

83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

MARCH 24, 1983

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will come to order. The chaplain for today will be Reverend Rudolph Shoultz, Union Baptist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Will our guests in the gallery please rise.

REVEREND SHOULTZ:

(Prayer given by Reverend Shoultz)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

Reading of the Journal. Senator Darrow.

SENATOR DARROW:

Mr. President, I move that the reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, March 22nd and Wednesday, March 23rd, in the year of 1983, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

You've heard the reading of the Journals. Is there any amendments or corrections? If not, they'll stand approved as read. For what purpose does Senator Coffey arise?

SENATOR COFFEY:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, we have a very important announcement to make here today. One of our distinguished colleagues this week is celebrating his 39th birthday again, Senator DeAngelis, wherever he might be. The gray-headed guy in the center. And I think he has a cake here to the right of myself that he would like to share with you. And I think we all ought to wish him a happy 39th.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

Should we wish him a happy 39th? Senator DeAl... Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Jerome Joyce, Chairman of the Agriculture, Conservation and Energy Committee, reports out the following Senate Bills: 117, 220 and 292 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Collins, Chairman of Local...Labor and Commerce, reports out Senate Bills: 42 and 286 with the recommendation Do Pass - 25 and 108 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Newhouse, Chairman of the Higher Education Committee, reports out Senate Bills: 47, 141, 238, 261, 263 with the recommendation Do Pass.

Senator Egan, Chairman of Executive Committee, reports out Senate Bills: 26, 186, 188, 247 and 288 with the recommendation Do Pass - Senate Bills 11, 172, 199 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended - Senate Resolutions 24, 39 and 71 recommend adoption - Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 recommend adoption.

Senator Lenke, Chairman of Judiciary I Committee, reports out Senate Bills: 206, 299, 333 and 345 with the recommendation Do Pass - Senate Bill 41 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Sangmeister, Chairman of Judiciary II Committee, reports out Senate Bills: 146, 147, 150, 167, 193 with the recommendation Do Pass - 62 and 205 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Nedza, Chairman of Local Government Committee, reports out Senate Bills: 54, 137, 212, 213, 214, 215, 241 and 289 with the recommendation Do Pass - 39, 58, 86, 107, 135 and 136 with the recommendation Do Pass as Amended.

Senator Savickas, Chairman of the Committee on Assignment of Bills, reports the following Senate Bills have been assigned to committee:

Agriculture, Conservation and Energy - 460, 467, 471, 472, 473 and 485; Appropriations I - 481; Higher Education - 466 and 474; Executive - 482 and 484; Finance and Credit Regulations - 479, 483; Pensions...or Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - 453, 469; Labor and Commerce - 480; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections - 454, 455, 456, 457,

458, 459, 461, 462, 463, 464 and 465; Revenue - 470, 477, 476 and 478; Transportation - 468, 475 and 486.

Senator Savickas, Chairman, Assignment of Bills Committee, reports the following House Bills have been assigned to committee:

Agriculture, Conservation and Energy - House Bill 12; Elections and Reapportionment -360; Executive - 416; Finance and Credit Regulations - 386 and 390; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - 45 and 346; Judiciary II - 28; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections - 104; Revenue - 273, 297, 340.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

...Channel 20 requests permission to tape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

A Message from the House by Mr...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

Hold on. Channel 3 also makes the same request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Go ahead, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

...a Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

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

House Bills 25, 27, 171, 235, 246, 299, 318, 333 and 376.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 21. Senator Schaffer and Friedland is handling this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALL)

Consent Calendar. For what purpose does Senator Philip arise?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like the record to show that Senator Bloom is in the State of Massachusetts testifying before one of the legislative committees in regards to JCAR.

PRESIDENT:

The record will so reflect. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and...on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT:

State your point.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, visiting us today in the President's gallery is a constituent of Senator Arthur Berman, an old friend of mine, and also former Senator Steve Nash who is now a Representative, Mrs. Ethel Caloger of Evanston, Illinois and she's sitting right...above the President's gallery there.

PRESIDENT:

Will our guest please stand and recognized. Welcome to Springfield. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 76 offered by Senator Newhouse.

And, Senate Joint Resolution 17 offered by Senator Kelly.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 77 offered by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. Introduction of bills.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Senate Bill 487, by Senators Bloom, Berman, Maitland, Demuzio, Jeremiah Joyce and Kent.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

488, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

489, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

490, by Senators Rupp, Darrow, Chew, Vadalabene, Davidson and Coffey.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 491, by Senator Bruce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

492, by Senator Rupp.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

493, by Senator Hall.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

494, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

495, by Senator Bloom, Dawson, Carroll, Schaffer and Kent.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

496, by Senator Fawell.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

497, Senator Sangmeister.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

498, by Senator Philip and Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

499, by Senator Schaffer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 500, by Senator Bruce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 501, by Senator Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 502, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

503, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 504, by Senator Jerome J. Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 505, by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 506, by Senator Bruce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 507, by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

508, by Senators Sangmeister, Rock, Egan, J. J. Joyce,
Welch, Holmberg, Luft, Bloom, Barkhausen and Hudson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Bill 509, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 510, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 511, by Senator Darrow.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 512, by Senator Savickas.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 513, by Senators Kustra and Berman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 514, by Senators Netsch, Etheredge,
D'Arco...and Watson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 515, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 516, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 517, by Senator Kelly.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 518, by Senators Lenke and Hudson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 519, by Senator Lenke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 520, by Senator Lenke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 521, by Senator Lenke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 522, by Senator Keats.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 523, by Senators Lenke, D'Arco and Marowitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

If I can have your attention, we, again, are graced with the presence of some special guests. The Chair will yield to Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Last night we enjoyed the biannual dinner of the Veterans of Foreign War, and today we're honored to have them here present with us on the Senate Floor. So at this time, I would like to introduce to you the Commander, George R. Cramer, from Woodridge, ... Illinois, the Commander of the Veteran of Foreign Wars, and he will introduce his officers. Commander Cramer.

