so I don't recall what Amendments 2, 3 and 6 do. Could you enlighten us? What do those Amendments do? House Amendment #2 is printed in the synopsis and it seems to add a whole lot of other Commissions. House Amendment 3 is in the synopsis, but Bouse Amendment #6 is not in the synopsis at all."
- .iash: "Hr. Speaker, I would refer to Representative Winchester for Amendment #2."
- ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to
 explain... has been yielded to in response to Mr. Bowman's
 inquiry. Proceed to the reponse to that inquiry, Mr.
 Winchester."
- Vinchester: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Amendment #... the Amendment #2 creates the Rural Problems Commission. It will be charged with the responsibility of studying rural crime, rural road problems, anything that pertains to rural problems, this Commission will make a study and report to the General Assembly in hopes of legislation to correct those problems."
- 3peaker Greiman: "Nr. Bowman, will you still on the floor... do you still have... seek recognition?"
- Bowman: "Well, I... While Representative Winchester was answering with respect to Amendment #2, Representative Wash came over to me and told me that Rep... Amendment #6, which is not in

'1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

the synopsis, is the one that extends... that adds membership to the Insurance Laws Study Commission. At least now, I think everybody is going to know what they're voting on. Thank you."

ipeaker Greiman: "Alright. Thank you. I remind the House that
we are on the Order of Short Debate. I see I'm... cnly one
person is seeking recognition. Ms. Zwick, rather than take
it off the Order of Short Debate, you may proceed briefly
within the confines of Short Debate, if you are standing in
opposition. Froceed."

wick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I will try and keep it brief. I think everyone has already programmed in their minds my traditional anti-Commission speech, so I won't refresh you on some of those comments. However, I think what I would like to ask you to do before you wote on this Bill is to consider that the... the underlying but predominant issue of this Session is priorities, as far as spending goes. This Commission last year received \$110,000, and I'm sure that it will receive that much, if not more, during the appropriations process of this General Assembly. Now, I ask you, do you think, under the conditions of the State of Illinois, that the priorities in your minds and your constituents minds are that it's more important for \$110,000 to go to the Insurance Laws Study Commission than to go to education, or for \$110,000 to go to the Insurance Laws Study Commission than mental health, for \$110,000 to go to the Insurance Laws Study OF Commission than to... to the public welfare, to the aid. And I speak to both sides of the aisle on this issue. There are some very important things that we are going to be dealing with as far as the fiscal picture of the State Illinois is concerned within the next week. This is what we are dealing with - the priorities of the State of

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Illinois as far as spending goes, and if you think that it's more important for \$110,000 to go to the Insurance Laws Study Commission than to go to any of those areas, other areas of state government, then go ahead and vote 'yes' on this. But if you don't, if you think that \$110,000 could better serve your constituents going to education or mental health or public aid or to the roads, to any place in state government, then I would urge you to vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

iash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed, 'no'. The voting is now open. Mr. Leverenz to explain his vote."

everenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the To the Lady on the other side, the real underlying issue in this Session is a tax increase. Your Leader αn side and the Gentleman on the second floor, somewhere in the middle lie the truth. You talk about \$110,000, mere pittance to the total state budget. Cut that stuff We get involved with these issues. out. ₩e qet done. Sometimes the departments of state government need a little extra motivation. I bring to your attention what happened in front of the Stratton Office Building. You got about \$10,000 of weeds out there. It took... I understand your applause for weeds. We had six ladies out there weeding the weeds for two days. They put up a rail fence. Two weeks from now, they're going to take part of that rail fence down to get a backhoe through there. management. That's planning bу th€ Department of Conservation and the Secretary of State's Office. They're

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

taking it down two weeks from now because they don't want us to see them take it down. Ridiculous. Go after those parts of state government. Put your direction and aim at the right targets. Vote green."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Nelson." Welson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. After the remarks of the last speaker, the money that's involved in the Commissions in the State of Illinois is not a mere pittance. Those of us on this side of the aisle are willing to go after all the waste in state government, only the weed garden, but also the Foards and Commissions that are unnecessary to the workings of government. It is not a stupid idea to save money on a Commission that could 40, if we were not spending it for that. to the investigation of four cases of child abuse, or could pay for one day care slot in this state. I would urge all of you to vote red."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', none voting 'present'.

This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills...

Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Short Debate appears Supplemental Calendar... appears Senate Bill... goodness gracious me... 557 now. There seems to be a lot of noise here. Let's have some order, for goodness sake. Now, let's see. The Gentleman... The Lady from Kane, Ms. Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe my speak
light was on before you announced that Roll Call. I was
requesting a verification."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "I was watching the Lady. She was trying to get

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- direction from her Leadership as to whether or not she should have asked for a verification. I was watching her seek recognition as you were... after you had issued your ruling that the Bill was passed. We had been debating the Bill for 15 minutes. If they wanted to have a verification, they should have asked for it earlier."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Alright. Before Mr. Ewing throws his arm out of its socket, I will tell you, I looked at the board very carefully and no one... no lights were on at that time, when I began to declare the vote. I can only look at the scoreboard for... with my eyes and then at the board here. No lights were on. However, we want this process to be handled in an orderly, appropriate way, and a fair and equitable way, give due process to the Minority. Now, Ms. Zwick, for what purpose did you rise?"
- Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rose to request a verification of the Roll Call, and I appreciate your consideration on it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, asks for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Christensen."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be taking a verification on this, I would like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."
- Ronan: "Mr. Speaker, you already announced the... the Roll on this vote. What... What are you doing? This is ridiculous."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ronan, I did indeed, but we had... we considered it, and there were... there was... there were a

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

number of people with their hands raised seeking recognition, apparently. I don't always know what they're seeking recognition..."

- innan: "Yeah, but Mr. Speaker... I don't want you to downtrod on
 the Minority, but let's not downtrod on the Majority,
 either. 61 votes are on the board, and I think the vote's
 already been declared."
- Speaker Greiman: "Absolutely. I certainly agree with that. I think we'll be declaring it passed eventually, but let's proceed, Sir. Have you finished the Fcll of the Absentees?

 Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Christensen. O'Connell.

 Steczo and Vinson."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, verify the Affirmative Boll Call."

 Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Barnes.

 Berrios. Bowman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, Mr. Steczo - how is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Steczc as *aye*, and leave for a verification. Ms. Zwick? Mr. Steczo? Ms. Zwick?"

Zwick: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "And Majority Leader McPike, verified."

Zwick: "Certainly."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Proceed."

- Clerk Leone: "Braun. Brookins. Bullock. Capparelli.

 Cullerton. DiPrima. Comico. Doyle. Balph Dunn. Farley.

 Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Giglic. Giorgi. Greiman.

 Hanniq."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Ms. Currie, for what purpose do you rise? Currie, 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Hicks. Huff. Butchins. Jaffe. Johnson. Kean∈. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore_ Leverenz. Levin. Marzuki. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McGann.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

McPike. Nash. Panayotovich. Pangle. Pierce. Freston. Rhem. Rice. Richmond. Bonan. Saltsman. Shaw. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Winchester. Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Johnson, 'no'. From 'aye' to 'no'? Mr.

Johnson, is that right? 'Aye' to 'no'. Mr. C'Connell?

Mr. O'Connell votes 'aye'. Froceed with the verification.

Mr. Zwick?"

Zwick: "Representative Bullock?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock? Mr. Bullock is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Call."

Zwick: "Representative Farley, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley? Is Representative Farley in the chamber? Mr. Farley? Remove Mr. Farley from the Roll Call."

¿wick: "Bepresentative Giglio?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio? Representative Giglio? Mr. Giglio is in the chamber, at the door. Mr. Farley is in the back, at the door. Return Mr. Giglio. Return Mr. Farley."

Zwick: "Representative Huff?"

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Huff? Br. Huff in the chamber?

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

:lerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Huff. Mr. Euff is at the door.

Return Mr. Huff to the Roll Call."

Zwick: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane? Representative Keane? Well, remove him for the moment. Remove him from the Boll Call. We've not seen the last of him. Go ahead."

Zwick: "Representative Pierce?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pierce? Is Mr. Fierce in the chamber?

Remove Mr. Fierce."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Zwick: "Bepresentative Panayotovich? Ecw does... How'd I pronounce it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Fanayotovich? Ecw is Mr. Fanayotovich recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Fanayotovich from the Roll Call."

Zwick: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Greiman: "Bepresentative Levin? Representative Levin in the chamber? Mr. Levin is at the door."

Zwick: "Representative Hutchins?"

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Hutchins is at his seat."

Zwick: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. Representative who?"

Zwick: "Slape."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Slape, the Gentleman from Bond? Mr. Slape?

How is Mr. Slape recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting *no*."

Speaker Greiman: "Do you want me to change him?"

Zwick: "No. I'm sorry. Representative Taylor."

Speaker Greiman: "Bepresentative Taylor? Mr. Taylor? Mr. Taylor in the chamber? Well, his jacket is here, but we can't count that. How is the Gentleman recorded? Mr. Taylor is right here at the door."

Zwick: "Okay. Is Representative Vitek excused for medical purposes, or can I question...?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, I think you don't care to call him.

Proceed."

Zwick: "Okay. I think that ... that's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. On this Eill, there are 60 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 557. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 557, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
in relationship to compensation and excluments of Members
 of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen... "

Speaker Greiman: "Hey, Mr. Nash, I just wanted... We are on Short

Debate. I just wanted to remind the House of that. Mr.

Nash."

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

Senate Bill 557 amends the General Assembly Compensation and Emoluments Act. This is the Act that deals with the district allowance. The language in this Bill was put in by the Comptroller's Office so they can process the vouchers in a more orderly manner. It was recommended by their counsel that this language be put in. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 557. Does anyone stand in opposition? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen... Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "I ask that this Bill be taken off Short Debate first,
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady asks that the.. that the Eill be taken off the Order of Short Lebate and is joined by the appropriate number. Ms. Fullen, do you wish to address the Bill?"

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a few questions."

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "Is the purpose of our district office allowance to help us in serving our constituents?"

Nash: "Certainly."

Pullen: "That's what I think, too. Is there anything in this

Bill that increases the amount that we can approve for

expenditure on our district office allowance from the

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

17,000 that is currently in the law?"

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Eill does not have any increases of any kind in it. This Bill... The language in this Bill was written by the Comptroller's Office. The district allowance is the same. All this Bill does, it adds the lang... some of the language that was in Representative Eirkinbine's Eill that if it's cheaper to buy something than lease it, we're able to do it."

Pullen: "I'm not sure you should abuse the Gentleman from Cook in that fashion by using his name that way, Sir, but let me ask you a couple more questions. You say that it does not increase the amount, and I agree with that. If there are items added to the purposes for which we can use that money, does that not change priorities, perhaps, rather than increasing the amount? As long as the amount is left the same, and there are new purposes added, then that takes away from other purposes if we, in cur own discretion, wish to do that. Is that not right?"

Nash: "In reference to that question, if it's cheaper to purchase something, say, over a two year period, than it is to lease it, then you're able to do it. It's to save money, and that was the purpose of this piece of legislation sponsored by Senator Rock and zipped out of the Senate 59 to nothing."

Pullen: "That's not an answer to my question, but thank you for trying, anyway. I call your attention to page two, line 29. Do you have the Eill handy?"

Nash: "Will you repeat that, please?"

Pullen: "Fage two, line 29."

Nash: "Yes?"

Pullen: "That line adds... has, in underlined language, the words 'travel, operation of automotive equipment', does it not?"

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Nash: "Yes, it does."

Pullen: "Are those words in the current statute in terms of purposes for which we can use our expense allowance?"

Nash: "No, it's not as vague. The practice was that they were doing, and the Comptroller's Office Counsel wrote this language, so there's no problems with it."

Pullen: "What was it they were doing in the Comptroller's Office?"

Nash: "They were doing their jcb."

Pullen: "No, you said the purpose was, they were doing it in the Comptroller's Office, and that's why this language is in here. They were doing what in reference to what we're talking about?"

Nash: "The language was vague. The language was vague in the present statute. It was very vague, and they thought they might have a problem with the voucher. For example, if a Member was down to Springfield or traveling throughout the state on official business, if they took a car from the car pool and they happened to bill it to their expense allowance for a day, rather than voucher it through, the language was very vague. That was the reason this language in this Bill was written by the Comptroller's Office."

Pullen: "I'm really glad you're... you keep telling me that. On page four, we see the stricken language in the current Act, and I wonder whether you would tell me what part of that language is the vague language that might have been construed to include travel and the operation of automotive equipment?"

Nash: "Page four that was stricken read, 'Each Member is authorized to approve the expenditure of not more than 17,000 per year to pay for supplies, commodities, rentals and other gccds and services.' The language was very vague, and the Comptroller's Office, Counsel for

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Comptroller's Office rewrote the language, so they can deal with it."

Pullen: "You believe that the phrase *supplies, commodities, rentals and other goods and services could be interpreted to include travel and operation of automotive equipment?"

Nash: "I do."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Froceed, Ms. Fullen."

Pullen: "I have no doubt that the Gentleman is sincere in he's saying, as far as his own intent is concerned, but the actual effect of this Bill would be to add to the purposes for which we can use our expense allowance, which is for our district office, travel, and separately, the operation of automotive equipment. Now, travel could be, there isn't anything in here that says it isn't, that we could take trips anywhere around the State of Illincis. or suppose anywhere else, really, by plane, train, automobile, boat, whatever form of transportation, charge the expenses of the transportation and lodging and meals to our expense allowances, which would really be a way of serving ourselves and perhaps the general public of but not our districts. The purpose, the Gentleman said, of the district office expense allowance, is to serve our constituents, and it has always been very carefully drawn, indeed, so that it would be for the service of our district offices. Travel does not mean anything located in one location, such as a district office. It means our opportunity to travel around at state expense on any day that we do not receive a per diem or travel allowance for days that the Legislature is The only restriction on this travel item in here. is that it cannot be for days the Legislature is in Session, which means it could be for, say, two-thirds of

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

We could travel around and Bill it against our office expense allowance. Now, I want to make it clear that this does not increase the office expense allowance in any way. It does not spend extra of the taxpavers! dollars, but what it does do is give Legislators the opportunity divert from items that serve their to constituents' taxpayers' dollars to travel expenses for Legislators when we are not in Session OI otherwise eliqible for compensation for travel under, say, Commission work. I hope the Members of the General Assembly will be aware that this Bill is not simply to clarify the present Act, but that actually, the effect is to change the present Act in a substantive manner, to add yet another purpose to the expense allowance, and this one, I think, is a rather self-serving purpose. I hope the House will defeat this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuFage, Ms. Rarpiel."

Karpiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I'd like to ask a couple of questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

Karpiel: "In... In the Bill, it does strike on our \$36 per diem.

It allows the \$36 for lodging and meals, and it strikes the words 'and all other incidental expenses', which we are now allowed. Would that be interpreted to mean that we would have to be putting in receipts, or how would that determine whether or not we're using it for incidental expenses?"

Nash: "The portion... The reference to per diem says 'Expenses incurred for lodging and meals during Session shall not be paid from the district office allowance.' It doesn't touch that... the per diem."

Karpiel: "Well, I'm talking about on page two, line 18, at the end of the line, where it says 'Fach Member shall also receive an allowance of \$36 per'... This is the old

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

language, by the way, that's in the statute now. 'Each Member shall also receive an allowance of \$36 per day for lodging and meals.', and the words 'and all other incidental expenses' have been stricken 'while in attendance at Sessions of the General Assembly."

Nash: "What it did, it clarified the language to where you can only spend the \$36 for lodging and meals. The other incidentals..."

Karpiel: "Well, but, that's my question. Is that going to be interpreted that we will have to be putting in receipts to show that it's only being used for lodging and meals?"

Nash: "I don't... I don't think you'll have to put in receipts." Karpiel: "Well, I don't know whether I think we want to get into all that extra paperwork, but another question I have, and probably it's just because I haven't read the Eill closely enough, but all the words dealing... I mean all the language dealing with our legislative staff being paid out of contingent expenses have been stricken from the original language, the present statute, and where do you put that in in this new legislation? I'm looking on page four, starting on line seven. That whole Section about legislative staff has been stricken, and I don't see anything referring to legislative staff in the new language. I'm sure it must be there somewhere."

