

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today will be Reverend William J. Peckham of Contact Ministries in Springfield. Reverend Peckham is a guest of Representative Mike Curran. Will the guests in the gallery please rise to join us in the invocation?"

Reverend Peckham: "Let us bow in prayer. Our Father, God, two prayers we have today. Let there be peace on earth, and let it begin here. And grant that something significant and helpful for the people of Illinois will happen in this chamber today. Amen."

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

Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. 111 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Greiman, do you have any excused absences? Thank you. Representative Fiel."

Fiel: "No excused absences at the present time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Is Representative Topinka in the chamber? Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2328, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Psychologist Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Topinka, would you come to the podium, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Further introductions. House Bill 2329, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the law in relation to criminal jurisprudence."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a recess until 1:45 for the purpose of a Republican Conference in room 118 in 10 minutes."

McPike: "The Gentleman has requested a Republican Conference in room 118. Representative Piel, do you have anything to add? Piel."

Piel: "Yes, would the record show that Representative Harris is an excused absence today, please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the record will so reflect. The House will stand at ease until 1:45 for a Republican Conference in room 118. If the Chair could have the Members' attention for just a minute, Representative Topinka would like to introduce some honored guests that we have with us today. Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Today, I think we're very well honored by having Delia Zieziulewicz of New London, Connecticut who has recently been installed as a Supreme President of the Supreme Emblem Club of the United States of America, and that occurred on September 23rd in Los Angeles. And also visiting is the Supreme Marshal, Frances Tuclisea, of New London, Connecticut and delegates from the Peoria and Watseka, Illinois area. The Supreme Emblem Club is a charitable organization whose members are wives and families of Elk Club members. There are 531 clubs throughout the United States and 45,000 members. So if you would join with me today in welcoming the Supreme President, Delia Zieziulewicz, and her delegation today."

Delia Zieziulewicz: "Thank you very much. We are very happy to be here. Have enjoyed your city, and we'll look forward to enjoying the rest of your state for the balance of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

week. Thank you."

Topinka: "And if maybe Frances Tuclisea of New London could also give us a message."

Frances Tuclisea: "I'm very pleased to be here in your State of Illinois. And it's very interesting, and I... I will be here for a few days enjoying the rest of the week."

Topinka: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The House will now be at ease until 1:45. The House will come to order. Introductions, First Readings."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2330, Representative Shaw, a Bill for an Act to authorize off-track betting in the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "On page seven of the Calendar, Amendatory Veto Motions. For the information of the Eody, on tomorrow's Calendar will appear a Subject Matter Order of Call, so that as we come to some Bills today, we will skip over them because they will be on tomorrow's Subject Matter Order of Call. So beginning on page seven... Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "You know, that's an interesting procedure to announce, and I don't have any particular problem with that procedure. But it would seem as if we ought to have some lists and that we ought to have that opportunity available to all Members, not to someone in a private room in the back of the chamber."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Vinson, your point is well taken. The Members may choose to have their Bill called as we get there simply in order to facilitate the Order of Business. I made that announcement. If a Member would like to have his Bill called today, that's certainly within the Member's right, and we will provide you with a list of Bills immediately. So we will start on page seven, and the first Bill that's not on a Subject Matter will be Senate Bill 97,

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Representative Brummer. Representative Matijeich in the Chair."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe my Motion in regard to Senate Bill 71 is on a Special Call."

Speaker Matijeich: "State and Local Government. We... We want to treat you preferentially if we can, Sam, at your request."

Vinson: "Oh, my Motion's on there, too?"

Speaker Matijeich: "You're going to be taken care of. Yes."

Vinson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. Okay. We're using our heads, Sam. Representative Brummer on House... Senate Bill 97."