COMMANDER CRAMER:

(Remarks given by Commander Cramer)

PRESIDENT:

Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Vadalabene, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans Affairs and Administration, to which was referred the Governor's Message of February 9th,

1983, report the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in the Governor's Message of February 9th, 1983.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Vadalabene. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate is now in Executive Session. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Okay. Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of February 9th, 1983, I will read the name of the salaried appointment to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans Affairs and Administration recommends.

To be Chairman and member of the Illinois Commerce Commission for a term expiring January 18, 1988, Philip R. O'Connor of Chicago.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment on one roll call, unless some Senator has objection to a specific appointment.

PRESIDENT:

Heard the request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Mr. President. Will you put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. In regards to...this appointment of Philip O'Connor, I may say that in all fairness to the gentleman, the day that the Governor recommended his appointment, he did, in fact, call me to inform me of his acceptance of the Governor's appointment. And I ask...that specific phone call of Mr. O'Connor if he would stop by the office and have an opportunity to discuss the various issues that face energy and energy related issues during this Session and he indicated that he would. I was looking for a way in which to support and...and vote for Mr. O'Connor. Needless to say, he never came by. The day that the Senate was considering his appointment in the Senate Executive Committee, he answered some questions of the...of the committee and, in fact, called me that very afternoon when his confirmation was not called in this very Body and set up an appointment to come by, in fact, he did. I think that this appointment is perhaps the most sensitive one to occur here in Illinois in this...in this Session. I want to know from Mr. O'Connor what his goals and his plans and his priorities, and frankly, what his strategies are going to be for Illinois during the decade of the 1980's because, in fact...balance of the decade of the 1980's because, in fact, he has a five year appointment. And I sat down and discussed with him eight or nine questions that I had raised, specifically about his philosophies of regulation; his long term planning which will be conducted by the Illinois Commerce Commission; the reliance of the Commerce Commission in the past on the utility information that was provided to the commission by utilities; commitment to Illinois coal versus the use of nuclear power and nuclear power plants; construction work in progress; conservation; natural gas issues; the rate base as to what goes into the rate base and if, in fact, there are going to be any kind of incentives so that utili-

ties will be rewarded with...higher increases and inefficiency with lower increases; and basically, specifically, what his long-term objectives were for the Illinois Commerce Commission. I must say, in all candor, that he admitted that he did not know very much about the Illinois coal and Illinois coal issues and I think that's to his credit that he admitted that. Today we are faced with the prospect of having to confirm an individual who...obviously, it is our responsibility as members of this Senate for the Governor to advise and for the Senate to consent. I'm not yet convinced that Mr. O'Connor is the type of individual that is best qualified throughout the State of Illinois to lead the Illinois Commerce Commission. I recall when he was a member of the Governor's Cabinet, Insurance Director, that he was the individual who was serving when the workmen's compensation increases were granted, and it took the Governor and the Attorney General, then Ty Fahner, to present a court case and have the rates rolled back. I'm not sure that that kind of individual and his performance ought to be rewarded with this very difficult job. I don't understand why Phil O'Connor wants this job. Perhaps in serving as the Governor's campaign manager, the Governor is attempting to punish him because he only won by five thousand votes. By...nevertheless and needless to say, I think that Illinois citizens across the State are loudly and clearly sending a message to this General Assembly that they want some kind of utility rate reform. I'm hoping that Philip O'Connor can give us the kind of leadership that we need to provide for utility rate reform in Illinois. I'm not convinced of that. And as of this moment, right now, I'm not even clear and sure how I'm going to vote, yes or no. I'd like to give the gentleman a chance, but I have to look at his previous record as a matter of evaluating his performance in what he, in fact, will do in...in this job. Obviously, the Illinois Com-

merce Commission and Citizen's Utility Board and other issues will be dominant in this Legislature; and certainly whoever we in this Senate confirm will have the responsibility of regulating consumer rates that are astronomical and unwarranted in Illinois. And we will have the opportunity on numerous occasions to decide what kind of utility rate reform that we will bring about for the citizens of Illinois. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. First of all...so much for Governor Thompson's pledge to depoliticize the Illinois Commerce Commission. I believe Phil O'Connor ran his campaign the last election. He may be a good man...I...I've listened to Phil O'Connor in committee, I was on that committee. I've listened to Senator Demuzio. We have more problems with the utility rates in this State than in any other thing that we are facing. And there are two appointments today. One of them has a track record, Phil O'Connor does not. But we have been consistent in one area here and that's all of us in the General Assembly have put out press releases telling our constituents that, by God, we're going to do something about your high utility costs. We've put them out when we knew we wouldn't get the fuel adjustments clause out of the Rules Committee; we've put them out when we knew we couldn't get the...elected Illinois Commerce Commission out of committee; and we've put them out and put them out till we've come to a point that is shameful in Illinois history. And that's that many people have to decide whether they want to heat or eat. And I'm not talking about just the senior citizens exclusively or the poor people exclusively, I'm talking about the average homeowner in this State. And we were blessed with a mild winter. Can you imagine what would