Wash: "Staff advised me that that, Representative Karpiel, is under personal services in the new language. One problem that I understand existed with the old language was if we used any of the offices expense account for any expenses down in Springfield at the Capitol, by the old statute language, we were in violation of it. If we hired an aide to work here during the last months to do... catch up with some of our work and paid it out of the expense account, we were in violation of that Act, and the Comptroller's Office

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

changed this language so they can pay those vouchers."

Karpiel: "Alright. Thank you. I ... "

Nash: "Staff says they have to paid... "

Karpiel: "I see that... I realize that you have a Section in here... I mean, you have it... all your expenses are going to be line itemed and one of the items is personal services. I just don't see a real definition of personal services in the Fill."

Nash: "Staff advised me that that's in the state financing."

Karpiel: "Ah, thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe. Oh, are you still... I'm sorry, Ms. Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Alright. I will finish up. The reason I m asking these questions and I seem a little hesitant on legislation is because; number one, I like the concept of the legislation. I think that we very definitely do need some kind of legislation clearing up this whole subject of our contingent expenses and what it can be used for. since I have been down here, I have thought it was rather ridiculous that we are only allowed to lease equipment for our district offices, which, if you follow that to its end result, anyone that is down here for 20 years could leasing a typewriter for 20 years, and that's perfectly ridiculous. 1 think there is a need to change the legislation on this part of it. The problem I have with this particular piece of legislation is the part that brought out by Representative Fullen, and that is the aspect of allowing us to use our office expenses to lease an automobile, to use it for travel, and that type of thing. I think that's expanding it just a little too far. There was a Bill sponsored by Representative Birkinbine that passed this House which did allow us to purchase office equipment. In the Senate, I understand, it has

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

been... all of that language was deleted and on it was placed an Amendment which goes to a salary... one of those advisory boards to set salaries for state employees, so when it comes back on Concurrence, it will not have the language that Representative Birkinbine had in it. Therefore, I think this is the only piece of legislation that is left that does this... what I think is important... important thing. But I am concerned about the and so I'm going to have to vote 'no' on this. Ιf it doesn't pass, I'd like to work with the Sponsor. don't know why I didn't get on it on Second, but I'd like to work with the Sponsor on an Amendment. Maybe we could still get it cut."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe." Ichuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's a mountain cut of a mole bill. I don't know where people are getting their... their offices at, but where I rent my office, my landlord just wants to raise rent to \$1,000 a year, or \$1,000 a month - from 500 to 1,000. He wants to double the rent. I don*t have any money left over to do anything with anyhow. So, we're just arguing about nothing. There isn't any money... any money left anyhow. By the time you get through paying for secretary and paying the rent, the electricity and the gas and the insurance, I end up paying 4 or \$5,000 out of my campaign account for this. So, I mean, I'm going to vote for this, but we ought to be talking about raising the office allowance to 25 or \$30,000 a year. You want to have people come in and visit your office and... and have the office in a closet somewhere, that's about what you can get by on this. After you pay a girl's salary and pay the insurance and pay the gas and the electricity, and buy some... some stamps, you haven't got anything left anyhow.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

So, we're arguing about nothing."

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

Leverenz: "For what purpose does the Chair recognize me? Did you
have something in mind?"

ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Freston."

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

ipeaker Greiman: "You learn who your friends are. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Mr. Nash to close."

This is a good piece of legislation. The travel portion of this Bill is restrictive. It's only in reference with your legislative duties in your district. Many of our Members who live in rural areas have big districts and have to travel around. It's a good piece of legislation. It's going to save money, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed, "nay". The voting is now open. Ms. Topinka to explain her vote."

Copinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish I could have phrased this better as a question to the Sponsor, but since we're going to explain votes... As... T c B V knowledge. in understanding what Representative McAuliffe said, we very rarely have anything left over in our expense allowances. If we do, indeed, commit to have a district office. But there's nothing in the law now that makes us commit to having a district office. It just arbitrarily gives us \$17,000 kind of for the good of the order. If that be the and since this particular Bill has no restriction on travel outside of the state, if this Bill would pass, and I did not choose to open a district office and let*s say I

/1st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

saw fit, in a non-Session time, to, in honor of Representative Nash, go to Athens, Greece, let's say, for a foreign investment meeting that may or may not have some implications to my district, I could charge that against my district office. But for \$17,000 a year non-committed in any way, you can do a heck of a lot of traveling, and as a traveler, I think this is just super."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, to explain his vote."
- "The people that are hinting on the subject of travel in this Bill are wrong, because you have to account to your constituents what you do when you're down in the General Assembly or when you hold any elected office, and it is for the people who have big districts and have to travel around. You have to account to your constituents. It is a good Bill, and I urge some more "aye" votes."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Yourell."
- Yourell: "To explain my vote, there were some individuals that guestioned and made a great deal to do about a Bill that might raise the district office allowance. As you know, I had that Bill increasing it to \$5,000, and there was a great deal of applause generated all over this chamber, and if you vote for this Bill, I think that's where I'm going to put it on in Conference Committee, so let's get some more green lights if you want an office allowance."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'.

 This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Second... Third Reading Short Debate appears Senate Bill 619. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 619, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Beading of the Fill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook... Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill (sic - House), Senate Fill 619 is a Bill to outline prior inconsistent statement exceptions to the hearsay rule. And I'm going to yield to my Co-chief Sponsor, Representative Tom McCracken, because he did place an Amendment on the Bill to remove all objections to Senate Fill 6... well, to remove as many objections as possible to Senate Bill 619.

So, Mr. Speaker, could I yield to the clean-up hitter on the A team, Representative McCracken? Yield to McCracken, the Co-chief Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 619 allows the prior inconsistent statement to be received substantively, as opposed to purposes of impeachment only. There was some concern over situations where there is an honest mistake made at or about the time of the offense and a witness who wishes to change his testimony at a later date for a mistake honestly made. We cleaned up that problem with Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 619, which further limits the application of this Bill to situations where the witness is either hostile or unwilling, within the meaning of Supreme Court Bule 238, or the party calling the witness is surprised by the witnesses testimony, within the meaning of that same Bule. I ask for favorable passage of Senate Bill 619."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 619. Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker ... "

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Jaffe. Excuse me. Let me just interrupt you for a moment for the purposes of an announcement. It is the intention of the Chair to sometime go to the Order of Nonconcur... to go to nonconcurrences. So, if you have a Bill on the Order of Concurrence, that's at page 18 and the pages following as well as Supplemental Calendar 2, advise the Clerk that it is your intention to nonconcur, and we will have a list later on of those Bills where there are Motions filed to nonconcur. Thank you.

Mr. Jaffe, I'm sorry. Proceed."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't think that this is an innocuous Bill, and I would ask leave to take it off the Short Debate Calendar. And I'd like to be joined by the appropriate number of people."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks to take the Bill off the Order of Short Debate, and there are an appropriate number joining him. Mr. Jaffe, proceed."

Jaffe: "Okay. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this really another step wherein we're taking the criminal law and just absolutely destroying it. The Illinois Supreme Court has consistently refused to alter the Common Law Doctrine that prior inconsistent statements not for impeach... are only admissible for impeachment of witnesses. Thus, the statements are not admissible to prove the truth of a statement or the fact in question. Ιn other words. i f you*ve made a prior inconsistent statement, that testimony can certainly However, under the present law, you cannot take impeached. testimony and use that testimony to convict an individual. What you're doing under this Bill is you*re taking a prior inconsistent statement, which may not be subject to all sorts of constitutional provisions. It not take into account the Miranda warnings. It may not

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

take into account anything else, and what you're permitting the state's attorney to do is you're permitting them to in with probably the weakest possible case and use prior inconsistent statements in order to prove its case. I will tell you this - that this type of law is not included under the civil law. And so, basically what you're saying is you're saying, 'We're going to permit you to use evidence in a criminal case, which is far more severe, that we would not permit you to use in a civil case. Now, you know, if you want to be а hang... hanging Legislature, you can pass this type of a Bill, but I'm telling you what you're doing is you're destroying the law. You know, there has to be a balance in the criminal law. You know, I used to remember, when I kid, I used to listen to *Mr. Eistrict Attorney*. You know, and it's the duty of the state's attorney not only to prosecute to the limit of the law, but also to protect the And what you're doing with this particular Bill innocent. is you're taking the innocent, and you're just throwing them right in prison. You're not permitting them to use ... to be protected by the rules of evidence. This is really a terrible Bill. The Supreme Court has consistently knocked down approaches to change this type of evidence. And if we in the Legislature move forward to change it, we are really doing a foolbardy Bill. It's a terrible concept, and should be defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will, if he's in his seat.

Where is he? He's coming. He will."

Cullerton: "Representative McCracken."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. McCracken."

Cullerton: "Yes, Representative McCracken, the part that concerns

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

me about the Bill is not so much the situation where we're in a trial and the prior inconsistent statement is admitted and goes to the jury. What I'm concerned about are grand jury proceedings and the state's case where there's a Motion for a directed finding. Now, with your Amendment that limits it to a situation where there's a hostile witness or a surprise, could this be used... could it... could this prior inconsistent statement be used in a grand jury proceeding?"

- McCracken: "I think, if I understand you, can the grand jury transcript be introduced substantively at the trial to get passed..."
- Cullerton: "No, I mean at the... in the grand jury, when the state's trying to get an indictment."

McCracken: "Bight."

- Cullerton: "Is there any... Does this Eill change the current law, or does it... would it, in any way, allow..."
- McCracken: "No, it does... That does not change the current law."

 Cullerton: "Okay. And how about on a situation where the state

 is trying to prove the prima facie case, can they use a
- prior... under what circumstances could they use a prior inconsistent statement under this Eill?"
- McCracken: "Well, that's why we introduced Amendment #1, because that would limit the circumstances under which they could use it to; one, where the witness is unwilling or hostile within the meaning of that Eule. Now, that's a decision to be made by the court and depends on a number of factors."
- Cullerton: "Well, could you just give me an example of how that might work?"
- McCracken: "An easier example would be the surprise Section.

 Surprise, under 238, is limited to where the person is actually on the stand, and the party calling the witness has never heard this inconsistent story prior to that time.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

If, in fact, you have that situation where you ve heard it for the first time, you could use the prior statement substantively."

Cullerton: "Well, just give me an example of a state's case. The state calls a witness, say, a police officer, and then he testifies to something that was inconsistent with the previous testimony in front of the grand jury."

McCracken: "Bight. That could be used."

Sullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "further discussion? There being none... Oh,

I'm sorry. Mr. Terzich, Gentleman from Cook. There being

no further discussion, the Gentleman from... Mr. McCracken,

the Gentleman from DuPage, to close."

McCracken: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Jaffe was not entirely correct when he told you about the parameters of this Eill. This Bill does not allow statements to be used substantively which were taken in violation of Miranda. All this does is say that if the hearsay rule is the only reason that they re inadmissible for the purpose of substantive evidence, that that rule will not stop it. If it violates other rules of evidence which would prohibit its introduction, if violates constitutional standards which would give the party making the statement a right to suppress those statements, it cannot be introduced for any purpose. substantive or impeachment. So, this Eill does not beyond the mere parameters of the hearsay rule. A similar Bill is in operation in a number of states, including California. It's in operation in the federal system and has been for some time. This is verv tightly-constricted version of that rule. The person has to be available for testimony. The inconsistent statement has to be made under oath at a previous proceeding, or it

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

has to have been acknowledged at a previous proceeding, it has to be proved by extraneous evidence, which go far beyond the current foundational requirements. This is safe Bill. It is designed to enhance the truth-seeking process, and it does it for this reason, basically. Currently, a limitation on prior inconsistent statements to the use of impeachment is an artificial distinction. If you can prove that the statement was made, if you can prove that it was made under oath, or if you can prove that it's been acknowledged by the declarent (sic - declarer) or if you can prove it by some other high degree of information or evidence, then you have a better truth-seeking tool than current law. The art... The distinction artificial. We don't do away with any other evidentiary rules. I ask for an 'ave' vcte."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Voting is now open? Have all voted who wish? Rea? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 80 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Order οf Senate Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Bill 1073. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1073, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this speaks to deputy registrars and how often must the list of registrars be published. Once a year is the first Amendment. My Amendment, #3, that was handled by Jim Taylor yesterday, allows board of election commissioners and county clerks to swear in Senators and

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Representatives if they want that authority, so that they can register people in their service offices back in their districts. Very simple Bill. I urge your support."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for a passage of Senate
 Bill 1073. On that, is there any discussion? The
 Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."
- Olson: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I merely rise to reaffirm what we discussed yesterday at the Amendment stage of 1073. It's necessary that each of you make your decision on whether or not you want to become a deputy registrar in your district, and the designees that you so indicate may also register voters for you. It was not clearly defined how many designees we may have. It could be an entire campaign committee. It could be... It could be your office staff, and if you feel that you can go back to your constituency and say that you start out with that in-built advantage, then you will probably cast an "aye" vote. I just wanted to call that to your attention."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino.:
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the... I believe, the only county chairman serving here in the House, I recommend all Legislators become precinct committeemen, that are already authorized under our statute to be registrars."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Winnebago to close."
- Jiorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say for the record that
 Senators and Representatives are not irresponsible. We're
 very familiar with the... with the types of registrations
 that are necessary. We're very familiar with the forms.
 We're all good public-spirited, good Americans. We'd like
 to see people that come into the office that sometimes

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

don't know where to get registered. You could help them get registered. I think this is a... this is a Bill that you can be proud to, when you walk into your office every morning, look at your flag and salute it and say, 'I'm a good American'. This is a good Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this Bill, there are 64 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', 4 voting *present*. This Bill. having Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. Alright. On the Order of Nonconcurrences on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 465. Mr. Winchester ... Mr. Winchester moves that the House nonconcur with Amendment... Senate Amendments to Senate Eill ... to Bouse Eill 465. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments to House Eill 465-On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate... House Fill 1024. Mr. Rice moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 1024. All in favor signify by saying... Vinson? Yes?"

Vinson: "You know, every time you get to moving that guickly, Mr.

Speaker, you get into trouble."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, Mr. Vinson, I'm not in trouble at all, and if you... if you seek recognition, you put your light on. If I happen to not see your light, you may raise your hand, but I'm not in trouble, Sir. Proceed."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bice?"

Vinson: "The Spensor."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Rice indicates he will yield for a

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

question."

Vinson: "Mr. Rice, why do you wish to nonconcur?"

Rice: "Line three, I believe it says... One minute. Because it strikes something that we originally had voted out of this House."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I didn't... I didn't catch what you said."

Rice: "It strikes a portion of the original Amendment that was

voted out of this House."

Vinson: "Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, did you want to debate the issue?

 Mr. Vinson? Excuse me. Before I go on to call anybody
 else, I wanted to make sure you wanted... you considered...
 through with your debate on the issue? Thank you. Mr.
 Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign."
- Johnson: "I'll save it until after... after this Bill. I do want to be recognized for purposes of a parliamentary inquiry."
- Speaker Greiman: "Surely, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rice, moves the House nonconcur with Ecuse... with Senate Amendments to House Bill 1024. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does so nonconcur. Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: "Would it be possible, Sir, that the Membership would be able to have the benefit of a list, let's say, of four or five Bills ahead on nonconcurrence, since we go through them rather quickly. We'd like to know what Bills we're going to be nonconcurring on. I would respectfully request that you provide us with this."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Thank you. Mr. Johnson, on... I think a list was provided to the Republican Leadership. Is that correct?"
- Johnson: "We have four Bills on a list, here, and we don't know what order they're going to be called in or anything else."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Well, we're going to call them on the Calendar first, and then we're going to call them on the Supplemental Calendar #2. On the Calendar, we're going to call Senate... House Bill 772 - that's an addition. And on the Supplemental Calendar, we've had requests on Senate Bill... on House Bill 1108, 1121, 1192 and 1257."

Johnson: "In that order, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, they aren't in that order on my... on my notes that they ve given me, but I've put them into chronological order so that we will conform with the rules."

Johnson: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Greiman: "On the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 772. Mr. Mautino, the Gentleman from Bureau, moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 772. And on that, is there any discussion? Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson: ".. Representative Mautino, and would support the Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The question is, shall...