be happening right now had we had a winter like we had last year, when gas rates have increased on an average of thirty-eight percent? Well, we are, as the previous speaker mentioned, going to be decided...deciding many things in this Session, whether we have an elected Commerce Commission; whether we have a...have a citizen's utility board; whether we have...do away with the fuel adjustment clause; whether we do away with the construction work in progress. And I submit to you, if we don't have guts enough right now to not confirm two people that are going to be put on the Illinois Commerce Commission, then we won't have guts enough to do the rest of the things that we've got to do this year either. It's time to quit putting out press releases, let's do something constructive, let's do something that people can see. Let's send a message to the utility companies that...get your act together, folks, because we're going to do something this year. And if you get your act together maybe we can work with you and we'll all survive through this. But right now, let's show people in this State that we mean something and let's not confirm Phil O'Connor and let's not confirm Helen Schmidt. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, as the sponsor of Phil O'Connor, don't understand why he wants this job either, but I think that we, in the State, are lucky that he does because Phil O'Connor has proven to be a real professional. I disagree with the previous speaker in saying that Phil O'Connor does not have a track record, he does have a track record. He has a track record as the Director of Insurance; and as the Director of Insurance he ran an open office with open access to every interested individual, allowing input from every citizen

across this State and from everyone interested in the Department of Insurance. Yes, he does have a track record, something that we can...we can go by. I think the...the Chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission is the toughest job in State Government today. And as I said initially, I don't know why he wants that job, but he is a professional and we need a professional in that job, because if there's any issue that's important and critical to the citizens across the State, it is the issue of utility rates and utility rate regulation. He has already taken the initiative in his job in dealing with the national...natural gas issue in going to Washington and in trying to get the natural gas prices lowered for the citizens of the State of Illinois. He has pledged before the committee and to each and every member to continue the policy that he...that he had when he was Director of Insurance to have an open office, open communication, open access to files, allowing input from all the citizens across the State of Illinois whether they be with the utility companies and the special interest groups or citizen groups and community groups and grass roots groups across this State of Illinois who are concerned about the ever increasing and escalating prices...of utilities across this State. I would urge everybody, take a look at Phil O'Connor's track record as Director of Insurance and vote Aye on this appointment. I do look at somebody's track record, and for that reason, I'm voting Aye on this one and I will be voting No on the very next one, on Helen Schmidt, because she too has a track record, a track record that is not enviable and one that I cannot support in taking a look at her votes and her roll calls as a member of the Commerce Commission. Let's take a look at those track records. I think this one says, yes.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. We are once again about to end the issue of the man that's bitten by the dog, I'm sorry...by the dog that's hit by the stick, biting the stick rather than the man. We have charged a lot to the Illinois Commerce Commission regarding what has happened to utility rates. Is it the fault of the Illinois Commerce Commission that the Federal Government, in its infinite regulatory wisdom, chose in the late seventies, to regulate natural gas by permitting them a fixed return on their assets of seventeen percent regardless of how much natural gas they sold? This meant that the inevitable result was as the...as we use less, the cost per unit became more. Is it the fault of the ICC that the Federal Government permits a severance tax forcing all the citizens of the States of Illinois to pay the taxes for the people of Montana, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma and the rest of the states of the country that are energy producing states? I would like that to Illinois choosing to charge the residents of those states for the loaves of bread they buy for all the wheat that we produce here as we send it to their states. Is it the fault of the ICC that interest rates went up? And let me tell you, utility companies are capital intensive, they either borrow and pay interest or they attract capital and pay dividends. Both of them cost money, both of them are vital to the running of utility companies and to the preservation of our way of life. Now, the demagoguery that surrounds this, I am sure is very fashionable. No one is upset...no...there is no one that is not upset with utility rates. In fact, around our house, and I have an all electric home, every time my bill comes in my wife wants to know why, as a State Senator, I don't do anything about this. My mother is even worse about it than my wife is. But, let me tell you what the Illinois Commerce Commission is guilty of. They are guilty of allowing the building...additional capacities when the

need was not there. Now, I guess they called it when they thought it was coming. They are also guilty of bowing to the political pressure of the General Assembly and people around the State by choosing to punish big users to help the little guy. And let me tell you something, you do not help the little guy by punishing the big guy. As I indicated before, utility business is capital based, and when you force big users to use less, you force little people to pay more. Now if you look at People's Gas, went in for an increase in Chicago; and for those of you who might not have read it, let me tell you what their justification was, they need an increase because people are using less gas. We had a mild winter, they didn't buy enough but the costs were still there and we, under our pressure, and the citizens permitted the Illinois Commerce Commission to punish the bigger users when in reality they were punishing the little guy instead. Now in regards to Phil O'Connor, and I'll finish very quickly. First of all, Senator Demuzio, when Phil O'Connor granted that twenty-three percent increase, he did it because we required him by law to do it. Senator Eruce, if you'll remember the bill you sponsored, 3250, is the one that eliminated that requirement. We, in our loss, indicated as a regulated industry that the insurance industry was entitled to a two and a half percent underwriting profit regardless of what their investment income was. We forced the director to do that, not O'Connor. And I also want to tell you that the man who went after those people was not just Ty Fahner, he was the point man on it, it was O'Connor's push for them to give the money back to the employers when those rate increases were excessive and when it was determined that he had other authority under the law that we granted him. In addition to that, Phil O'Connor was on the forefront of pushing the open competition and worker's comp. insurance which has now resulted in substantial rate...substantial

savings to all employers. Phil O'Connor is not timid about redirecting public policy; he is not timid about challenging large corporations; he is not timid about protecting the consumer; in fact, he is bold as heck about it. And I, too, as I indicated, with all of his intelligence, his fearlessness and his commitment to public policy, why in God's green earth he would want to take this job. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I am going to oppose Mr. O'Connor's appointment not so much because of his credible record because he has, I'm sure, done quite well to show that. But this is one of the few ways that we can show our concern and our opposition to the poor job that the ICC has done besides the...the budget, which...which I can oppose as a legislator. But I...I'm concerned the direction that we've gone with the Illinois Commerce Commission. There is very few times that they have turned down rate requests, and they have consistently, when they do turn one down, the utility comes back in a short time and they're back with a similar request and...and it's honored. And I...I would say this, the State of Illinois would probably not be much worse off if we didn't have any Commerce Commission members. You know the direction we're going in Washington and...and in Springfield with the administration is for deregulation, and I would say that the consumers can't hardly be ripped off anymore than they are right now.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I believe that you members here in the Senate who are not

members of the Committee on Executive Appointments and Administration of Veterans Affairs should know that this committee had approximately a two hour discussion. Phil O'Connor was cross-examined extensively, he answered every question of every member on that committee who asked him a question and he asked...answered them to the best of his ability. You further should know, those of you who are not members of this committee, that after all of the discussion was over and everyone who had his day in court with Phil O'Connor, he was voted out of that committee by a vote of 12 to 1.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 39, the Nays are 12, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nomination just made. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. With respect to the Governor's Message of February 9th, 1983, I will read the salaried appointment to which a Committee on Executive Appointments, Veteran Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise...advise and consent.

To be a member of the Illinois Commerce Commission for a term expiring January 18, 1988, Helen Schmidt of Glen Ellyn.

And Mr. President, having read the salaried appointment, I now seek to consider this appointment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The question will be as to the advice and consent of the nomination just made. Discussion? Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just voted for Mr. O'Connor's confirmation because he does not have a track record as far as the Commerce Commission is concerned, and he has taken some...some stances and made some moves and...and said some things that have some appeal to me and I think that he ought to be given a chance. However, exactly the opposite is true with the person who is in front of us now. Miss Schmidt was first appointed by Governor Walker in 1973, reappointed by Governor Thompson, 1978, and is now up for a third appointment. Her record is one of consistently, in my opinion, favoring utilities and...and ignoring the overall good of...of utility consumers in the State of Illinois. I think she's had her ten years there, I think she's had her chance and she hasn't done a very good job, in my opinion, and I intend to vote No on her, and I would certainly like to see the Illinois Senate stand up and...turn this nominee down and let the Governor go back to the drawing...boards and try to find somebody who is a little bit more consumer oriented that Miss Schmidt has proven that she is.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

...thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I, too, echo the sentiments of Senator Buzbee because we do have a record on Mrs. Schmidt of her ten years that she been on the committee. Based on the information that I have, she has voted ninety-five percent, approximately ninety-five percent for all of the utility increase requests that came before that board, which totals 2.4 billion dollars. Now, I don't know the lady personally, I have no personal problems with her; but I do know that the citizens of the State of Illinois and particularly those of my district are suffering tremendous problems with utility costs. I also recognize the

reality that costs are going up for businesses as well as consumers, and to meet this problem we must have people in key positions sitting on that ...committee with the sensitivity and the ability to come up with new innovative ideas to meet the demands of our times. And I cannot see how the Executive Committee could have recommended confirmation for another four years, we're talking about fourteen years of nothing. This lady most certainly should not be confirmed. And let us reach out and get someone else until we can bring about the kind of reforms that is necessary to have an effective, sensitive Commerce Commission. Therefore, I'm voting No.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you...Mr. President. I do know Helen Schmidt, I know her personally and I have known her for twenty years. And I am standing up in support of her, not only as her sponsor but as someone who does know the type of woman that Helen is. Helen has the kind of capabilities and the integrity that we need on the commission. I heard that there was going to be opposition to Helen and I...and I personally called her and asked her about her record. And I'd like to point out some of the things that perhaps you don't realize that she has been doing over the last several years. First of all, Helen is the one who has been trying more than anyone else to get the power companies to realize that...that this time of day rate that they've got is absurd. The fact that the...the power companies seem to feel that it is cheaper to produce power later at night is just not true, and the University of Illinois has just recently come out and said that this is not a cost effective thing that the power companies are doing. She has stood up for a company such as the Central Public...the Central Illinois Public Service Compa-

nies...and dissented when they would raise their rates. She has worked to reopen the quip for the Illinois Power and has voted as such. She has voted to reopen the Illinois Gas Company rates so that they can reinvestigate their requests. She has asked that the Illinois Bell Company be cited in and her...colleagues have agreed and they are being cited in. Most of the increases that she has voted for have been one-quarter and sometimes as low as one-tenth that the public utilities wanted. She did feel at times that she had to give them something. I think she is an excellent candidate. I think we would be foolhardy to take some woman, and this is the only woman that is on the Commerce Committee, to take her and remove her for some unknown factor. And I urge you to vote Yes.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I rise to speak in opposition to the appointment of Mrs. Schmidt. I think that Mrs. Schmidt's own words should be heard in this Session by reading some of her dissents or alleged dissents to rate decisions. In one case in particular, she went out of her way, Mr. President, to create a standard for granting a merger that would put a burden upon utility consumers. In that case, Mr. President, of Illinois Power Company, Number 81-0818, there was a potential merger. Illinois Power Company sought to merge its wholly owned subsidiary into...Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company. Central Illinois Power Service came up and they said we would like to also get involved in that particular situation. The Commerce Commission agreed and they said in their inciting the law applicable to the case, "After a hearing, and in case no hearing is required, if the commission is satisfied that such petition, petition for merger, shall reasonably be granted