 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "We're just having trouble... locating the file over here, so I wondered if you could just explain it. It's a Motion to nonconcur. Could he just explain..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino... to close, and we'll proceed in a..."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much. I relieve that the record is wrong. I think, on concurrences, it should be House Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, it's House Bill."
- Mautino: "... 772. Senator Bloom put an Amendment on the Bill in the Senate addressing taxidermy. When the drafting of that Amendment came off, they left the second part of his

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Amendment off, and Phil Chiles from the Department of Conservation has requested that we just complete his Amendment as it defines 'taxidermy'. So therefore, I have to nonconcur to make his Amendment correct in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton? The Gentleman from Bureau moves to nonconcur with Bouse... with Senate Amendments to House Bill 772. All those in favor. signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'no'. Th€ 'ayes' it, and the House does nonconcur. have On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears, on the Order of Senate Bills, Third Beading, Short Debate, 1109. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. This is on Senate Bill Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar Supplemental #1."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Beading of the Bill."

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

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 1109 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. It exempts the
lessor vehicle from liability for parking violations during
the term of the lease. Bill passed out of Committee 15 to
nothing on the Consent Calendar. It's a good Bill. It's
going to give an opportunity for the... for the cities and
the state to generate some additional revenue. I move for
the passage."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill
1109. On that, is there any discussion? The Lady from
Cook, Ms. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."

Braun: "Representative Ronan, as the law new stands, a... the local government is entitled to go after a Hertz

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Rent-a-car, for example, and to collect parking tickets that were generated by cars that they ve leased. Is that correct?"

- Ronan: "It's been a series of... of court cases have been held.

 There's litigation still pending in the courts concerning that issue."
- Braun: "But, as the law now stands, they are entitled to go after the rent-a-car agency to collect parking fees."
- Ronan: "There's been a court case ruling in that direction, but as I said, it's still in litigation. At this point, and for the last number of years, cities have not generated any revenue because of the litigation. This will clarify the situation and allow cities to... to generate a tremendous additional amount of revenue. It's going on in most cities around the country."
- Braun: "Alright, Representative Roman, but the clarification you're talking about is to take away the ability of local governments to go after the big rent-a-car operations and force them in a position where they have to go directly after the person who's rented a car, who may have left the city, left town, gone and disappeared into nowhere. Is that correct?"
- Ronan: "Representative Braun, it's going to make it very easy for the... for the municipalities to go after the individual who rents the car. Forty-five days after the company is notified that... that a parking violation was issued, the rental car company has to issue name, address, phone number, to the municipality so that they can pursue the... the individual. So it will make it much easier for the... for the municipality to go after the individuals who violate the law."
- Braun: "So.. But, Representative, if I, for example, if I live in Tupelo, Louisiana, and I come into Chicago and rent a car

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

and run up 15 parking tickets, under this Bill, the... the city would have to find me in Louisiana, as opposed to going after Bertz Rent-a-Car, which is right there in the City of Chicago, right?"

Bonan: "Representative Braun, as I said, the city's generated revenue off this concept, because there's litigation pending, as it has been for a number of years. What's going on in other cities, I think it's about that we moved our state in the right direction. What's going on in other major cities around the country is, they ve gone to this system. In New York City, for example, there's a 70 percent recovery rate, so even the people from Tupelo, Louisiana, pay their parking violations, because they're... most people are law-abiding citizens. So, what we're trying to do is put faith back in human beings and make sure the law-abiding citizens do what's right. I know you and I support that concept."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Froceed."

Braun: "Representative Ronan, with all due respect, has not responded to my questions in such... in as clear a way ագոյին have been possible. For the Members of this Assembly, you should know that this could be called the Hertz, Avis, Rent-a-Wreck giveway, because what we are essentially doing, if this Fill passes, is letting the companies off the hook and forcing local governments to go and find people who rent cars to collect their parking tickets. Now, anyone who knows anything about local government would recognize the tremendous potential loss in revenue loss to a local government which is then forced into the position οf going and looking for person-by-person-by-person-by-person wherever live, even including France, Europe or whatever, who come

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

in and rent automobiles and incur parking violations. I don't think that it serves the interest of a local government. I don't think it serves the enforcement of our parking laws, and frankly, I don't think it serves... and it doesn't serve the interests of local governments in terms of collecting revenues from people who break the law. If you want to encourage scofflaws, if you want to encourage people running away from their responsibility to pay for their illegal parking, then vote for this Bill. If you want, however, to protect and to provide some consistent way of collecting these fines, I would encourage a "no" vote on House... Senate Eill 1109."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from... The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bopp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is probably a good idea, because, what is actually happening is that the leasing company, Hertz or anybody else, really did not commit the violation, and so we're really, in fact, going after the person who had the license and caused the violations, and I was going to ask a question as to the brief mechanics of this, and I... did you explain that, Representative Bonan? Would you, please?"

"Yeah, Ronan: I'11... I*11 bе glad to explain it Representative Ropp. What happens is that 45 days after the company is notified that an individual has received a parking violation, the company has to send written notification to the municipality with name, address, phone number, social security number, of the individual who had leased the car, so that the municipality very easily can go the... the violator. What happens also is if an individual runs up a number of tickets and becomes a scofflaw, then the municipality can go after that individual wherever he's living, and the scofflaw is liable

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

for the cost of bringing the individual back into the state to pay those fees. So, it's a very reasonable, simple concept that we're trying to establish, here, that's done in most other states."

Ropp: "Okay. On my driving record, then, if I've had three or four of these, would actually be added to the driving record of the individual, there's no reason to add the violations to Hertz, because they really have no driving record. Isn't that right?"

Ronan: "Absolutely."

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

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would rise in support of Representative Roman's Bill. can tell you from being a police officer in Chicago that these people that rent these cars feel they can park them anywhere they want. They know they won't ever have to gay the tickets. They feel that they "11 get the automobile rental agency to pay it. They all go down to Bush Street or on Michigan Avenue and park in bus stops, in front of the fire hydrants, or just park any place they feel like it, and they don't care if they get a hundred tickets. doesn't make any difference to them, because they know they're never going to have to pay them. So I would strongly urge aye4 а support of... vote for Representative Ronan's Bill."

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

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

I rise in support of Senate Bill 1109. I... Excuse me.

I'm sorry. I'm shocked and chagrined by the attitude of certain people over there. Maybe I should oppose the Bill, but I won't. This is a pro-consumer, pro-business Bill for the State of Illinois. The majority, 95 percent or more of the people who rent cars in Illinois are from out of state.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

They know that the tickets go back to the rental companies, whether they're the small rental companies or the large rental companies. And who ends up picking up the tab when they can't find the people, is the small rental companies, so the price of the cars end up going up in the long term. What we're talking about is increasing revenue to the State of Illinois, helping the consumer from Illinois who does rent a car, even though it's a small percentage, and I would ask for a favorable vote on Senate Bill 1109."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes'... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the previous question will be put, and on that, Mr. Ronan to close."

Ronan: "I'd just ask for a favorable Boll Call. The Bill's been adequately discussed."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Fill pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Fill 1191. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1191, a Bill for an Act relating to professions and occupations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Tate."

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

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Bill was introduced by the department, and it was commonly referred to as the Agency Fee Bill. The Bill covers three revisions from the original model Act. The first one is the deletion of the reinstatement of licenses referring only to the restoration. Each Act currently has an arbitrary cutoff of five years without an active license before the department determines if a person is qualified to re-enter that profession. This change will provide such a review be established by rule, allowing establishment on an Act by Act tasis the necessary qualifications and time requirements for such requalifications for an give you one good example of that, is, last vear we had a pharmacist that had practiced ... selling insurance in the State of Missouri for four years and 11 months, and he came back for... for his license renewal, and the department had to reinstate the license. The second provision is the establishment of inactive status license. This device is currently necessary for the four Acts with continuing education requirements, so that something similar to retired status licensing can be provided. The third is an establishment of a fee schedule. This Bill is presently being supported by the barbers, the nursing association, the nursing home administrators, the physicians! assistants. the podiatrists. the psychological... no, the social workers and, as many of you know, we debated yesterday. I also put an Amendment on the Bill to address a specific concern of a... Representative Woodyard, and be... I would encourage a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ecwman."

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

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Limited questioning, yes. Froceed, Sir."

- Bowman: "Yes. Representative Tate, as I recall, this Bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday and was amended at that time. Could you refresh our memories and tell us what that Amendment was?"
- Tate: "Yes, Representative Bowman, as you know, yesterday we put an Amendment on that would have addressed... addresses the problem of the mandatory continual medical education, and we will... if the Bill as amended would repeal that medical Act. Bight?"
- Bowman: "Okay. Well then, briefly, to the Bill. I don't see mandatory continuing education as a problem, and I see no reason to repeal it, so I stand in opposition."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. A11 those in favor signify by voting *aye*, those opposed vote *no*. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this Bill, there are 78 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 10 voting *present*. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar, on Concurrences, Motions to Nonconcur, appears appears House Bill 646. Mr. Saltsman, the Gentleman from Peoria. Boves that the House nonconcur with Amendments to House Bill 646. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, Shall this Motion pass? . All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur. The Gentleman from Winnebago for a Motion, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Pursuant to Rule 12(c), I move that the Special Order of
 Business Subject Matter Economic Becovery be modified by
 continuing the Special Order Sunday, June 26th at 4 p.m."

 Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves pursuant to rules that

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

Special Order Economic Recovery be modified to extend the time to Sunday, June 26th. At what time, Mr. Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Four o'clock. Haven't changed the time."

Speaker Greiman: "At 4 p.m. And on that Motion, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Giorgi: "Please don't discuss it."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is hereby granted and the Order... Special Order Economic Recovery is extended to the hour of 4 o'clock on Sunday, June the 22nd (sic - 26th). The hour of 12 noon having arrived, we will proceed to Special Order of Eusiness Subject Matter Workers' Rights. On that Order appears Senate Bill 336. Out of the record. Senate Eill 25 has been passed already today. On the Subject... On the Order... Special Order of Business Subject Matter Workers' Bights appears Senate Bill 1070. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1070, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning injuries and disabilities caused by exposure to asbestos. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Ecuse, I would ask leave of the House to return Senate Eill 1070 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of tabling a Motion and adoption or consideration of another Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill...

to return Senate Bill 1070 to the Order of Second Reading
for the purposes of an Amendment and Motion to table. Does
the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave, and the
Bill is returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there
any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion to table. "I move to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1070." Representative Matijevich."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I Matijevich: am tabling Amendment ... I move to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1070. Table #2 to Senate Bill 1070 is one moment. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate (sic - House) Amendment #2 was the Amendment of the Chicago Firefighters where they would have been under workers' compensation program, and I discussed this... this with the ... Mike 'Cohen' from the firefighters he said that the firefighters wanted out of group. And this Bill, and they didn't want in any way to jeopardize is a good Bill for those who may suffer from ill... diseases of asbestosis and also of some procedures that we Bill relating to workers compensation. felt that it is possible that the Amendment #2 could... passage of the Bill. could have jeopardized the So I. therefore, now move that Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1070 be tabled. And I'm talking slowly so that Jim McPike can come from the Senate because he has Amendment ... And he's here, so I can talk a little faster Amendment. now. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves to table Senate Amend...

House Amendment #2 to Senate Eill 1070, and on that, is
there any discussion? The Gentleman form DeWitt, Mr.
Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out that he had moved to table Senate Amendment #3, and we can't do that.

I thought it was House Amendment #3 that he cared about."

Speaker Greiman: "House Amendment 2, yes. There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall this Amendment be tabled?" All those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, McPike, amends Senate Bill 1070."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McFike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 was technically cut of Order. the other day. What we're trying to do is explained it change the composition of the Industrial Commission to try to speed up the process. They currently have five members. This Amendment would change that to six members. would set up two, three member panels, and on each panel would be a member of a employee group, a member of a employer group and a neutral member. And that three member panel then could make a decision. We think it would... would cut... or it would increase by 100% the speed of the Commission because. in effect today, they have one Commission of five and under this, they would have † NO Commissions of three each. I think it's a good idea because under the current process they're now scheduling oral arguments for next January. So people facing a work comp disability suit are locking at anywhere from a year to two years just to get the case heard. So I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1070. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Br. Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."
- Birkinbine: "Doesn't the raising of the number of the members of the Commission from five to six almost invite the problem of a stalemate on any vote on the board?"
- McPike: "No, the... two members, two out of three could make a decision. We have set up in here in this language with six members. We divided it to two three member panels, and on that panel, two members could make a decision, two out of

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

three, as today, three out of five. Then under this, it would be two out of three, so the six members would not meet as a panel."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Peoria,
Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will. Proceed."

Tuerk: "What is the precise rationale for adding another member other than... Is there another reason other than the expedited hearing rationale that you offered?"

McPike: "No, none at all. We hesitated, as you can see, we... we were rather hesitant in doing this because there is a Bepublican Governor of this state, and the Governor makes the appointment. And we are allowing the Governor to make a neutral appointment. Obviously, we weighed that heavily before deciding to offer this Amendment. So the... It was certainly taken into consideration that we're taking a risk that the neutral member would, in fact, not be took neutral. But we were willing to take that risk in order to speed up the process."

Tuerk: "What's your definition of a neutral member?"

McPike: "We don't change that definition. I answered that the other day. We don't change the definition under current law."

Tuerk: "Well, would you explain to the Membership what a neutral member really is though?"

McPike: "Yes. The language reads that, "One shall be a member of the employee class, one the employer class and two of whom shall be representative citizens not identified with either the employing or the employee classes." So we did not change that definition. We simply changed it from one neutral to two neutrals."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Tuerk: "How do you actually get a neutral member who is not affiliated with either employee side or the employer side?"

McPike: "Well, we leave that to the Governor."

Tuerk: "Well, I'm not going to violently oppose this Amendment as

I didn't the other Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I leave that to
the Membership to use their own judgment."

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

Jaffe: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this very, very good Amendment. You know, as it Industrial Commission is not working well. All we do on this floor is consistently scream about the fact that Industrial Commission is not working well. Well, one of the reasons it's not working well is that we're not getting hearings. As Bepresentative McFike says, if you can't hearing at the Industrial Commission, especially on the appeal level, when you go before the full Commission for a year or two years and then after you get that hearing, they don't hand down a decision for a year or two years. Industrial Commission is doing very poorly. We have to do something in order to improve it. The whole concept actually creating an Industrial Commission and creating the Workers' Compensation Law was to have speedy hearings for people that needed that money to operate with, and we're not doing that. We're falling down on the job. This is an excellent Amendment. It should be supported by everyone, both by business and labor alike, and I don't know why anyone would oppose this particular Amendment. "

Speaker Greiman: "As you know, we have adopted a rule recently that precludes introduction of anyone unless they are dignitaries introduced from the podium. United States Senators fall within that general category of dignitaries. Accordingly, we have with us this morning, we are honored to have with us United States Senator Alan Dixon, a former

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Member of this House."

Alan Dixon: "Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Delighted to be here, and glad to say 'hi', and I appreciate the fact that you welcome an old friend. Thank you so much."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Mays: "Currently, Representative McPike, lacking the standards, we're looking to the Industrial Commission to come up with written decisions to be precedent or to give us direction as to what way they're going. Under your Amendment, we will then have two Commissions and not one, each making decisions independently of the other. Do you foresee any problems in consistency or anything like that?"

McPike: "We discussed that with the current Chairman of the Commission and he indicated that by... by rule or by practice, he would rotate the four members of the panel that were not neutrals so that there would, indeed... they would, indeed, try to strike consistency between the rulings. There still is a possibility that you would get a slight inconsistency from day to day, but I think if you rotated the members, that is, had a neutral member in charge of one panel and a neutral member in charge of the other, rotated the other four between the two, I think that over time, you would have fairly, generally consistent rulings."

Mays: "Would there be a possibility of one Commission coming up with one decision and one coming up with another and who would then arbiter... bring the Commission..."

McPike: "No, they would... One Commission... Only one Commission... Only one three member panel would hear a

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

case."

Mays: "Okay. So then what you're going to be doing with this Amendment, if I read it right, is decreasing the number of board members or Commission members to make that decision. You're going to go from three with the one member... with the five member board to two with the three member board, so two people will be able to make these decisions rather than three right now."

McPike: "Well, in practice today you have two employer members and two employee members and they always side together, and the neutral member sides with one of the two parties. And so under this system, the same thing would happen. You would still have an employer, employee and the neutral member would have to side with one of the two. It really doesn't change the process."

Mays: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean,
Mr. Fopp."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Ropp: "I'm still a little bit troubled about the current definition of neutral, and I wondered whether or not a neutral might also be considered one who is an employer and an employee?"

McPike: "Well, we all know in politics that there's no such thing as a neutral, and that was our fear in allowing the Governor the right to make one additional appointment. If you let a Democrat pick a neutral and obviously, the Republicans are not going to be crazy about the selection and vice versa. It is difficult, and we can only trust that the Governor will do the best he can to try to pick someone neutral for this job."

Ropp: "Well, I just wondered under the ... as you so explained an

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

employer and employee whether or not, for example, a farmer might be considered. $^{\circ}$

McPike: "I don't know."

Ropp: "Well, under your definition that person is a welfare recipient on occasions, and I just wondered whether or not since he is an employer, and an employee and also a welfare recepient, whether or not he would qualify?"

McPike: "Are you referring to the situation I mentioned the other day where a farmer is receiving 430,000 dollars in cash from the federal government, and you objected to me saying that someone that receives 435,000 dollars is on the dole? If that's what you're referring to, I don't know if we would want to put that individual on the Industrial Commission."

Ropp: "Well, he might be a pretty good..."

McPike: "I would be afraid of the size of the awards he may hand out."

Ropp: "He might be a pretty good person because he'd have plenty of time to serve."

McPike: "No doubt about that."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. McFike to close."

McPike: "Well, I think ... "

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. McPike. Mr. McMan (sic - McGann has asked for recognition."

McGann: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. The name is McGann not McMan."

Speaker Greiman: "I just said McGann. McGann with a $q \cdot q$."

McGann: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

McGann: "May I ask a question, Mr. Leader? Just... Do you have any idea what, or who or whom the former Republican Legislator will end up with this plum, being and appointment by the Governor?"

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- McPike: "What ... What was the question? I missed it."
- McGann: "I was just wondering what former Berublican Legislator would end up with this rlum after the... by appointment from a Republican Governor?"
- McPike: "Well, it could have been ex-Speaker Ryan, but he has another job now, so..."
- McGann: "I just thought the Republicans should keer that in mind
 in their voting."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, Mr. McPike to close."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really think that everyone should support this Amendment. The truth of the matter is that, 'Justice delayed is justice denied' and, currently, before the Industrial Commission the delay is running anywhere from one to two years. I think it's incumbent upon us to speed up that process. I move for the adoption of Amendment #4."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Yes, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Vinson: "I distinctly heard Bepresentative Tuerk say that there was a fiscal note filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "That's correct. You also should have heard him say that a fiscal note was, in fact, filed."
- Vinson: "A fiscal note as amended?"
- Speaker Greiman: "There was a reguest, and a fiscal note as amended was filed. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "The fiscal note as amended is filed."
- Vinson: "And who signed the fiscal note?"

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "Hr... Mr. Vinson, the fiscal note is here, so rather than question the Clerk, why don't you come look at it? That'd be appropriate. All right, the Bill is on Third Reading. I did... on Third Reading. Yes, Mr. Vinson."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Yes, I would move to extend this Order of Eusiness until tomorrow at the hour of 4:30 p.m."

Speaker Greiman: "The Majority Leader, Mr. McPike, moves to extend the Order of Subject Matter Workers' Rights Special Order of Business to the hour of 4:30 tomorrow, June the 26th, 1983. On that Motion, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I have examined the fiscal note, and I inquire of the Chair how a fiscal note filed on June 20th could satisfy the requirements for a fiscal note as amended when the Bill was amended today."

Speaker Greiman: "Certainly, there's no inherent possibility in that, Mr. Vinson. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "Yes, I reiterate that question."

Speaker Greiman: "Fardon?"

Vinson: "I reiterate that question."

Speaker Greiman: "And I say it again to you, we do it all the time. We can do it in anticipation of Amendments to be adopted, and there's nothing inherently impossible about it."

Vinson: "What's anticipatory about that fiscal note?"

Speaker Greiman: "You objecting? Are you making appropriate Motion... some appropriate Motion, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "I'm inquiring of the Chair on a point of order, a matter that is clearly prescribed by statutes..."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair... Right, and the Chair advised you that a fiscal note request as amended had been filed. fiscal note as amended reflects that it includes the Amendment just adopted, and on that basis, the Chair moved the Bill to the Order of Third Reading. We are I will be glad to debate this, but we are now on a Motion of Mr. McPike to... to adjourn this Order of Business at this time and to delay it until the ... 4:30 tomorrow. Now, if you want to debate that Motion, you are recognized to do, Sir. All right. All those in... The Motion is, 'Shall this Order of Business te continued tomorrow at the hour of 4:30? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. and the Motion carries. All right. On the regular daily Calendar, on the Order of Senate Fills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 255. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 255, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Third Beading of the Eill."

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

Keane: "Mr. Chairman, would you take this out of the record?"

Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 256. Ms. Braun, 256. Do you wish to proceed with that Bill, Ms. Braun? Ms. Satterthwaite, do you wish to proceed?"

Satterthwaite: "Out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Cut of the record. On the Order of Senate
Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill
257. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills
Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Fill 258.
Mr. Bopp in the chamber? Mr. Bopp, do you wish to proceed,

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Sir, with 258? Mr. Ropp. Is that a sign that you wish to proceed, or that you..."

Ropp: "No, I have a guestion. Might I? What did Representative Keane do on his Eill?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane took the Bill out of the record."

Ropp: "I think that's the proper procedure for this one too."

Speaker Greiman: "All right. Thank you. Gut of the record.
Yes, Mr. Reilly, the Gentleman from Morgan."

- Reilly: "Well, first of all I apologize. I was out in the Speaker's corridor when 255 was called, and certainly, I'll abide. Representative Keane is here and took it out of the record. He is a hyphenated Sponsor, and I'll abide by his decision. I must say as at least the spokesman on our side of the aisle on the Committee that handles these matters, I think the higher ed people are playing with fire by taking all these Bills out of the record. There's a real possibility, I think, that... that the Speaker may not get back to them. All right. Could we back up to 255?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, surely. Let's begin the call then again on the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 255. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 255, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Eoard of Bigher Education. Third

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reading of the Bill."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Fill 255 is the appropriation for the operations of the Board of Higher Education. Now if... if all the Members, particularly all the Members on our side of the aisle would listen, what I'm about to say will apply to a great many of the Bills here. What happened is, the higher education Bills came over from the Senate at the Governor's with tax level. The Majority party in Committee

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

higher ed Bills down to the FY 83 spending level which is still somewhat above the doorsday level but way below the with tax level, and as a matter of fact, way below the House Republican Folicy Committee level. that will ... That's a general statement of applicability. It's my opinion that we ought to move these Bills, even though they're slightly above the doomsday level, they're a lot below... they're a lot below the FY'83 appropriated level. We ought to move them. They're all going to end up in Conference Committee, but we need a number of Bills Conference Committee, otherwise, we're going to end up having to consider the whole budget on one Bill. This Bill appropriates a total of 30,044,500 dollars for the operations of the Board of Higher Education. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 255. On that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Just to support the statements that Representative Beilly has made, although, many of us would quarrel with the levels of funding provided in the Bill. At this point, I think it is necessary for us to move the package of Bills on and put them in a position where we can resolve the final figures in Conference Committee, and I urge a "yes" vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
 Mr. Fowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise to support the Motion. I do want to make sure everyone understands what is happening. Representative Reilly explained it pretty well, but not quite. I just would like to point out that the reductions made in House Committee were made from the point of view of

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

legislative strategy. At the present time, we do not know whether we have a tax or not or indeed how much the tax be, but the Bills in this posture will permit us, if there is no tax forthcoming, for the Senate to accept And the Bills then will go to the Governor at Amendments. a level that is consistent with current spending. Bills as amended are amended to reflect current spending levels, and so no university or higher education system in this state will be cut as a result. If, however, there are tax monies available, the Senate could refuse to concur, and then we would simply recede from our Amendments. Bills could go to the Governor at the Governor's proposed level with the tax. So, I think the proper way of viewing these Amendments is from the point of view legislative strategy. It keeps the process flexible, and we can accommodate either a no tax or a tax... substantial tax increase within the scope of the Amendments which offered. And that is true. not only for BHE the appropriation which we are now discussing. but for the remaining appropriations. I urge the support of the So Gentleman's Motion at this time."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marzuki." Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I urge the support of Representative Reilly's Motion also, although I disagreed with the reduction of these appropriations. I felt we could have served the same purpose by increasing them to a level where they do belong. would hope that as these things are moved to Conference Committee that we rectify the error of underfunding of higher education and all education programs. Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor signify by voting aye, those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting "aye", 1 voting "no", 1 voting "present". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 256. The Lady... Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 256, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again, consistent with the Committee action, this provides for funding for the University of Illinois at the estimated expenditure level for fiscal year '83 with the exception that it adds in some additional monies garnered by the increase of tuition that is anticipated for next year's level. While, personally, I would not feel that this is an acceptable level of funding for the University of Illinois, I have agreed to support the Bill in this measure and hope that we will, at some point along the legislative process,

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 256.

On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to close."

be able to revise the funding upward. And on the basis of that, I would ask for your support in passing this Bill."

Johnson: "Just urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay". Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Eill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 257. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 257, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 257 makes appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1984.

 This Bill, also, has been amended to put the... the appropriation at the level of last year's expenditures, and I agree with all that's been said by previous speakers regarding the process that we're going through. And I would ask for your support of this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 257. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Pardon? On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 258, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Borp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingency expenses for the Board of Regents which includes the Amendment which deleted

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

13,446,000 dollars out of that hudget giving a new Bill total of 145,352,600 dollars. As others have stated, this is, in my judgment, not what is needed for higher education but is one that in this necessary process we must move along, and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 258. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is. 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 259. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 259, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Foard cf Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the same as the previous Bills. It's the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Board of Governors. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 259. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Senate Bill 260. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 260, a Pill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis for the fiscal year 1984. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the Bouse, Senate Bill 260 contains the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Community Colleges in Illinois, and the Community College of East St. Louis and the operating expenses of the Board. It, as the other Bills, is at the level of last year per the Amendment in Committee that reduced the amount by 11,000,000 dollars. That contains the credit hour grants equalization disadvantaged students funds, and I would ask for an affirmative Foll Call on Senate Eill 260 as amended."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, *Shall this Bill pass?* All those favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order... Yes, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rice. Is your light not working, Mr. Rice? Well, we can't go back unless there's some kind of mechanical difficulty, but check it on next vote and make sure your light's voting. I'll... watch to see that it is, Sir. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Fill 262. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, this is the Bill for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. The Bill came out of the Senate at 144,862,500 which was about a million six under the introduced level. The House further reduced it where it is now 129,344,400 dollars. all know that we yet are determining what our revenues are Many of us had that uneasy feeling yesterday. The Governor had said that starting on June 24th the activities in State Government were going to be affected if we didn't have new revenue, and sure enough, about o'clock at night the lights went out. So we know that we've got to keep working but there's got to be more work on this Bill as many others in the appropriations process. But up to now, I would move for the passage of Senate 262- "

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 262. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 264, a Eill for an Act making appropriations for retirement purposes of higher education

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

institutions and agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Bill as it came to us from the Senate provided for a pay... a level of funding this year for 77.5% of the pay out for the year. The Bill was further reduced in Committee to now be at the 70% of pay out level. Again, I feel that this is really an insufficient amount that we should, in fact, be funding our universities retirement system at a much better level than this, so that we can provide a viable system. But because we are still uncertain about the amount of revenue that will be available, I would ask for your support in passing this Bill at this time."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves... The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 264. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On this I would just like to point out that unlike the other Bills that we've been voting on which have all been at the '83 expenditure level, here when we consider retirement, you may recall that the retirement funding level is 51% for the current year. So, while this is below the Governor's budget, it is, nonetheless, above the current pay out level. I think we're making progress in difficult times, and I urge support for the Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the guestion is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 278. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 278, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 278 includes all of the Commissions plus the Amendments that we adopted. Amendment #1 includes the laundry list that went through the subcommittee of the Commissions. Amendment 3, 6 and 7 was adopted also. The total appropriation in the Eill, currently, 15 million, 027.4 (sic - 15,027,400) as compared to FY'83 appropriation of 14 million, 869 (sic - 14,869,000), an increase of 158,400 dollars or 1.07%. I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 278."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 278. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman
from Peoria, Br. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will yield for questions."

Tuerk: "I noticed that the appropriation for the Labor Laws

Commission was 178,000 in fiscal *83, and it's changed

upward about 46%. Could you enlighten me on why that is

happening?"

Leverenz: "There was a 52% increase in workload and, therefore, we increase the amount of dollars.

Tuerk: "What kind of workload?"

Leverenz: "Labor laws that have to be considered."

Tuerk: "Who's considering these?"

Leverenz: "Pardon me? Restate your question."

Tuerk: "Who's considering all the big workload, you know, that you refer to?"

Leverenz: "No, my question was, would you restate your original

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- question also?"
- Tuerk: "Well, I said I noticed that the increase is about 46% over FY'83, and I wondered why?"
- Leverenz: "Could you state the numbers that you're working from?"

 Tuerk: "178 (sic 178,000) to 260 (sic 260,000)."
- Leverenz: "Well, let me point out to you that the 260 (sic 260,000) was the FY'84 request. The 178 (sic 178,000) is the FY'83 estimated expenditures. They are in this Amendment for 225 (sic 225,000), so your 48%, Sir, you're off the mark."
- fuerk: "Well, apparently my information in the book here is outdated. Oh, I see."
- .everenz: "That's correct. They are at the same level as the previous year."
- expending 178 (sic 178,000) out of 225 (sic 225,000) from this current year. They are in for the next year for 225 (sic 225,000). A zero percent increase rather than the 48 that you did point out."
- "Well, okay, so you say they're expending 178 (sic 178,000) out of 225 (sic 225,000), and yet, they're asking
 for 225 (sic 225,000). Now, my guestion is, why the
 increase?"
- .everenz: "First, there was a late start, as you probably know.

 They are not expending everything we appropriated. A very frugal Commission, and we are simply at the same level for the workload that is at a 225 (sic 225,000) dollar amount. The same amount as their appropriation last year."

!uerk: "Well, to the Bill."

ipeaker Greiman: "Froceed, Sir."

'uerk: "I haven't had an opportunity to examine the whole list of

'1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Commissions here, but let me tell you one thing about the Labor Laws Commission. It's absolutely ludicrous to be spending or even appropriating almost a quarter of a million dollars for this Commission. The Labor Laws Revisory Commission, or whatever term you want to give it, hasn't really performed in the fast nor do I anticipate it's going to perform into the future. As a result, I wouldn't even appropriate half that amount or a third of that amount for this Commission. And I'll reserve my comment or my vote for the other Commissions after I've had a chance to examine."

peaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuFage, Ms. Ccwlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

cowlishaw: "Representative, could you please tell me how many legislative Commissions are covered in this appropriations Eill?"

.everenz: "Fifty-one, Ma'am."

Cowlishau: "Thank you. Could you please tell me also, how many reports from those fifty-one Commissions are scheduled to be completed or in other words are due in fiscal year 1984?"

everenz: "As many as statute requires them."

:owlishaw: "You... But you do not know the exact number. Is that correct?"

.everenz: "No, and apparently your analysis does not show that information either. Is that correct?"

lowlishaw: "That is correct. That's why I asked."

.everenz: "May I ask the purpose of your guestion? And we would be very happy to respond."

cowlishaw: "All right. It appears to me that if we knew how many reports are due during fiscal year *84, we would be able to figure out how much each of them is costing the taxpayers

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

of the State of Illinois."

- Leverenz: "We know that. It's 15,000,000 dollars. 158,000 more than the previous year for all fifty-one Commissions.