and that the public will be inconvenienced thereby, the commission shall make such order in the premise that it may deem proper," meaning they would allow the merger if it's proper and reasonably should be granted. Mrs. Schmidt came up with a different theory. She says that a commission decision to reject Illinois Power's offer should be based on a clear showing that the CIPS proposal would be substantially better for the public than Illinois Power's offer. What she seeks to do is to overturn that decision, Mr. President, and allow the merger when it might not be in the benefit of the public. In another case I would like to cite her dissent. She said, and I quote her here, "The public response to the repeated necessity of utility rate relief in recent years causes this commission enough problems, we need voluntarily seek out no further residential customer complaint." Mr. President, I think that the utility commission should listen to the complaints of customers. I think it is very appropriate today that we are serving cake over here for somebody's birthday because the attitude of Mrs. Schmidt is let them eat cake. I would urge my fellow Senators to vote No on this renomination.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I will not repeat what Senator Welch has said because he covered it well, but when you stop and think that these utilities end up as being the only game in town...now one of the questions that I asked Mr. O'Connor and Mrs. Schmidt...Mr. O'Conner said he was new and he didn't understand, but when I asked her and that was this, that in my home and many others down there the same way, that we have a water meter sitting there and that water meter has been in the ground for years and years and yet we pay a four dollar

rental every month on that water meter. And that meter is there for the purpose of where the water company can read the meter to tell how much water I use. I question why, that every three months that I'm paying twelve dollars rental on a water meter, and she said, well, you don't understand. The reason that you're paying this is that is to cover running the pipes, hooking up the meters and other extra things. And stop to think that I've got a meter that's been there fourteen or fifteen years and I'm still paying every month a four dollar charge on that meter as rental for the company. And that's just one thing I want to cite you. Another thing is that with these run away prices, your bills double, how do you explain to people today that we're up here and what action are we going to take. Now I realize that you might say that she has been on there for ten years, and you mean to say, in ten years that you can't find some reason to object to some things. And she was asked the question, "Do you ever say, no?" And her answers were to many questions that she evaded them. I rise in opposition to this appointment. I think it would be a serious mistake on the users and we need to send a message to that Commerce Commission.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Marowitz.

REEL #2

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We've heard a lot about track records. We are not removing this lady, if we do so, because she is a woman. We are not removing this lady because of any unknown factor. We would be removing this lady because of her ten year record, a track record. A record that is the most insensitive record of any appointment that has ever been made to the Illinois Commerce Commission. And I can't think of a better way to send a message to the Governor, to the utility companies, and most important of all, to the people across this State, that we are concerned about their cries for utility rate reform than by not confirming Helen Schmidt. If you're insensitive to this issue, insensitive to your constituents and their...and their needs and their problems, then vote Yes. A Yes vote is a vote to ignore the cries of people across the State and to continue to allow the utility companies to have a stranglehold on the Illinois Commerce Commission. The most important thing is, confirmation of Helen Schmidt is the very best argument for an elected commerce commission.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. So that I remain consistent in regard to these two appointments, Helen Schmidt was questioned quite extensively but not near as extensively as Phil O'Connor. However, she did answer her questions, she was forthright, some of her responses were not to the satisfaction of some of the members of the committee. However, her vote was just a little bit

different than Phil O'Connor's. Her vote was 8 to 4 to send her up here to the Senate for confirmation.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I will be brief. I just want the membership to know why I will be voting against Helen Schmidt. We are in the process of advising and consenting on appointments of the Governor. I've had an opportunity to serve with...under three governor's and receive appointments for the last twelve years, and I believe, and I would have to be corrected, this is the first appointment that I have voted against in the time that we have had people sent up here. I normally do vote for the Governor's people because I believe that the administration ought not to be hamstrung by people in this Chamber, and he ought to be able to select the people that he wishes to run his administration. But this commission is not strictly and solely an Executive branch. This is a...a committee and commission that through the...the 1880's and 1890's throughout the United States legislative bodies decided rather than regulate railroads on their own, that we would turn that function over to an independently operated commission, normally called the commerce commission. And that is the appointment we are considering today, and this, to a large degree, this commission is our commission. The Governor has the power to make the appointments, but we in...in effect are responsible for the utility rates that are established throughout the State of Illinois. And we're not electing ourselves by voting against Mrs. Schmidt to the Illinois Commerce Commission, but I think it's realizing that this commission touches each and every citizen of the State of Illinois. I dare say, you could not point out one person that has not had some sort of regulatory function handled by

the Illinois Commerce Commission. And on the basis of the questions and the ten year record that Mrs. Schmidt has developed as a commissioner, I think I have a right to vote against her reappointment. I felt that she had a lack of sensitivity to consumer issues, an unbending attitude often times in granting every request for an increase, and a feeling, frankly, in committee that over the ten years she had never cast an incorrect vote. That's a matter of judgement. And she has judged her own record that those...every vote was correct. And my judgement as State Senator is that all those votes have not been correct, and so I will vote my judgement and vote against her.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Senate, I would submit to you that if Mrs. Schmidt has a distinguishing factor, it is by voting in favor of all but two, all but two, of the major...forty-five...of the forty-five major utility rate hikes over the last ten years. Now, if we can't even do this, if we can't even deny this appointment, then I submit to you that we truly do need an elected commerce commission and the people will do a better job than we will. But what the commerce commission needs is not more money, not more staff. They need to be able to say "no" once in awhile. And I submit to you that we ought to show the commerce commission how to say "no" right now by saying "no" to Helen Schmidt. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 26, the Nays are 24. A majority of the Senators elected having refused to give their advice and consent by record vote, the Senate rejects the nomination of Helen Schmidt for the office of the commerce commission. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I now move that we arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate does now arise. Senator Zito, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ZITO:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege. We are honored today to have students throughout the gallery from Triton Community College, which is in my district in River Grove, escorted by Dr. David Hunt of the Political Science Department. I would like us to give them a warm welcome to Springfield.