 1.07% increase over '83 fiscal spending level. Any other particular questions, I'd be most happy to provide you with great detail. Some Commissions are responsible for reporting annually. Some are... are semi-annual. Some don't have to report."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker...
 Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Ms. Cowlishaw. Proceed, Ma'am."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Bouse, we have just passed some appropriations measures for higher education at levels reduced. Here we have an appropriation for Commissions which, in my opinion, cover topics to be studied that if they need to be studied the Members of the Legislature should do that studying. I am opposed to Commissions to begin with, but in particular when we have reduced levels of funding for higher education, it is unconscionable that we would increase the funding for Commissions. Thank you very much."
- speaker Greiman: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman
 from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question he put?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it in the orinion of the Chair, and the previous question will be put. Mr. Leverenz to close."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As it has been pointed out, we are funding fifty-one Commissions, a total of 15,027,000 dollars. It is an increase of 1.07%. I telieve that these are

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

necessary Commissions. I believe that the funding levels that they are receiving are the amounts of money correct for the workloads that they have. I find personal to support all of the Commissions that are here and the amounts of money that are here. There are a number of things that Commissions do for us. Generally. criticism comes from those that do not serve the Commissions and don*t fully understand, but т can understand that. Some criticism comes from those that do not even read the analysis that might be laying on their desk, and I can understand that. I would move for passage of Senate Bill 278."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote 'nay". Voting is now open. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe, to explain his vote. One minute, Sir."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I heard some of the previous speakers say that these Commissions don't do anything. I'm on a number of these Commissions, and I can tell you that they do do some The Motor Vehicle Laws Study Commission was the things. ones that were directly responsible for the improvement drunk driving laws in Illinois. And countless lives have been saved through that. So, people that get up and about the Commissions don't do anything, they don't talk know what they re talking about. They're not... And they're not on any of the Commissions, and that's why they don't know what's going on. If they want to find cut, they ought to try to get on some of them and see what's going on. They do a lot of good work and a lot of good deeds for citizens of Illinois. We're more than getting our monies worth cut of them."

speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

his vote."

lowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of just like to point out that under the general rubric of Commissions is included the Legislative Reference Bureau, the Legislative Information System and other legislative agencies that we depend upon very dearly. Also, I would like to correct one thing that one of the other Representatives said. We are not cutting education this year. We have passed Bills at *63 expenditure levels. This particular piece of legislation is very, very close to •83 expenditure levels. Overall, I think Appropriations I Committee did a find job to... to try and keep the lid on in a difficult time."

ipeaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to
 explain his vote."

"Thank you. I am certain that those folks that everenz: be voting red simply want to get a press release out so that they can say this is what I did to save money or I am You, in fact, are voting against against Commissions. yourselves. These are things that are support operations to the General Assembly. You're talking about JCAR. You're talking about the things that Representative discussed, the Legislative Council, Legislative Information System for a number of dollars, 2.6 (sic - 2,627,050), Reference Bureau. If they didn't work their fannies off you nobody did in this place. Data Information, Economic and Fiscal, I mean if you don't want to fund them, draft an Amendment to remove them. Give it your shot. You know the Status of Women is in here for a nice substantial increase, so ... Gonna kill it? I doubt that."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 66 voting *aye*, 49 voting *nc*, none voting *gresent*.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now, on the Order of ... Now on ... Motion, the Chair recognizes Represent... Representative Rice with respect to Senate Bill 1024. Representative Rice moves to reconsider the vote by which the House nonconcurred... No, I'm sorry. This is House Bill 1024, House Bill 1024. Mr. Bice moves that, having voted on the 'prevailing' side, moves that the House reconsider the vote by which we nonconcurred in Senate Amendments to House Bill Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is hereby granted, and the Motion to nonconcur is withdrawn. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 280. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 280, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and the Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cock, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, the title is a little misleading because the first Amendment gutted the Bill and started all over again. Ιn its current form, House... Senate Fill 280 is a 1983 supplemental appropriation. It effects the current budget year not the prospective one. It does two things. makes some transfers out of the awards and grants line into personal services lines at the Community College of St. Louis, and it also makes the reverse transfer from personal services lines into contractual services and travel for the Pension Laws Study Commission. In both cases, the Amendments do not change the appropriation levels. It is no net change. It is a wash for the current year, and I move for passage of 280."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 280. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Bowman is correct. The Bill now has nothing to do with Mental Health. It is simply two transfers, makes no additions and should be passed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Mulcahey 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriation only appears Senate Bill 300. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 300, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Arts Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."

- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, this ... Senate Bill 300 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Arts Council. The 684,600 (sic - 3,684,600) 3,684,000 dollars... is dollars of which 800,000 dollars is federal money. This level of appropriations again is largely dependent what happens with the tax package and the like. I would just say to everyone here that there's an important economic function performed by the Arts Council in that generating dollars that come into Illincis, and I would encourage your support for Senate Eill 300."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 300.

 On that, is there any debate... discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Beilly."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We are at a position which... in don't know what's going to happen on the tax question and which we still may have to face reluctantly or enthusiastically, as the case may be, the docmsday budget. basis, I am personally recommending to those On that Members on our side of the aisle a 'present' vote on this Bill. I assume it will pass anyway because of the majority on the other side. I, personally, happen to be a supporter of the Arts Council and hope that it's in the final budget. On the other hand, there are many Members who oppose it, but my feeling is that at this time a "present" vote is the appropriate vote, because we still don't know what's going to happen with taxes. If we have to live with dcomsday, we're going to have to take a great close look at any then kind of agency like this that's not just absolutely essential. So, I would ask for a *present* vote."

ipeaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, $\text{Mr. Eowman.}^{\mathfrak{q}}$

. owman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I detect in the voice of Representative from Morgan I'm sure he would love to vote for a note of remorse. this, and I hope that he does reconsider his position. fact is, the Governor did not see fit to fund Council in his budget, and I think that is something that all of us should regret. The further fact is that the Governor's Minority Leader in the Senate introduced a Bill to abolish the Arts Council, to change the substantive law, the statute which establishes the Arts Council, and that Bill didn't even get out of Senate Committee. It is clear that the Legislature wishes to retain the Arts Council. being the case, the law is on the books. That Arts Council remains and will remain a viable entity until tbe

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

law is changed to abolish it. That being the case, we should fund it. We have an obligation to fund it. This particular Bill does so in a responsible way keeping the appropriation at last year's expenditure level just like we did with higher education and everything else, and I urge its passage."

- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
 Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I'm sorry. I was distracted. The Lady was asking for some additional Commission money, and I'm trying to I rise in support of Senate Bill 300. It is at the FY'83 spending level. I would like to point out that I would certainly solicit one Gentleman's wote from the other since his Little Theatre Group did get money this year, and I'm sure if they put in a good application with a good purpose, they would have an opportunity to get some money for this year. We should really in this area be spending about fifty cents for every person in the State of Illinois which is the national average, and I'll raise that point every time this Bill comes up. I think if look back during World War II or during the Degression that it was the arts that held this country together, and I ask for your green vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean,
 Mr. Ropp."
- opp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Bouse. It's true that if we don't have new revenues most of these appropriations that we have voted for aren't going to pass in its current form anyway. Art is important to the state. It's important in our area, at least in mine as well as in yours, and I think that we ought to at least support it and move this process along."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

datijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Patijevich: "Representative Beilly, you said that in these times of economic distress, and I know I don't have your exact words..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Matijevich, Ms. Braun is the Sponsor."

Antijevich: "Oh, nc, well, I... I... Well, let me pose a rhetorical question then to Representative Reilly."

Speaker Greiman: "That's kind. Go ahead."

latijevich: "All right. What I heard him say was that, in these economic times that these nonessential services, like the Arts Council, should not be funded, or there is a question whether they should be funded. And I was going to pose the question to him, let's say that we did not have a tax increase. Is he then saying to me, and to all of us in the General Assembly and to all of the people of Illinois that we should give zero dollars to the improvement, and to our culture and to the arts, because that's the way bе posed And I don't think even if there were no tax increase it. that we ought to stand for that. Now all of us know of the logic in the Governor's doomsday budget. know that the Governor knew that he was not quinq to get away, for example, with the one ... cutting out the cities of one twelfth of the revenues of the income tax. And T don't think anybody on this floor knows who the Governor was trying to tweak when he didn*t fund the Arts Council. We all know whose attention he was trying to get. It was. you know, just about as phoney as you can get. You and I know that the Governor and the guy that he was ... attention he was trying to seek are going to be working close on whatever revenues have to be worked out. He didnot have to resort to that, and everybody knows that. And I don't

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

think anybody does justice to the appropriations process if you join the Governor in such a low trick. You know that the Arts Council ought to be budgeted. You know whether there's a tax increase or not that it should be funded, so do the only thing that should be done and wote for this appropriation."

speaker Greiman: "Mr. Reilly, did you want to respond to his...No. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would urge all of you to join in voting for this House-Bill to join with Representative Ropp. This Bill has great economic implications for the State of Illinois. been said about the cultural aspects of the Bill. Illinois is one of the top art producing states in the country. Ιt brings dollars to Illinois. It is something that encourages the development of the arts and is of economic importance. I don't think that can be emphasized enough. Since this is going to go into a Committee, I think we should treat it in the same way that we've treated all of the other appropriation Bills. I urge your vote on this. I don't think we need to play games at this time. Thank you."

ipeaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Lady
 from Cook to close."

Fraun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Marzuki said it very well. This Bill has important economic... positive economic impact on our state. For every dollar we put into the arts, at least 36 are returned via other commercial activity. In addition to the economic interest, there is also the interest in culture and in providing our young people with educational opportunities that might not otherwise exist. I encourage your support for Senate Bill 300."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "nay". The voting is now open. The Gentleman from Kendall to explain his vote."
- want to make a comment in debate, but I was too late, I guess. You know, one of the points I think we should make, that the Arts Council certainly does do a service for the urban areas, especially the large urban area in the northeast part of our state. But I've found them to be very insensitive to the smalller communities and people around this state, all the people around this state, that want to be involved in the arts. And I think maybe a 'present' vote is a good message on this."
- speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 75 voting "aye", 7 voting "no", 31 voting "present", and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 301. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Slerk Leone: "Senate Bill 301, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Eill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Senate Bill 301 is an Act making an appropriations to the

 State Treasurer. It's the State Treasurer's appropriations

 Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 301. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'.

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received... Yes, Mr. Piel." Fiel: "My... My console is not working, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be voted 'yes'."

Speaker Greiman: "Your counsel, you mean Mr. Webb or...?"

'iel: "No, my voting console, Sir."

Record Mr. Piel 'aye', so that on this Fill, there are 108 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Piel, I will take care the next time. Make sure that you ask for recognition, so that we're sure your switch is working. Okay? On the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 373. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

:lerk Leone: "Senate Bill 373, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary, contingent and distributive expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

:peaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

House, Senate Bill 373 is the budget for the Department of Agriculture. And the original request had been 39,327,200 dollars, and the Bill as amended now is 39,577,200 dollars. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

ipeaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 373.

On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Mr. Piel, are you working? Is your... Mr. Piel? All right. Mr. Piel is on. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 105... Who seeks

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

recognition? Mr. Rhem 'aye'. On this Eill, there are 106 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 374. Mr. Clerk, read the Fill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the annual appropriation for the Commissioner of Banks. The appropriation for this... these funds comes out of the Bank and Trust Company Fund which is a separate fund, revolving fund, and is approved by the banking organizations themselves. This level of funding will allow for all banks to be examined annually in FY 085... 084."

374. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Eill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Appropriations only appears

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 375, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Central Management Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the budget for the Central Management Services request had been 304 million... 416 million... 500 (sic - 304,416,500) and their actual budget was far less. It's 300,452,900 dollars. I would ask for an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 375.

On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "nay". Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting "aye", 1 voting "no", none voting "present". This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading Appropriations only appears Senate Bill 376. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 376, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Civil Service Commission. Third Beading of the Eill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, their request for the Civil Service Commission had been 302,100 dollars, and that is exactly the money that they are receiving. There are no increases. Excuse me. I'm looking down at the new Bill total. As amended, it is less. It is 289,828, and I would recommend a do pass vote, please."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 376. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Representative yields..."

Speaker Greiman: "She indicates that she will."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Leverenz: "... for... for a guestion. Could you explain the
 House Amendment again that was attached to this Bill.
 Normally, it was the Policy Committee that cut but this one
 was an increase over what we cut."
- Barnes: "There were three Amendments, Bepresentative Leverenz.

 They were Senate Amendment... Amendment #1, which was introduced by yourself, reduced funding by 18,895 dollars to the fiscal year '83 estimated expenditure level. #2 was withdrawn. #3 was adopted. It was introduced by myself, and that reduced the operation lines by 2,877 dollars which gave us a new Bill total of 289,828 dollars."
- Leverenz: "If I'm reading correctly, you... or listening correctly, you just said it decreased it by 2,000 dollars.

 And my original question was, why was the reason that you increased above our cuts?"
- Barnes: "Amendment #3 was what decreased it by 2,877 dollars.

 Your Amendment also reduced spending, so there isn't any increase."
- Leverenz: "Amendment #3, that I question, as far as I read the
 Amendment adds back 1,623 dcllars to General Revenue which
 were reduced by Amendment 1. Am I incorrect?"
- Barnes: "Staff points out to me that there has been a typographical error here, and instead of 18,895, it should be 13,895."
- Leverenz: "Yes, that was the reduction we made in Amendment #1.

 But again, my original question was, your Amendment #3 was not a decrease but an increase in spending of General Revenue Funds, and I just wondered if you'd explain what the increases were for."
- Barnes: "Your Amendment brought it down, then our Amendment brought it up just slightly, but the budget in total is still lower."
- Leverenz: "And for what line items did you increase?"

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair."

Leverenz: "Thank God."

Barnes: "Contractual Services, Travel, Commodities and Printing."

Leverenz: "It did... It did increase subscriptions also. Is that

correct, by 400?"

Barnes: "That's under contractual, Representative, and it decreased."

Leverenz: "And you increased instate travel by 1,000 dollars?"

Barnes: "... it was a decrease over your request."

Leverenz: "Oh, okay."

Barnes: "What happened, Bepresentative, was you had your Amendments and we had our Amendments and sometimes, you know, we didn't know what your Amendments were going to be and that's where the differences came in."

Leverenz: "Sounds okay now to me."

Barnes: "Thank you. I would ... "

Speaker McPike: "Is there any further discussion?"

Barnes: "I would recommend an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved to... for the passage of Senate Bill 376. The question is, "Shall Senate Bill 376 pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", opposed vote 'no'. Bepresentative Barnes to explain her vote. Have all voted who wish? Representative Barnes, do you want to vote? Okay. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 "ayes", 1 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 376, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Fill 377, Bepresentative Barnes. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 377, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Third Reading of the Eill."

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

Speaker McPike: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Illinois Commerce Commission request had been 11,651,300 dollars. As amended, the new Bill total is 12,880,200 dollars. If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 377. On that, the Gentleman from Ccck, Representative
Levin."

Levin: "Would the Lady yield for a guestion?"

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will."

Levin: "Representative Farnes, this money contains... this Bill contains money which could be spent by the Commerce Commission at its various offices in both Chicago and Springfield and for their operations around the state. Is that's correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Levin: "It's my understanding that the Commission is planning on either closing the Chicago office or eliminating most if not all of the Chicago hearing officers and staff.

Wondering if you can edify us on whether or not there is a specific plan to do that at this point?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative, you must have some new information that I am unaware of. If you had mentioned this to me before I called the Bill today, I would have been very happy to get those answers for you. To my knowledge, I am totally unaware that they are making any plans of that type."

Levin: "Okay. Is there anything that is in the Eill now that would preclude them from closing the Chicago office and moving all the hearing officers that may be in Chicago either firing them or moving them to Springfield?"

Barnes: "No, there's sufficient monies in there to maintain the

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

office downtown in Chicago."

Levin: "Eut there's nothing that requires that the money be spent for hearing offices in Chicago or staff in Chicago?"

Barnes: "Representative, what you're saying, I think, is just kind of a rumor or hypothetical guestion that I can hardly deal with since I don't know all the facts. The budget, as it stands, is for an office in Chicago, maintaining the hearing officers as they are today and, I think, will continue to be. But I would be very happy after we pass this budget to find out the answers to your guestions."

Levin: "Okay. To the Eill."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Levin: "I have some concerns about this issue. You know, I think my views of the Commerce Commission are well known. know, I do not hold them in tremendous respect, yet, even within a context there are, you know, some staff and there's some hearing officers that when they see something that's going on that they consider inappropriate have have not been afraid to stand up and make their views known. And it's my understanding that there's a desire to squelch that independence among some of the hearing officers and staff. And there have been threats, substantial threats, to either close the office completely or to transfer all their major cases to Springfield. would hope we can... can ferret that out and we can lay that to rest before June 30th. I assume this is going to go to Conference Committee, and if there is a need to put some language in guaranteeing that this kind of will not occur, I would hope that we can do that. But I... I do urge at this point an 'aye' vote. I would like before, you know ... the Bill runs the rest of its course if we can examine a little bit more into that issue. I'm not the only one that is been apprised of this problem, and

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

certainly, we have passed a lot of important public utility legislation making substantive reforms. And we cannot forget about the Commission, and its operations and the good people that are there and that need to be protected and should not be threatened and intimidated because when they see something wrong they want to stand up and do something about it."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "She indicates she will."

"Representative Barnes, I'd like to follow up on what Representative Levin has just raised, because I come the Chicago area as you do, and I'm concerned that the Chicago office of the Commerce Commission might be closed. And I would like to ask if you could give... give us some assurance that... that you would help us to make sure that that office stays open. It's good for our constituents. And I'm sure that the representatives of the various utilities that are headquartered in Chicago do not want to continue to...do not want to troop down to Springfield every time they have to file a Motion or something. So I think that, you know, we really ought to keep that office like to ask your opinion, if you would be willing to support our efforts to do sc. "

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Representative Bowman, these are questions really that I wish that you had addressed in the amendatory stages of this Bill. The Director of the Commerce Commission resides in Chicago. The only time I ve ever heard this mentioned is today on this House floor by you and your seatmate. All I can say is, I would be very happy to address the situation. When we get to the Conference Committee, I would be very happy to have the answers even before that

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

time for you, but I can hardly stand here and say, yes, I promise you this and I promise you that. I don't even know if what you two are saying are fact."

Bowman: "Well, okay, Representative Barnes, I'm sorry I thought this information was common knowledge. And because I had been hearing rumors of this sort for several days, probably a week at least, so I just assumed that it was common knowledge, and I apologize for not tringing it to your attention. However, it is now in the public domain as it were. And I just was looking for a little reassurance from you that...that you would use your good offices to try and avoid this prospect."

Barnes: "Representative, the reason that I'm usually smiling, is

I don't worry about a problem until it is a fact."

Bowman: "Well, Representative Earnes, I think the Commerce Commission is a problem generally, and that's why I'm smiling. The ... What I'd like to ... Let me just ... I hope we will be able to address this in Conference Just a couple of more points, we did pass several pieces of legislation here. One. I believe, required the various members of the Commission, at least one member of the Commission, to attend every hearing, that will probably require additional travel. We...I believe Representative Preston passed the legislation that would...it changed the Hearing Officer System into Administrative Law Judge System and so forth. I just wondered to what extent the Bill addresses the legislation that is now moving through the chamber?"

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me. Representative Birkinbine, for what reason do you rise?"

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We seen to have diverged from the subject of appropriations Eill, and I think we should stick to the Bill that's on the board, number 377."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker McPike: "I think your point is well taken.

Representative Bowman, would you address yourself to the
Bill."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker. I wanted...you know, it is customary, and I'm sure that the Representative, who raised this point, realizes that substantive legislation and ٧e have appropriation legislation that are companions. And I wanted to know from the Sponsor whether this appropriation Bill includes any monies for these particular items which I mentioned. I notice that Amendment #2 does include money for Citizens Utility Board, which is legislation that is under consideration, but there is other legislation consideration. and I wanted to know whether the other legislation was in the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "I see."

Bowman: "Will she please answer the question?"

Barnes: "Mr. Chairman, we have addressed this budget at what we felt was needed. You can hardly address a budget by pieces of legislation that are being introduced in the House and in the Senate. And as a Chairman of an Appropriation Committee. I am absolutely shocked by Representative Bowman's questions. This is going into Conference Committee. Many issues will be decided there. I will be very happy to answer both of their questions after I find out if they re rumors or fact. I think that this House should move along, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on this Eill."

Speaker McPike: "Bepresentative Shaw on the Bill."

Shaw: "Did I...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Iid...a question for the Sponsor. Did I understand you to say that, Representative, one of the Gentlemen before me, that there was a chance of Chicago office closing up?"

Barnes: "Representative Shaw, I would recommend that you address

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

that question to the two Gentlemen who have talked about the rumor that I am not aware of."

Shaw: "Well, what...To the...to the Bill. The only question that I had about that, it seems as though to me, that if there's a chance of not only the office in Chicago closing, but to abolish the entire Commission. It seems as though to me, that that would be the appropriate thing to do in light of the rate increases that they have been giving the utility companies and robbing the people of this state in the last few years. Bight now around Illinois, people cannot afford to pay their gas and light bills, because of the fact that this Commission has given the utility companies everything they want. And the poor citizen that goes down there and protests don't have any voice at that Commission. And I would...I'm going to vote against this appropriation, because I'd like to see the whole Commission close."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Barnes: "Yes."

Leverenz: "Isn*t it true that the questions on the Chicago office closing are simply rumor?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Leverenz: "Isn't it true that in the State Illinois Center at
Chicago with the plans I have in my hand, that they are
indeed going to be located on the ninth floor?"

Barnes: "Yes, Bepresentative."

Leverenz: "Isn't it true in space allocation they are in for 15,000 square feet.?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Leverenz: "That should take care of that problem."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Leverenz: "On the appropriation also, during Committee I would

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

just want the fine Representative to agree on the floor, that we questioned the Director at length relative to the funding of a \$100,000 to CUB and that it would be a loan. We did discuss at length, that they would make sure that in the loan agreement there would be every protection to the state."

Barnes: "That is correct."

- Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Despite our feelings about the agency in the main, it has an important function. I feel that we will have the ability to straighten out some of the problems that we find with the agency. I'd ask for your green vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If necessary, I move the previous question."
- Speaker McPike: "That won't be necessary. Begresentative Barnes to close."
- Barnes: "Well, Br. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this Bill had been discussed at great length in Committee. The questions have been addressed on the House floor, and I would recommend an "aye" vote."
- Speaker McFike: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 377.

 The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 377 pass'? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

 Representative Cullerton, do you want to vote? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 94 'ayes', 15 'nos', four voting 'present', and Senate Bill 377, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

 Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 378, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Fill."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 378, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Freslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Court of Claims's budget, and they had requested \$4,002,500 and we cut the budget to \$3,981,200, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the rassage of Senate
Bill 378. And on that question, is there any discussion?
The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "This would fund how many people in the agency then now?"

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Barnes."

Barnes: "Forty people, Representative."

Leverenz: "It's at the eighty-three level of people and also of total appropriation?"

Barnes: "It...The head count is the same as it was in *83. The budget that I just submitted to you has been decreased."

Leverenz: "So it's, in fact, less?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Leverenz: "I'd recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Bepresentative Erummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor will yield to a question."

Brummer: "Does this include awards...are awards made by the Court of Claims included in this appropriation?"

Barnes: "It includes money for the awards and also for the operations."

Brummer: "Okay, how much of that is awards and how much is operations?"

Barnes: "3,450,000 in awards."

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

Brummer: "And I notice that \$100,000 was from the road fund, was there a specific reason that was from the road fund?"

Barnes: "That's to make awards for highway accidents."

Brummer: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion. The Lady from Cook, Representative Earnes, to close."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, I would recommend an 'aye' vote for this kudget."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 378 pass?'.

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote
 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
 record. On this Bill, there are 105 voting 'aye', and
 three voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is herety declared passed. The
 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, for what reason
 do you rise?"
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd ask the House waive Rule 65(h) while the present Speaker's in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the House to waive Rule 65(b). Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman has leave, and the Rule is waived. Senate Bill 378 (sic 379), Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 379, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Third Reading of the Eill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes on 379."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
 Bill 379 is the funding for the Criminal Justice
 Information Authority. Last year's budget had been
 \$866,900, and this year's is \$2,697,900. And I believe
 the reason that Representative Leverenz increased the

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

budget was he felt that the level wasn't proper for the functioning of the Criminal Justice Information Authority.

If there aren't any questions, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the rassage of Senate
 Bill 379. And on that question, is there any discussion?
 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "The increase, yes, mainly that we did put in. Isn't

 it true, Bepresentative, that it would take care of the

 Correctional Institutional... Institution Management

 Information System on the movement of the prisoners, where

 exactly they are at any given point in time would be fully

 funded? Is that correct?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

- Leverenz: "And we have concerns and problems with that operation.

 It does... take the money for the development, the operation improvement of the Folice Training Board System that's now going to be funded at its proper level."
- Barnes: "Yes, Bepresentative, I think when you and I met with
 that Authority downtown, they had pointed out some of the
 inequities of their budget and how they just weren't able
 to function properly. And I think when you and I walked
 out of that meeting, we felt that the level should be
 changed."
- Leverenz: "It also includes the proper level of funding to maintain the Juvenile Monitoring Information System, which is up and operating for the Department of Children and Family Services now?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Leverenz: "Status offenders, and also for the Barid Automated Prosecution System to improve the management of criminal prosecutions in the court systems. That correct, that's now going to be fully funded?"

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Leverenz: "And for the communities operating off of the FIM

System, which is the Folice Information Management System,

used by the local police departments for which they provide

a participatory amount of money that will be fully

operational, correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "Eut it would not start any new programs?"

Barnes: "No, it would not. And that program, also, is funded by users fees."

Leverenz: "That's what I meant by a local police organization participating with their financial share. I rise in support of the funding level in this, clearly the... making of the Governor's budget by the Bureau of the Eudget which spends 2.7 million dollars, fully doesn't understand how this Authority was reconstructed from the legislative... or the Law Enforcement Commission rather, this is what is leftover that he wanted, but the Governor would not fund at the proper level. I ask for your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

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

Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Senate Bill 379 pass?".

All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no".

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Eill, there are 109 voting "aye", none voting "no", and none voting "present".

This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading appears Senate Bill 380, Representative Reilly.

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 380, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Environmental Facilities Financing Authority.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 380 appropriates a \$128,800 to the Illinois Environmental Facilities Financing Authority. This is at the doomsday level and, anyway, anytime you get to vote for a Fill that only appropriates \$128,000, you ought to grab at the chance. So I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 380. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Bowman."

Bowman: "Will the Gentleman yield to a guestion?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Bowman: "How on earth did we manage to avoid amending this one in Committee?"

Reilly: "I don't know. Nobody was looking."

Bowman: "Well, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in case people missed the...what Bepresentative Reilly said, I'd just like to point out that this particular Bill was introduced at \$128,000. It passed the Senate at \$128,000. It passed the Connittee at \$128,000, and God willing, it'll pass the House at \$128,000. This is one that even Representative Pullen can vote for. I am sure that Members of this side of the aisle will be pleased to know that the Chairman of this Commission or Authority is Representative Marzuki's constituent. And...so I think it's something we can all support."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Eureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Mautino: "How many employees are in this finance authority, Jim?"

Reilly: "Two."

Mautino: "Two?"

Reilly: "It's a nice little authority."

Mautino: "Yeah, it's...it's a very interesting authority. Is this the authority that two individuals for a \$125,000 make the determination on the bond issues, or the...the bonding provisions that are allowed by our statute for financing EPA structures, and proposals and clean ups? Are these the two individuals?"

- Reilly: "No. These...All these people do...We allow private companies to take advantage of the state's tax exempt status by issuing bonds in the...technically in the name of the state, although, there is no...no credit of the state pledged to build private pollution control facilities. And all these people do is just process the paperwork of approving those bond issues. All the work of issuing the bonds is actually done by the private companies. They do not issue any bonds that are spent by state agencies at all."
- Mautino: "Yeah, well, we do have this...this... this authority is the one that advertises the bonding programs, like in the <u>Wall Street Journal</u>, et cetera, for funding programs, experimental projects, et cetera. Is it not?"
- Reilly: "I...I don't know if they fund experimental projects or not, but whatever they fund, our really private projects that we simply, as a lot of cities do, we simply give the private companies the benefit of the state's tax exempt status."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Mautino: "Yeah, I understand that. I understand that as well.

Like in most cases when we have those pollution control authority, I can't with the exact...the Environmental Facilities Financing Authority are the ones that put out the...the authority authorizes the...so that firms like waste management, et cetera, can get additional funding for programs through the bonding, is that not true?"

Reilly: "I...I honestly don't no whether they've ever done anything for waste management or not, they may have.

But... We authorize the...you know, if you think we ought not be in the business we ought to regeal the statute, but yeah, at least that would be an example. If a private company of whatever kind needed some kind of pollution control device, the private company would put the financing together. This agency puts a seal of approval on it, and then the bonds are tax exempt."

Mautino: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Committee we discussed the affirmative action plan of the Environmental Facilities Authority. Could you describe to me their affirmative action plan?"

Reilly: "Yes, they •ve done wonderfully well on that. They have 100% minorities. They have one racial minority and one sex minority."

Currie: "When you say sex minority, do you mean...?"

Reilly: "Have one woman and one black."

Currie: "Bell, that's excellent. And I'm delighted to hear it, and I think Senate Bill 380 sounds like a Bill we should all be supporting."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative
 DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Representative Reilly, I see in Amendment #5 that you're adding four million dollars for sewage treatment works to certain eligible facilities. Could you give me an explanation of that?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Wrong Bill. That's the next Bill. This Eill has no Amendments."
- DeJaegher: "I'm sorry."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Beilly, to close."
- Reilly: "I ve earned a \$120,000 just in the time this took.

 Please vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 380. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cock, Representative Topinka, to explain her vote. No? Excuse me. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Eill, there are 107 voting 'aye', four voting 'no', and one voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Fill 381, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 381, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary contingent expense of the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency budget arrived from the Senate at \$177,670,700. The new Bill total is a

71st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

\$183,349,409. If there are no guestions, I would recommend an "aye" vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the rassage of Senate
 Bill 381. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Could you explain to us, now, how many individuals will be employed? Is this the same as last year?"

Barnes: "The head count last year was 689, and it will be 685."

Leverenz: "Ckay, I thought the Senate..."

Barnes: "686."

Leverenz: "...The Senate restored a couple of positions or six?

Restored two of the requested six. Would that then not put
them higher than the previous year, or they going to lay
people off?"

Barnes: "No, Representative. I think there are seven less."

Leverenz: "How many vacancies, then, do they have currently?"

Barnes: "Approximately twelve vacancies."

Leverenz: "And are they spread throughout the different divisions, or are they all in one?"

- Barnes: "I think...they are mostly in the water and land division."
- Leverenz: "Why would...What was the rationale that all the vacancies would be in the water and land division, which has the most problems in terms of pollution, toxic and the like? I don't remember their rationale for that."
- Barnes: "I am looking at another sheet of information, and there are eight positions in the public water supply and two in EFF."
- Leverenz: "I see. Did they resolve the guestion of the charging companies and injecting pollutants into the ground?"

Barnes: "No, Representative."

Leverenz: "When will they? Is there a guess?"

Barnes: "It has...That job has been turned over to the Attorney

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- General."
- Leverenz: "Oh, I'm sure they'll be a fast resolution of that then. I would stand in favor of the Ludgeted amount in Senate Bill 361 and ask that you vote green."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Representative Barnes, I see in House Amendment #5
 you're adding four million dellars. Could you tell me, has
 all of this money already been apprecriated, is there a
 specific request for that total amount of money?"
- Barnes: "Representative DeJaegher, I would defer to Leverenz and Mautino since it is their Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz to answer Representative DeJaegher's question."
- Leverenz: "The Senator Luft put a four million dollar amount of money here for a project, and I'm sure because of your fondness for Senate Luft, you would stand in support of the Amendment, which restored his project to the EFA Bill."
- DeJaegher: "I have no problems with Senator Luft, Ted, but my concern is, in my locale, we're doing...we are having problems pertaining to sewage. And there is a certain subdivision up there that needs additional funding tremendously, and I'd sure like to have consideration for that particular project, if there can be something worked out on this particular budget."
- Leverenz: "Well, with your green vote, we will be most happy to entertain the project you have in mind. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May I...Would the Spensor please yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady indicates she will yield for a

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Koehler: "Thank you. Bepresentative Earnes, in Committee, I believe there was an Amendment and, please, correct me if I am incorrect, that would have eliminated or reduced the appropriation to around one dollar for equipment for the Illinois Environmental Frotect Agency. Is that a part of this legislation yet?"
- Barnes: "Yes, it is, and I would defer any more of your questions to Representative Leverenz, since that was his adopt."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Representative Farnes. May I ask Representative Leverenz his intention with this? Do you intend to correct this situation? As I mentioned to you in Committee, we are giving the Environmental Protection Agency more and more responsibility all the time. I think that it is important that we restore their ability to do the things that we are mandating that they do. Would you tell me your intention?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz to answer Representative Koehler's question."
- Leverenz: "Well, let me...Yes, I would be most happy to respond to the Lady's question. Your original question was, in Committee, an Amendment was offered to reduce all the equipment line items to a dollar. You are incorrect on that. It was done, I believe, on the House floor. And certainly, we are going to review the equipment lists and make sure that an adequate amount of equipment is in the budget. I have spoken to the director, and we are working very closely with him. And I'm sure he will relate to you that he is satisfied that the proper thing will be done at the proper time."
- Koehler: "Well, thank you, Mr. Leverenz. I am...Even though the exact place, whether it was the floor or the Committee room, where this Amendment was placed on, the fact still

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

remains that there is no money for the equipment for the Environmental Frotection Agency, and I just wanted to make certain that it was your intention to make...be sure that the Environmental Protection Agency did have the necessary equipment to fulfill the responsibilities that we are giving them. Thank you."