PRESIDENT:

Will our guests from Triton please rise and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

With leave of the Body, we'll go to House bills 3rd reading. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 327, Senator Rock. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd ask leave of the Body to return House Bill 327 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment. Will you put the number up, Mr. Secretary?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

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

granted. Mr. Secretary, are there any amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Rock and Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The amendment will be handled by those who have been intimately involved in these lengthy...rather lengthy negotiations, Senators Bruce and DeAngelis on behalf of Senator Philip and myself. For those who are unaware, and I am sure there are not many, for the past month there have been meetings...meetings between...the representatives of organized labor and the representatives of the business community in this State confronting what we all admit was an almost insurmountable problem, namely, the unemployment insurance debt that this State has...incurred. We have additionally, the Governor...the joint leadership has additionally solicited some help from the national administration and from the Congress. And, frankly, our action here today will hopefully spur the Congress to relieve us of a debt or at least the interest on that debt. We will owe as of October 1st, sixty million dollars to the Federal Government. Sixty million dollars which we, frankly, do not have. We will now, by virtue of the adoption of this amendment and the passage of this bill, be in a position to say that we, in fact, have done something to straighten out our unemployment insurance problem. And with that, Mr. President, I will yield to Senator Bruce.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Philip. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, also, would like to compliment labor and busi-

HB 327
Amend #1
Sen Bruce's remarks

ness. This has been a very long, controversial, detailed agreement worked out. Also, Senator Rock, Representative Daniels, Representative Speaker Madigan, and Senator DeAngelis have worked on this a long, long time. To my knowledge, there is complete agreement on both sides for the first time. We ought to do this as soon as possible. As you know, the Federal Congress is in Session now. In...in order for us to get any kind of concessions at all, we have to show that we have done our part in Illinois. So, it's extremely important we do it today and we get on with the work of the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Further discussion? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I would like to go over for the Senate Body the amendment which is before you and make a few comments about the changes that will relate to employee benefits. And I understand that Senator DeAngelis will cover the tax changes for employers. I would want to point out to all the membership that there have been two changes from our March the 17th agreement in which this bill was to have gone into affect on July the 1st, the employers tax will now go into effect on April the 1st, and the employee benefit changes will go into effect on April the 21st. Additionally, to change and grandfather in employees who are unemployed on April the 24th, we have left the lower cap on the State-wide average wage...from what was to be the first of January to the first of February. There's no net change in the cost of the program, however, it does mean that some people who are presently receiving benefits will not have them reduced. Without any additional cost to the employer it...it gives us a chance to keep benefits at a higher level for a longer period of time. There are three changes that are going to be done to employee benefits.

First of all, we are going to change the way that the State-wide average working wage is computed and we will change the time period. The second change is, we will change the benefits that employees will receive as a percent of their own salary. And thirdly, change the way in which they compute wages. The first change is in the State-wide average wage in manufacturing. That is presently...and was changed on January the 31st, at three hundred and thirty-five dollars. This bill and amendment will roll that back to three hundred and twenty-one dollars. As you know, that is the cap from which employees cannot exceed. That will stay in effect from now until January the 31st of 1984. There will be no changes, there will be no alterations at midyear. That change, the State-wide average wage under this amendment then will change on the first day of February of 1984, to...back to its present three hundred and thirty-five dollars. No increases in the interim, and that will stay in effect until June the 30th of 1986. And I might mention that this entire agreement lasts until June 30th, 1986, at which time it sunsets. So, we are reducing the State-wide average wage in manufacturing to three twenty-one. We are leaving that in effect from now until January of next year at which time it will go into...to three thirty-five, and that will stay in effect until June of '86. We are also making significant reduction in the benefit amounts to employees. Present employees receive two limitations, sixty-six percent of their salary not to exceed sixty-six percent of the State-wide average wage. That is being reduced down, for a family of four to forty-eight percent. I've got my table upside down, 62.4. The spouse presently receives sixty percent...sixty percent, that is to be reduced to fifty-five percent. A single person presently receives fifty percent of his wage not to exceed fifty percent of the State-wide average wage, and that will be reduced to forty-eight percent. That savings alone...those changes

alone saves about two hundred and forty million dollars. Additionally, the way wages are computed will also be changed. Presently, your wage on how much you may earn and what your unemployment compensation check is based on, excluding the quarter in which you are in and going back four calendar quarters, and you...then you take the highest of that, divide that by thirteen and that gives you your weekly benefit amount. This proposal will change that to take...exclude the quarter in which you are in and go back...and accept the two highest quarters, and divide by twenty-six. For those of you who are aware, the construction industry and other industries that have part-time employees and seasonal work, that is a significant reduction in your weekly benefit amount. I would point out, the last...that the total savings of these three changes, changing the State-wide average wage in manufacturing, or just the State-wide average weekly wage, changing the percentage that employees can receive, and changing the base wage period is going to save around two hundred and forty million the first year, two hundred and forty million in the second year and approximately three hundred million dollars in the third year. The total savings to employers and reduction in benefits to employees amounts to seven hundred and eighty million dollars. And I am sure, as Senator DeAngelis is going to point out, the other side of that formula is a...a billion one hundred and fifty-one million dollar increase in taxes for employers for a total cost of this package of approximately one billion nine hundred and forty...million dollars. There's been a question about how we split up that. The reduction in benefits an increases amount to about a sixty-five thirty-five split, business to labor. Sixty-forty, I am told. Sixty-five thirty-five, sixty-forty split between business and labor. It is a proposal that has met with the approval of everyone. No one is happy. I think Bob Gibson,

the State president AFL-CIO in a news conference stated what he felt about it. He said he was like the man being run out of town on the rail, if it weren't for the honor of the thing I would just as soon not be here. And I'm sure people on this Floor, both business partisans, labor partisans and people of neither persuasion would prefer not to vote on this bill, but this is the best that can be arranged. I think it's a workable compromise accepted by business and labor and ought to go out of here today to be accepted by the House later on this afternoon. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