Leverenz: "Why, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

Homer: "Representative Barnes, how much is being requested for consultant contracts?"

Barnes: "One point four million."

Homer: "In according to the analysis, that is the approximate amount that was spent in fiscal year 1983. At the same time, the analysis indicates that there are 692 employees in the agency with 207 of those employees earning an access of \$25,000 per year. Have efforts been made to reduce the amount of outside consultant work that is necessary and to develop the expertise within the agency, so as to reduce that added burden of 1.4 million dellars?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative, the reason that they have these outside contracts, is because they have to hire people with a lot of expertise, engineers, and scientists, and they could hardly keep that type of expertise on a payroll all year round."

Homer: "Is it your understanding, Representative Earnes, that efforts are being made continually to reduce the burden of outside consultants and to depend upon in House personnel for these tests?"

Barnes: "They have made efforts in the past."

Homer: "Thank you."

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Lady from Ccck, Representative Barnes, to close."
- Barnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 381 pass?'.

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

 On this Bill, there are 106 voting 'aye', four voting 'no',

 and two voting 'present'. This Eill, having received the

 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

 Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill

 382, Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 382, a Fill for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission. Third Reading of the Fill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an appropriation for the ten percent state matching funds to obtain a 90% funds from the super fund for the clean-up of PCB's in Naukegan Harbor. I would ask for the passage of this Eill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate
 Bill 382. And on that question, is there any discussion?
 There being no dis...Excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hit my light guite right. Could
 the Sponsor indicate the Senate...the rationale for the
 Senate reduction on Senate Amendment #1, it reduces
 \$600,000 to a \$100,000 for a clean-up project in Ottawa.
 And there is a small place in my heart for anything that
 has to do with Cttawa."
- Churchill: "I have no reason to...to tell you why they deleted

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- the \$100,000."
- Leverenz: "Well, did the agency have too much in there for that project?"
- Churchill: "I'm sorry, Representative, I don't know why they reduced the amount."
- Leverenz: "I just wanted to make sure that I understood correctly that the balance of the money was in another Bill so that we did get this \$600,000. Is that correct?"
- Churchill: "Perhaps, Representative, that this additional \$100,000 was included in a Bill that was sponsored by Madam Speaker at this point, in 1251."
- Leverenz: "Yes. That's correct, the Bill didn't go anywhere.

 And I would really hope that the project in Ottawa would be fully taken care of with the appropriate amount of money to do the correct job. So maybe you can relate that information to someone."
- Churchill: "I'll be happy to relate it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."
- Yourell: "Bepresentative Churchill, is this the Bill that provides for matching funds from the federal government for the clean-up of Waukegan Harbor?"
- Churchill: "Yes, it is."
- Yourell: "And the Feds pay 90% and the state pays ten?"
- Churchill: "That's correct."
- Yourell: "How much does OMC pay?"
- Churchill: "It's my understanding, at this point, that there is litigation between the EPA and OMC, and there's been no result of that litigation. The EPA has decided to go ahead with the first phase of the clean-up portion of the

71st Legislative Day

- June 25. 1983
- project. And any funds that will come from OMC after that would go tack into the fund."
- Yourell: "In your judgment, do you believe that the sole responsibility and the sole cause of the pollution of Naukegan Harbor is because of the dumping of the PCB's by OMC? I want to read that into the record."
- Churchill: "I don't know whether that has been established, and I would...I'm not an expert in it. I don't think, at this point, that I could tell you what is on the bottom of the floor of Waukegan Harbor. I know that there are FCB's there."
- Yourell: "Madame Speaker, the Co-chief Sponsor, Representative Matijevich, indicates be'd like to answer that."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, to answer Representative Yourell's question."
- Matijevich: "Put it on the record. I think that CMC and the manu... the manufacture of those PCE's are...they are totally responsible for the PCB contamination of our great Harbor in Waukegan. The problem is that, we want to clean it up as soon as possible, but I think eventually, we had better get at those who ought to be liable for that contamination. And I don't believe that OMC ought to get out of their responsibility."

Yourell: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill, to close."
- Churchill: "Yes, I would just ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 382. And on that guestion, all those in favor vote 'aye', and all those opposed vote 'nc'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', three voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 383, Representative Barnes."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 383, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the State Fire Marshal. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the budget of the State Fire Marshal is four million, five hundred and thirty-seven dollars, six hundred dollars (sic - \$4,537,600) when it arrived from the Senate. The new Bill total is \$4,770,700. The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Safety Division has been restored to the Fire Marshal's Office. If there are no questions, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Right. Representative Barnes, does this Eill contain the appropriation for the Chicago Fire Academy?"

Barnes: "Yes, it does. Representative Mautino had Senate Bill 1156, that has already passed out of this House, and you have Senate Bill 599 which is on Third Reading."

Terzich: "Thank you."

Barnes: "You're welcome."

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

Leverenz: "The funding for this part of state government, can you explain the funds where they come from?"

Barnes: "The surtax on fire insurance premiums."

Leverenz: "Those are the fire insurance companies out of state,

STATE OF ILLINGIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF BEFFESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

called Foreign Fire Insurance Companies. They pay a tax, correct?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Leverenz: "A premium in which brings money into the state from any other areas, do they receive funds?"

Barnes: "Foiler Inspection fees."

Leverenz: "Those are deposited straight through to the General Revenue Fund, are they not?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "Is there any other special funds, like the Fire Prevention Fund?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Leverenz: "And they will spend a little over five million dollars from that fund? I can't locate it here, can you tell me the amount of surplus in the Fire Frevention Fund now?"

Barnes: "No, Mr. Chairman."

Leverenz: "Any idea what it might be? Close?"

Barnes: "Probably a couple of hundred thousand as an estimate."

Leverenz: "And how much did the Governor roll out of the Fire

Prevention Fund into the General Revenue Fund when times

are tough as we have it this year?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative, since you are the Chairman of the Appropriation and I am merely the Minority Spokesman, I would like you to give us the answer."

Leverenz: "The point of the question I asked, I'll explain in this fashion. Speaker...Madame Speaker, to the Bill.

There is much to be said about the State Fire Marshal's Office. Year after year, we complain about the operation of the State Fire Marshal's Office. We find that the State Fire Marshal says on one hand, he needs five or six more arson investigators. He needs more boiler inspectors, because we never inspect all of the boilers or the pressure vessels. We find that he submits to the Eureau of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Budget a budget and asks for a compliment in work force to get the job done that they are designed by statute. Year after year, the Bureau of the Budget makes the appropriate cuts, so that the continual skim of these funds can be drained off to take care of a bit of a short fall in this qeneral fund. And this continual process of skimming money off of this appropriation or source of funds is really a diversion of the foreign fire tax premiums that developed funds. And if the Bureau of the Eudget would only get their act straight, we could eliminate all of the audit exception because this agency of State Government never performs everything set out for it by state That's law. unconscionable. That's cheating somewhere. In this case, however, because of what we must do, I guess it'll have to go on, you may as well vote green."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative
Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Lady yield for a guestion? Thank you.

My analysis here indicates that the department or the office awarded a consultant contract to review guality control programs for the NFIBS System to one, Mr. John Conti of Elmwood Fark. Now, is that John Conti any relation to Mr. Elmer Conti, who use to serve in this Body and Mayor of Elmwood Fark?"

Speaker Ereslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I think everyone that's named Conti in that area is related."

Bowman: "Okay, well, I won't ask if it's cousin, or uncle or whatever. But it seems to be a little troublesome, not only for the possible implications, but it says here that Mr. Conti was surpose to have visited sixty representative fire departments throughout the state and to prepare some

STATE OF ILLINGIS 83RD GENEBAL ASSEMBLY BCUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

reports. He visited only about two-thirds of those. Furthermore, he had no data processing training, but was trained after the contract was awarded. It goes on to say, that in addition to traveling to the departments, Mr. Conti was also paid to make a presentation regarding quality control to NFIES conference held in Feoria, but that the manual that he was presenting was not his own or that he did not prepare it. It was written by an agency employee, who presumably could have gone to the conference a lot cheaper and wouldn't have had to been paid a consulting fee to do so. I wonder if you could...would like to set our minds at ease about that particular contract and its usefulness to the state."

Jarnes: "Yes, Representative, this was discussed in great length, and believe me, great length in Committee. The Fire Marshal went back and checked with the Federal Government, and they felt that the number of visits that Mr. Conti had made were sufficient and met the requirements."

Bowman: "Okay. My understanding, though, is that..."

"He's paid seven dollars an hour for... per performance." Rarnes: Bowman: "Alright, but then my understanding is that...that in such instances it is customary and, in fact, proper amend the contract. If a person or contractors only going to do two-thirds of the work, then you go back and you amend the contract, and both sides agree to it and sign off on it, and then everything is fine, but my understanding is the contract was never amended. So the contract is still on file in the Comptroller's office requires that he visit the remaining one-third of the fire departments. And I wonder if the department has plans to make sure that those

Barnes: "Well, Representative Bowman, we'll keep your suggestion in mind. The way it is right now, Mr. Conti is paid by the

are visited."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF BEPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

hour per performance."

Bowman: "Okay, well, I do hope that someone is checking on the performance, because it does seem to have been lacking, and I trust that this sort of thing will not happen again. Let me ask just one last question regarding boilers. I, for a couple of years here, had made it my personal crusade to make sure the Fire Marshal clean up all of the problems that had been identified by the Auditor General. And I believe he's basically done that, except in the area of boiler inspection. I believe that they're still behind in collecting fines from individuals who operate boilers that do not have a proper license. And I wondered what steps are being taken to correct that situation?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, is that a question?"
Bowman: "Yes."

Barnes: "Yes, it is. It's up to the local State's Attorney to prosecute."

Bowman: "Well, I don't want to put anyone in jail, I just want to make sure we get our money."

Barnes: "Well, to collect the fines."

Bowman: "What are we doing to collect the money?"

Barnes: "It's up to them to collect the fines."

Bowman: "Well are we...The problem was in the past, that they weren't even going to the State's Attorneys. Are they doing that?"

Barnes: "Yes. Since you brought it to their attention,
Representative."

Bowman: "Thank you. Well, I'm glad to know that these appropriation hearings and procedures do have a positive effect on State Government. Thank you very much."

Barnes: "You're welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Badame Speaker, Nembers of the House. Will

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

the Sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

Currie: "Yeah, I'm interested in the affirmative action plan and information of the...of the office. My information suggests that this here is last year the agency did not at the time of the budget process submit its affirmative action information in a timely fashion. Is it your understanding, as it is mine, that that's consistently true for this agency?"

Barnes: "Representative, we also had that problem. They had a turnover in staff and they were very slow responding. But let me tell you, every Eill that was heard in our Committee, Representative Shaw got up and guestioned every director very thoroughly and was responded to."

Currie: "Well, but, I'm merely just making the point that although it has been customary that these forms should be submitted when the budget is submitted, that this agency consistently has to be reminded to subsit an affirmative action plan. I have some questions about the affirmative action plan that was ultimately submitted by this agency, only after large numbers of requests from our staff, and it me as if over the years, there has not been any lcoks to improvement in minority or female hiring by this office. Do you have any explanation as to why, even though they apparently have plans that are submitted late, they don't seem to be doing any better? My figures, for example, show decline in female hiring by this agency between fiscal *82 and fiscal *83. Was that in their plan for last year? Did they intend, in other words, to decrease the percentage of employees that were female?"

Barnes: "I do know that the questions were addressed in Committee
to the satisfaction of the Members. Any inequities were
brought to their attention, and when you say your staff,

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCEIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

what staff are you referring to, Representative?"

Currie: "To the House Democratic Appropriation Staff."

Barnes: "We had...Our staff had the same problem that their...
that your staff had."

Currie: "Well, I would just hope that ... that this House would make it clear to agencies like this one, that when we make a requirement, that they submit an affirmative action plans at the time that they are submitting their budget we mean it. That we don't have to have our staff people continually on the telephone trying to make this... of your staff, our staff, to make sure that this agency does comply. Let me ask specifically about the numbers, Representative. In fiscal *82, the actual count of the agency seems to have been 116. What proportion ... What number of that 116 were minority?"

Barnes: "I don't...I know that the head...authorized head count
was 119 in '83, but I don't know. I didn't take note of
the questions that you're asking about minority."

Currie: "As I understand it, actually our staff had some problems with the actual numbers, that is to say, how many people were there in 1982? How many were there during the course of fiscal *83? But my figures, the figures that we did finally get from this agency, suggests that of 116 actual fiscal '82 head count, only six were minority. None those was in a category earning \$25,000 a year or more. fiscal '83. again, only six out of 112 are minorities. again, none earning \$25,000 per year or more. My guestion really is, was last year's affirmative action plan did that suggest that there would be no improvement in minority hiring? Let me refer you also to the numbers with respect to female employment, in fiscal *82, 36 of a 116 were In fiscal '83, 33 out of a 112 are female. did their affirmative action plan suggest there would be a

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENEBAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF BEPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

decrease in female hiring, in the female segment of the work force, and was there any implication in their last year's affirmative action plan that they might do a better job with respect to minority hiring, or that they might do a better job with respect to the salary schedule for the minority and the female members of their work force?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative, since you have all the information, I would hardly dispute it. It was my understanding that the Fire Marshal said he was going to take note and make some improvements."

Currie: "Well. I hope that when we come to the same discussion next year at this time, we will have access to not only this year's affirmative action plan, but last year's. And let's begin looking at affirmative action plans in terms of what they actually do for future employment and for future salary schedules. I am sometimes fearful, and this agency seems to be a case in point that we ask for affirmative action plans. We ultimately get the plan, but the plans hears no relation to the actual activities of the agency under consideration. This agency, it seems to me, has been particularly unresponsive, both with meeting that requirements that plans be submitted and then with making sure that the plan has anything to do with what the is actually about. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Bepresentative Winchester."

Winchester: "Move the previous question, Madame Speaker."

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

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

Barnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

think this budget has been thoroughly discussed. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

- ipeaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 383 pass?'.
 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine, to
 explain his vote."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the last couple of hours that we have been going through Eills, we seem to be steadily slowing down. And to the best of my memory, not one person who's gotten up to speak on these various Eills has, in the end, voted against these Eills. It can only seems to me, that the reason is that they like to hear themselves talk. Perhaps the Chair, when we adjourn, can set aside a half hour Perfunctory Session so that those people who like to hear themselves talk can stand around and, indeed, talk at each other. Or if this is, indeed, an intentional slow down on the part of the Majority party, why don't we just go through how many...however many Bills they wish to get through and adjourn at an early hour."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative, the Membership would be well advised that we are spending the taxpayers money, and we certainly don't want to cut off free speech on such important issues. The Gentleman from Lake, Bepresentative Matijevich."
- fatijevich: "First of all, Madam Speaker, he well knows that
 there are times when you want to make some comments. You
 know, I wanted to say something, because the State
 Marshal... the State Fire Marshal's Office, when I was
 Appropriations Committee Chairman, always screwed up in
 giving the staff information. You can still wote 'yes'. I
 was going to vote 'yes', but they...I was amazed that they
 screwed up again. They do it every time. You know, I
 would hope the Fire Marshal is a good guy, I like him, but

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

there are many problems with the office. Now, I also was going to add, if that comment came from anybody else, I could believe it, but not after John Eirkinbine presented that Amendment on the Collective Pargaining and then voted against his own Amendment. You know, you got a short memory, John."

- ipeaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."
- 'linn: "Well, Madam Speaker, a lot of us are being bored to death with a lot of the chitter chatter that's went on in Committee. In the first place, this will all turn out to be an exercise in futility if there is a tax increase, and we'll have to do it all over again. And maybe, two, omnibus Bills... I think that those people who loves to hear their own voice should make a recording of it and go off in the hallway and play it to themselves."
- ipeaker Breslin: "It should be noted that this Bill lost seven votes during that explanation of votes. The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 76 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no', and three voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading is Senate Bill 384, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- :lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 384, a Fill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

 ipeaker Ereslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Parnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Department of Insurance's budget arrived from the Senate \$7,644,900. The new total is \$7,613,000. And if there are no questions, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."
- speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83PD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Bill 384. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, *Shall Senate Bill 384 pass? . All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 104 voting *aye*, eight voting *no*, and none voting *present*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading is Senate Bill 385, Representative Earnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 385, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense for the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Expresentative Barnes."

Board's budget is \$3,305,700 as it arrived from the Senate.

The new Bill total as amended is \$3,373,460. And if there are no questions, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 385. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a guestion."

Leverenz: "The *83 estimated expenditures versus the *84 appropriation now that we're talking about, is up or down?"

Barnes: "*83 were higher. It was \$4,169,007."

Leverenz: "And this is in your budget at what level now?"

Barnes: "\$3,373,460."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

ipeaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bardin, Bepresentative Winchester."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REFRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- linchester: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I move the previous
 question."
- ipeaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous guestion. The question is, "Shall the main guestion he put?". All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the previous... the main question is put. Representative Earnes to close."
- Jarnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this budget has been discussed thoroughly in Committee and on the Floor, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."
- All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The

 Clerk will take the record. On this Fill, there are 112

 voting 'aye', and none voting 'no', none voting 'present'.

 This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

 hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Senate

 Bills Third Reading appears Senate Fill 386, Representative

 Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- :lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 386, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ereslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Harnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill addresses the budget for the Department of Nuclear Safety. It arrived from the Senate \$4,202,600, and the Bill as amended now is \$4,523,600. If there are no questions, I would recommend an 'aye' vote."
- ipeaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 386. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lake,

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

/1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Representative Matijevich."

latijevich: "Yes, Representative Earnes, I don't have my staff analysis here...analysis, and I wasn't in the Committee when this was brought up. And I want to know, for example, in...at the 'Zion' Nuclear Plant, we have under the federal laws and regulations that have been passed wherein the local governments now have to go through these emergency evacuation drills. How much do we have in the hudget for the local...local governments to reimburse them for these drills that they have to go through? Eccause I know in my area, the city's had to spend considerable amounts of monies for that purpose."

Barnes: "Representative, the grants are a 120, \$100,000."

Matijevich: "That's state-wide right? That's a 100,000

state-wide that..."

3arnes: "Yes, Representative."

fatijevich: "I don't think that'll cut it, because I know in...I think the City of Waukegan expended 30,000 alone. you consider all...all around the state in those nuclear plants... I'm not sure it's money being well spent first place, but as long as the Federal Government has mandated this, I think ... I think the money ought to come the Federal Government really. But, I guess what I'm getting at, I...I was part of the first one they believe me, if we really had a nuclear catastrophe at any of the nuclear plants, I don't think what happens at those drills will, in any way, resemble what's going to happen if, in fact, a true catastrophe does happen. But I don't like to see these local governments expending monies out of pocket of local taxpayers. I know when we had House Bill 69 years ago and 101 this year, and many said local governments get so much money from these nuclear plants, and telieve me, they have to expend monies too,

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENEBAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

because of those nuclear plants. So I just want to make that comment, even though, I make it. And I hope that John Birkinbine lets me vote 'aye', because I intend to vote 'aye', but I think something has to be said for that, because I think Winchester wants to move the previous question. I think we've got a right to slow things down if we want to."

Breslin: "Thank you for your comments, Representative Matijevich."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative

Bowman."

3owman: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield for a question?"
3peaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."

Bowman: "Thank you. Representative Barnes. Representative from LaSalle is in the Chair and is not able to participate in debate, I wanted to ask some questions about LaSalle Flant, because that has been the source of considerable controversy. The Nuclear Begulatory Commission, has on several occasions, cited the facility for violations that are potentially danger to the safety of public. Now, I'd like to know what our own Department of Nuclear Safety has been doing. I have not heard one from the Department regarding the...regarding their What are the activities of the department in plants. regard?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Was your final question on the operations in the plant,

which we have no control over or the accidents?"

Bowman: "No ma'am. The question was, what is our Department of Nuclear Safety doing about the conditions at LaSalle? I hear a lot. I read a lot in the papers about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission citing it for viclations, but I read nothing about our own Department of Nuclear Safety taking any action in regards to the LaSalle site, and I want to

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENEBAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

- June 25. 1983
- know what they are doing regarding LaSalle site."
- Barnes: "That is not the State's function, Representative. We are preempted by the Federal Government."
- Bowman: "Well what in the Hell is the Department suppose to be doing, then, if they're not protecting the safety of the public?"
- Barnes: "I'm merely trying to answer your questions,

 Representative."
- Bowman: "Well, Representative, we have a Department of Nuclear Safety, what is their function then? Would you please tell us? Well, if you can't tell us, then maybe we shouldn't appropriate any money to it. I'm inclined to vote 'no' on this one."
- Barnes: "That is your right and prerogative, Bepresentative."
- Bowman: "Well...Madame Speaker, to the Bill. I think we have here a situation where the Federal Government has cited the LaSalle facility, in particular, on a number of occasions, and that we have a Department of Nuclear Safety, and the Sponsor of the Bill can't even tell us what the Department of Nuclear Safety is suppose to be doing to protect the safety of the citizens of the State of Illinois. And I think until somebody's prepared to answer that question, we ought to vote 'no' on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- churchill: "Madame Speaker, if necessary, I move the previous
 question."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

 The question is, 'Shall the main guestion be put?'. All
 those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In
 the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main
 question is put. Representative Barnes to close."
- Barnes: "Madame Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I

STATE OF ILLINGIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

would recommend an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 386 pass?'.

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to explain his vote."
- Levin: "I would join in urging a *no* vote, because we not only have the lack of any kind of activity to protect the residents arcund the LaSall€ clant. but we have Commonwealth Edison receiving more fines than any other utility in the country for its nuclear lack of safety. we don't know what this agency is doing there. We've got the Clinton plant which has, apparently, been on hold for year because of major safety violations, and we don't know what this agency is doing to protect the residents in that area either. So I urge a *no* vote on this appropriation."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 94 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', and nine voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 387, Representative Daniels...Excuse me, Bepresentative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 387, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ereslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Parnes: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Senate Bill 387 arrived from the Senate at a total of
 \$727,400, and the new Bill total as amended is \$726,840.

 If there are no questions, I would recommend an 'aye'
 vote."
- speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMELY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

Bill 387. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall Senate Bill 387 pass? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 108 voting "aye", two voting "no", two voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Beading appears Senate Bill 388, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

:lerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 388, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

ipeaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Barnes."

Harnes: "Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House or Madam Speaker, the Department of Revenue fiscal year '84 budget request was \$1,112,284,300. After the Senate action and House Committee action, the budget is \$1,139,246,200 or \$23,789,900 above their request."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 388. And on that question, the Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

heverenz: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

Leverenz: "How much are we now funding for investigators, the level of funding for investigators and the number of investigators? The...those police power quys."

tarnes: "I think they were removed, Representative Leverenz, by
Amendments. There are no investigators."

.everenz: "Ah, we were sneaky, we refunded the investigators."

tarnes: "Which Amendment, Representative?"

.everenz: "Number five by Representative Kulas. Do you have that?"

larnes: "Let's see. Representative Kulas. Let's see. Increase

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEHATE

'1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

for legal and investigation services for twenty-eight revenue fraud agents and five support staff for an investigations unit. Also, eliminates four administrative assistants."

everenz: "Well, that's the one that restored the twenty-nine...

twenty-eight revenue fraud agents and five support staff,

but blew away the assistants. So we're going to deal with

twenty-eight, and this is Mr...is it Mulcrone's operation,

the one with the police powers, is that in this group?"

darnes: "Yes, Representative. And, Representative, if you would like to answer your own questions, I have no objections." meverenz: "Well, I can probably handle that too. manual was requested from the Director of this agency from the investigation's unit. And I wanted to let you know have...we have not received the policy manual, the that I policy manual which includes their strip search policy the Department of Revenue. And I just don't understand the ability of the Director to respond. We saw the same thing in Committee when we asked Mr. 'Kerr' to be with An d us. as you know, when we went on the visit to the agency, Mr. *Kerr*, after finally getting to the Committee, admitted that when he found the group coming to the Ninth Street Building, slipped out the side door so that he was not able to have any questions put to him by the members of Committee that took the time to go over there. In the Bill as it is amended are their additional new positions?"

Barnes: "You had reduced twenty positions in one of your Amendments that were new."

Leverenz: "Well, I just wanted to make sure there are no new positions, because we eliminated with Amendment #6 the staff to the mushrooms...Eliminated twenty new positions and five government career trainees. Those seem to me to be patronage appointment positions. Eow many...can you

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HGUSE OF REFRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

'1st Legislative Day

June 25. 1983

tell me how many people we put into auditing and collecting over the last eighteen months or the last fiscal year?" $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{n}$

warnes: "I think 730 in total, Representative."

Reverenz: "Why, that's more than we expected. They...They only told us 567. Is there some rationale for the two different numbers? Why would you have another hundred and twenty more than what we had?"

Names: "We gave you the total of what they have now, Representative."

.everenz: "I see, but then it's only 567 that they received in the last eighteen months?"

Barnes: "Yes.

Teverenz: "Has the Department responded to you, because they have not responded to me the total amount of revenue that might be slipping through the cracks that we could add to the nine hundred million that has been uncollected by this agency of State Government, whose primary charge it is to bring the revenue into the state?"

Barnes: "No, Representative, they haven't responded to us either."

Leverenz: "Why not?"

darnes: "Did you request the information, Sir?"

Leverenz: "Sure did."

Barnes: "I wasn't looking for it."

.everenz: "We requested it at Committee. Is the Director still in town today?"

larnes: "Pardon me, Sir?"

Leverenz: "Is the Director still in town today?"

Harnes: "Well, I think he must have recovered from the very heated interrogation that he received by you for two hours when we heard this budget, so I'm sure that he might be."

.everenz: "What...What I would like to relate to you also, that the Director...Is it that he said in Committee that he did

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY BOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CERATE

'1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

not know about the health spa and the elaborate...the elaborate indoor greenhouse that the New Revenue Center here in Springfield, the greenhouse for twelve thousand eight hundred square feet, he said he didn't know about that until it was brought to his attention a week or two ago?"

- 3arnes: "I believe that's what he said. CDB is the one that builds the building, and I think when you were questioning him that was his answer."
- Leverenz: "I received a letter from a former State Representative that served a number of years here, was on the Board of Review for the state up until a couple of years ago, the distinguished Representative Morris. In the opening line is a two... two-word sentence. He enclosed the article about that which I just discussed. Bis opening sentence is, 'He lied.'. He went on to say that the Director prior to being Director at length discussed the grandiose plans for the new Revenue Center to be built here in Springfield in fairly decent detail. And I just thought it should be let known to the Members here, that the Gentleman tries every which way to say I don't know, he goes on with lengthy answers to duck the questions. Bill"
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would hope that this

 Bill would receive 61 green votes. Thank you."

:ullerton: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield to a question."

:ullerton: "Representative Barnes, what was the total budget?"

Barnes: "The total kudget as amended is \$1,139,246,200."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPBESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEEATE

71st Legislative Day June 25, 1983

:ullerton: "Was that one billion, the first thing you said?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Barnes: "Most of it is refunds and grants."

Jullerton: "Oh, okay. Alright, thank you very much."

Barnes: "Their operation hudget is \$99,535."

Fine. I was going to say, it really doesn't sound like it's very cost effective. Therefore, we're spending a billion dollars to help raise...nine billion, but that makes more sense now.
Thank you. I...I also hope it gets 61 votes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Bepresentative Tate."

Tate: "I move to the previous question."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, "Shall the main question be put?". All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the main question is put. The question is, "Shall Senate...Excuse me, Representative Barnes to close."
- Barnes: "Madame Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would recommend an 'aye' vote on Senate Eill 388."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, Shall Senate Bill 388 pass?".

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Bardin,

 Representative Winchester, to explain his vote. One

 minute."
- finchester: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. It looks like we've gotten to that period of time in this process where we're all going to start acting squirrelly. We all know that the Department of Revenue's budget is going to pass. We might as well pass it out today instead of having to address it tomorrow or some time next week. Let's get on

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

with the legislative process. For once, let's not get ourselves in that position of trying to slow down the whole legislative process which has been working pretty well. Let's get the Bill out, and let's go on about our business."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- fatijevich: "Well, there is some merit to what Representative
 Vin...Winchester says, but I think there's also fairness in
 what Ted Leverenz said, that it should get only 61 votes.
 I think we ought to in some way register our opposition for
 some of the things that are going on in the Department of
 Revenue. So I would urge about five more Members to get on
 that Roll Call, but then cut it right there."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do any further Members wish to be recorded on this Bill? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there...Representative Taylor asks leave to be voted "aye". On this Bill, there are 62 "aye" votes, 17 voting "no", and 31 voting "present". This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. At this time, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to page 16 on your Calendar. On the Order of Senate Eills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 294, Representative Jaffe. Clerk, read the Eill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 294, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Jaffe Cullerton, amends

 Senate Bill 294 on page four by deleting line two and so

 forth."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Jaffe."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION CEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

- Jaffe: "Yes, Madame Speaker, Members of the House, this is merely a clarifying Amendment. It clarifies that the Bill applies to convictions which occur during the course of marriage. This was actually asked for in Committee, and it's just a clean-up Amendment. I would move its adoption" Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 294. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Greiman, for what reason do you rise?"

Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

- Greiman: "Speaker, only to announce that Representative Pierce is...should be excused on the Journal for medical reasons today. His key was removed earlier in the day, but we did not get the message until just a little while ago."
- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, Representative. And now Representative McPike for the Adjournment Resolution."
- McPike: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, allowing the Clerk five minutes Perfunctory, move that we stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 3 p.m."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the crimion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the House stands adjourned."
- :lerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
 Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House
 of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENEBAL ASSEMELY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

71st Legislative Day

June 25, 1983

in passage of Eills of the following title to wit: House Eill 186, 842, 1037, 1057, 1089, 1090, 1134, 1225, 1250, 1260, 1310, 1336, 1378, 1561, 1665, 1723, 1772, 1842, 1922, 1925, 1934, 1955, 2029, 2055, 2072, 2078, 2109, 2135, 2201, 2230, 2242, 2284, and 2267 together with the attached Amendments, and the adoption in which I'm instructed to ask concurrence to the House, passed the Senate as amended June 25, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."

01/04/84 10:35

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 25, 1983

HB-0328	MOTION	PAGE	2
HB-0465	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	84
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-1024	MOTION	PAGE	111
SB-0022		PAGE	9
SB-0025	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-0026	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
SB-0034	THIRD READING	PAGE	18
SB-0161		PAGE	20
SB-0161	THIRD READING	PAGE	22
	RECALLED	PAGE PAGE	23
	RECALLED	PAGE	30 33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
SB-0206		PAGE	34
SB-0209	-	PAGE	35
SB-0209		PAGE	37
	THIRD READING	PAGE	96
SB-0256		PAGE	99
	THIRD READING	PAGE	100
	THIRD READING	PAGE	100
	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
SB-0260		PAGE	102
SB-0262		PAGE	103
SB-0264	THIRD READING	PAGE	103
SB-0278	THIRD READING	PAGE	105
SB-0280	THIRD READING	PAGE	111
SB-0294	SECOND READING	PAGE	166
SB-0300	THIRD READING	PAGE	112
SB-0301	THIRD READING	PAGE	117
SB-0373		PAGE	118
SB-0374		PAGE	119
SB-03 7 5		PAGE	119
SB-0376		PAGE	120
SB-0377		PAGE	122
	THIRD READING	PAGE	130
SB-0379		PAGE	131
	THIRD READING	PAGE	134
SB-0381		PAGE	137
	THIRD READING	PAGE	142
SB-0383		PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	154
SB-0386	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	155
SB-0387	THIRD READING	PAGE	156
SB-0388		PAGE	160
SB-0412	THIRD READING	PAGE	161 38
SB-0492	THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-0557	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	48 57
	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
	RECALLED	PAGE	85
	THIRD READING	PAGE	72
SB-1109	THIRD READING	PAGE	77
SB-1191	THIRD READING	PAGE	82
HR-0420	ADOPTED	PAGE	4
	_		•

SUBJECT MATTER

1
1
1
2

01/04/84 10:35

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

2

JUNE 25, 1983

SUBJECT MATTER

AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	9
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	9
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	9
REPRESENTATIVE GREINAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	12
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	122
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR	PAGE	129
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	167
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	167
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	167
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	168