We have Senator Geo-Karis, Grotberg, Schuneman and DeAngelis to speak on this. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I'll go through this rather rapidly because I think everybody got a handout on this. But, basically, the two major changes that were made that affected the employers was the increase in the base salary from seven thousand to eight thousand and changes in the max rate from 5.7 to 6.7 on upward. As Senator Bruce explained, the cost to the business community of this is 1.151 billion dollars. There are some unique things that have been added in to allow employers with rather bad past experiences to improve their experience for the future. We're increasing the minimum contribution. We're putting a max ceiling for all employees...employers with fifty thousand dollars or less. There's quite a few changes. You have to take a look at them, you're going to probably get a lot of questions. The negotiations was very successful, there was a tremendous spirit of cooperation. The members of the legislative team, however, were unsuccessful in convincing labor and business to...include defeated legislators to make them eligible for unemployment compensation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill is a must if we're going to keep business and industry in Illinois and bring jobs in and retain them. And I want to commend the leadership on both sides, Senator Rock and Senator Philip and all their associates, and also the representatives of the labor unions and of the business people who were good enough to meet and work out a compromise. It was about time because we should have had this done long ago, but I'm glad it's here and I feel that it can help the business climate and the job climate of Illinois, and I certainly will support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President and fellow Senators. I don't wish to be redundant, only to express my admiration for getting the deal cut in a timely fashion and approximately but not quite fairly. My bigger problem, however, is, and I would like to remind this membership as each of us go home, regardless of party, Saturday morning you go down to the coffee shop, people say, How are things in Springfield? and they don't even know that you probably weren't there that week, they assume that whatever happens to them in their daily life on Main Street happens by all of us and each of us one at a time. I think this is a fine compromise, but I submit that the membership of the various organizations that put it together will not be as well informed on the matter as we are, and it will come as somewhat of a surprise to them that as much as they hate this dreaded insurance in the first place, the price is still going to go up. And it literally did not cost labor any dollars, it cost management the dollars out of pocket. My concern then is, and if you are

listening anywhere and if you are in the gallery, Illinois State Chamber, Illinois Manufacturers Association, retail merchants and associated employers, I would ask you to do probably as good a job notifying every employer in the State of Illinois of this fine compromise, because I am certain that that's what Mr. Gibson, Jim Wright and all of the other leadership of unions are going to do. Every employee in the State of Illinois will know immediately that they have done a rather good job on compromising. My concern then would be to ask these associations that were represented and did an excellent job to go to the Revenue Department and get the tax number of every employer in the State of Illinois and send them the facts out early, not in a multi-newsletter, but a single statement that we represented you, Mr. Main Street man, who may not belong to any of our associations, small manufacturers who don't belong to any of our associations, and you did a good job representing them. They don't even know it, they won't know it till they get their next bill which will go up. And I'm not suggesting that that isn't their fault, but I would cooperate through my office any way I can to get the word out immediately to all employers of Illinois that this was the only way, they were well represented. You gentlemen on both sides of the question did a good job. My concern is the communication quickly to the uninformed who probably won't know until their price goes up and then they will hate us all the more. Thank you, very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Thank you for that lesson. Senator...Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have a...a question, I think, of Senator Bruce who detailed the...the benefits. Senator, I'm curious to know about the way the State-wide average weekly wage is used in computing benefits now. On

page 7, line 23 and 4, the bill says that notwithstanding any provisions of this section to the contrary, the State-wide average weekly wage for the benefit period beginning April 24, 1983 and ending January 31 shall be three hundred and twenty-one dollars. Now, is that the actual State-wide average weekly wage as determined by the Department of Labor, or is that simply an arbitrary figure that we're going to use for the purpose of figuring benefits?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

It is an arbitrary figure because we had to come up with a sixty-forty split. The actual wage that should be paid is three hundred and thirty-five dollars. To get the cost of the package, the savings in the employee benefit, you have to run the average back down to three twenty-one. It's an absolute...it's a figure based on how much each side was going to have to give up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Okay, but it's also true, is it not then, that that average...State-wide average weekly wage was just recently increased for unemployment compensation benefits? So, in fact, we're rolling it back to somewhat a little less than it was in December of 1982.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes. The...the cap came off on...on January the 1st, but you should remember the bill I handled eighteen months ago put the cap on for eighteen months, and we capped it on July 1st of 1981, it stayed till January 1st, and then it went up to three thirty-five. We are going to roll that back to

three twenty-one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Two...just two more points. One is that as I understand the bill then, once we complete the period covered by the bill, which is the end of Calendar '86 I believe, then do...this whole thing is...has a sunset provision and we go back to the current system which is recalculation of benefits every six months on the basis of the State-wide average weekly wage? Is that true? Thank you. One other point that I want to make, and I, too, congratulate those people who worked out this...this plan. I know that it's...it's a tough thing to do. One thing that I think we can all be proud of if we go home and talk to some of the small employers of this State, and that is that they have retained the break given to small employers who may have one person layed off, who had they not received the exemption that...that they have under the law might go from the minimum rate to the maximum rate, but instead of that, we have retained here in Illinois a maximum tax rate for small employers who have annual...or quarterly payrolls of fifty thousand dollars per quarter and less. And I think that's a very important thing for the small employers of this State. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Lemke. You're light is on, Senator. Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Rock may close debate.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would merely move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 and ask leave of the Body that when the bill is returned to 3rd, we...after intervening business, we can call it for passage. I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

3rd reading. With leave of the Body, we'll go to Consent Calendar Resolutions. Oh, we'll go to the adjournment resolution. Senate Joint Resolution No. 18, Senator Rock.

SECRETARY:

Senate...Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 offered by Senator Rock.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 18)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 18 is the adjournment resolution. It calls for us to return to Springfield after Easter on Tuesday, April the 5th, at the hour of noon. That's the same time the House will return when we adjourn today, and I would move for the suspension of the rules and the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 18.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion is adopted. Having had intervening business, with leave of the Body, we'll go to House bills 3rd reading. House Bill 327.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 327.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the compromise package with respect to the Unemployment Insurance Act. It is absolutely essential that this be passed and sent to the House and that the House further send it today to the Office of the Governor for his approval. I wish to congratulate all those who participated, it's been a long and arduous task. I particularly want to thank the members of the staff who worked late...until late last night and early this morning to make sure that we would have this before us. This will comprise over a three year period a 1.9 billion dollar program. It is worthy of your vote and I solicit an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. The question is, shall House Bill 327 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none voting Present. House Bill 327 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed.

PRESIDENT:

With leave of the Body, we will move to page 3 on the Calendar, Senate bills on 3rd reading. There is an appropriation that is of an emergency nature. Turn to page 3 on the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 177. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 177.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, this is a supplemental appropriation to the Illinois Department of Public Aid for one million eight thousand dollars. It's Federal money that is now available for our use in the WIN program, which is the Work Incentive Program, in the State, and it will allow us to use some Federal dollars to bring some people that have been layed off in that department back to work, hopefully, to reduce our public aid rolls.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this. This is, as Senator Schaffer correctly pointed out, an appropriation of one million plus dollars of Federal funds which will allow for the rehiring of approximately one hundred and twenty-six employees in the Department of Public Aid who have been layed off, and those employees will be working in the Work Incentive Program trying to get folks back to work, and it's a worthy cause and I think we ought to vote for it.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? With leave of the Body, Channel 17 wishes to shoot some film. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Any further discussion? Senator Schaffer, you wish to close? The question is, shall Senate Bill 177 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are 1, none voting

Present. Senate Bill 177 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of Motions...with leave of the Body, we'll move to the Order of Motions in Writing. Mr. Secretary, Senator Collins has a motion I am told.

SECRETARY:

Motion in writing. I move to recommit the following bills to the Committee on Labor and Commerce, to-wit: Senate Bill 25, 42 and 286. Dated March 24th, '83. Signed, Senator Collins.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I have consulted with the sponsors of these three bills, Senate Bill 25, 42, 286 that were passed out of the Labor and Commerce Commission this morning. However, in the spirit of cooperation and honest negotiations with the business people and...and labor who were tied up and working very hard to reach a compromise on the unemployment trust fund situation, we would like to recommit these bills back to the committee and give them an opportunity to appear before the committee to testify on these bills. And at this time, I move to recommit.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Senator Collins has moved to recommit those three bills to the Committee on Labor and Commerce for further hearing. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, it's so ordered. Senator Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President. With leave of the Body, I'd like to be added as a co-sponsor to Senate Bill 508, 509 and 510.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Marovitz on 508, 509 and 510. If you'll turn to page 2 on the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 3, Senator Joyce. Senate Bill 78, Senator Rigney. Senate Bill 105, Senator Zito. Senate Bill 124, Senator Berman. Senate Bill 127, Senator Vadalabene. Senate Bill 128, Senator Carroll. Senate Bill 134. Senate Bill 152, Senator Bloom. Senate Bill 173, Senator Vadalabene. 182, Senator Joyce. 275, Senator Carroll. Bottom of page 2, Senate Bill 275, 276. 347, the top of page 3, Senator Philip. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 347.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 405, Senator Coffey. Hold. Alright, you have on your desks the Resolutions Consent Calendar containing Senate Resolution 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, Senate Joint Resolution 15, House Joint Resolution 19, and added today were Senate Resolution 76, Senate Joint Resolution 17 and House Joint Resolution 12. Any objections been filed, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

No objections have been filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Alright, if not, Senator Hall then moves the adoption of the Resolution Consent Calendar. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolutions

are adopted. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 524 introduced by Senator Sangmeister.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

525, by Senator Fawell.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

526, Senator Nedza, Savickas and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

527, Senator Buzbee.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

528, Senators Marovitz, Demuzio and Degnan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

529, Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

530, by the same sponsor.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

573...531, Senators Smith and Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

532, Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

533, Senator Macdonald.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

534, by Senators Netsch and others.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Any further business to come before the Senate? Senator Hall, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR HALL:

I move we adjourn.

PRESIDENT:

No further business to come before the Senate, Senator Hall moves that the Senate stand adjourned until Tuesday, April the 5th, at the hour of noon. Tuesday, April 5. I

hope everyone and their family has a very happy Easter.
Tuesday, April 5th, at the hour of noon. The Senate stands
adjourned.