Brummer: "Yes, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. Senate Bill 97 basically did two things. It provided that information be on... information be provided concerning the median level of assessment for any assessment district so the taxpayer could better understand whether the taxpayer was being assessed at the appropriate level or not. And it provided that taxpayers would have a right to appeal their assessment to the... to the Property Tax Appeal Board if the assessment exceeded thirty-three and a third percent of fair market value after the imposition of the multiplier. The Governor endorsed the first item. He opposed the second item and amendatorily removed that. In addition to that, the Governor added new language concerning notification to the taxpayer when there was a supervisor of assessment equalization factor used. I agree with the last portion. I think it was unfortunate that the Governor amendatorily vetoed out the provision that the taxpayers could appeal to the State Property Tax Appeal Board when the affect of the multiplier was to increase the assessment above thirty-three and a third percent, but

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

the Senate has accepted the the Governor's amendatory veto, and I think that's the only choice that's left to us at this point. And, therefore, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummer has moved to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor with regards to Senate Bill 97. On that, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question."

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

Vinson: "Representative, this is not the Bill in which the Governor deleted the requirement for the Department of Revenue to publish income tax data by school district. That is not involved in this particular..."

Brummer: "It was not in the original Bill, and I don't think it's part of the amendatory language."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to rise in support of Representative Brummer's Motion. This Bill, as it is amended, doesn't do everything that it set out to do, but it's still good legislation. It's good taxpayer legislation, and I think it should have our green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations of the Governor with regards to Senate Bill 97?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 71 votes because of the effective... immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present', and the Motion prevails. And the House does accept the specific language and

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

recommendations of the Governor with regards to Senate Bill 97. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 133 is on a Special Call. 149 is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 151, Rep... Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign."

Johnson: "I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change and would move to approve the amendatory veto made by the Governor on Senate Bill 151. It just makes minor technical changes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Johnson has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 151. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "Let me... Let me just... So we save debate here, let me just specifically say what the minor changes are."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Proceed."

Johnson: "The Bill... This Bill is a post-conviction relief Bill - a good law and order Bill. One of the things we thought, and the ACLU and others thought would make the Bill more palatable was to require that a different Judge hear the subsequent petition, subsequent post-conviction petition. I still think that was a good idea. The Governor didn't think it was a good idea, and among other reasons... the reason he didn't think it was a good idea was because in small counties, in areas where you oftentimes have only one sitting Judge, it would make it impractical to do. You know, I'm really reluctant to move to approve it; but, at this point, I don't think we have any choice. This is the way the Bill was originally approved in Committee. I

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

simply put on the Amendment that the Governor took off as an accommodation to ACLU. It still makes sense in terms of providing protection for the public against frivolous post-conviction petitions, and that's the reason I want to approve the Governor's specific recommendations for change. I didn't mean to preempt Representative Cullerton, but I wanted to be a little more specific in what the minor changes were."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm glad that Representative Johnson was more specific. We just would disagree as to whether or not the changes are minor or not. It would... It seems to me that this minor change was what was necessary to get the Bill out of Committee. I think that the Members of the Judiciary Committee felt that this provision which the Governor removed was essential to the Bill. What we're saying here is that frivolous post-conviction petitions can... it can be dismissed easier than they can be now. Well, it doesn't make any sense to me that the same Judge, the same trial Judge who presided over the trial can be impartial when it comes to considering whether or not a post-conviction petition is frivolous. We've had similar legislation with regard to whether or not a Judge should be... exclude himself for cause from hearing a case, because he is familiar with the parties. That petition is not heard by that Judge, because he can't be impartial. It's unfortunate that the Sponsors of this legislation didn't decide to override the Governor's veto. It would have been very easy for Senator Sangmeister and Representative Johnson to do that. And I suggest that since the veto message is technically defective anyway for failure to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

properly amend the title of the Bill, that we could put this Bill in again, and pass it again, and have the Governor sign it and would have, in effect, the same effective date as this Bill. So, I think that the Governor's made a mistake. I don't see the problem of the shortness of Judges in smaller counties, because I think that it's easy enough to get at least two Judges together to rule on post-conviction hearings and petitions. And for that reason, at this time, I would oppose the Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative John Dunn."

John Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The problem with post-conviction hearings is that many of the petitions are, in fact, frivolous. The present practice, however, is to take a look at them in one hearing and rule against them, because they really are frivolous. If this Bill becomes law, it will not speed things up at all; because, to determine whether the petition is frivolous or not frivolous, the Judge is going to have to look at everything which went before, including transcripts if they are available. If a Judge decides that the petition is frivolous, he will only be doing what a Judge does now. If the Judge decides that a petition is not frivolous, then yet another hearing will have to be scheduled. The only thing this Bill can do is require more hearings, not fewer hearings. The Judges now dismiss these petitions out of hand when they are frivolous in nature. They have been doing so. They can continue to do so. This is not needed legislation. It will cause more hearings, not fewer hearings, and I would recommend a vote against passage of this Bill on any Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Alexander."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Johnson: "Yeah."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Alexander: "Tim, normally when there is a final judgment in any criminal case, there's a 30 day appeal period. If this Bill passes as amended, would that 30 day appeal period still be in the record?"

Johnson: "Would it be what?"

Alexander: "Would the 30 day, after final order or judgment, would that still prevail, the 30 day appeal time?"

Johnson: "Oh, yeah, it doesn't affect that at all. Post-conviction petitions are ones that are filed after the time for appeal has passed and... and, in some cases, after an appeal has either been affirmed or denied. So it wouldn't affect that at all."

Alexander: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Johnson to close."

Johnson: "This Bill passed in House Judiciary, Senate Judiciary, on the House floor and in the full Senate by overwhelming margins. The reason the Bill passed is very simple. When individuals sit in the penitentiary with nothing else to do, oftentimes what they'll do is to file post-conviction petitions asking that the court in almost every case frivolous grounds, because if they weren't frivolous grounds they would have been raised on appeal to begin with - Representative Alexander has spoken well to that - and require a court, appoint a lawyer and incur overwhelming expenses, substantial expenses, simply to deny a post-conviction petition. All this does is to provide that the court can dismiss the petition where it determines that the petition is frivolous or patently without merit. The Bill was amended in the House, not in Committee. It wasn't necessary to get it out of Committee, as Representative Cullerton said - I think he just misreclected that - to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

require that the Judge evaluating the petition for such purpose shall not be the same one that presided over the original trial. The Governor felt that that Amendment was too onerous, that it wouldn't work in the 96 or 97 smaller counties in the state and that that was simply a... provision that watered down this Bill to some extent. I don't have strong feelings about the Amendment. I don't have strong feelings about the Governor's veto on it, but it passed overwhelmingly on Representative... Senator Sangmeister's Motion in the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we have some order in here? We're trying to listen to Representative Johnson. It's noisy. We can't hear back in the back."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let us have order in the chambers. Please have order in the chambers so that we can hear these closing remarks. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Representative Winchester. If you voted for this Bill last spring because you felt that the state was incurring substantial expenses, court time and everything else on frivolous post-conviction petitions by people that didn't have anything else to do, then you should be for this Bill even more as the Governor made it a stronger Bill in that sense by his amendatory veto. It was passed by overwhelming margins in each chamber because of the consensus, I think, in both chambers that the process of effective law enforcement can be expedited by this procedure. It still allows petitions with merit to be granted, attorneys to be appointed and the appropriate expenses incurred, but it says if your petition is without merit and frivolous, then the state ought not to log the expense for that. And for those reasons, I urge a 'yes'

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

vote on this Motion to override... or not to override, but to approve the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before we get to the question, there are two Members, Representative Laurino, William Laurino and Roger McAuliffe, who are now in attendance, and we show them now on the attendance quorum call. On Motion of Representative Johnson, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 151, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 61 'ayes', 29 'nays', and 10 answering 'present'. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "And Representative Cullerton asks for a verification. Representative Johnson asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Berrios... I'm sorry. Berrios voted 'present'. Christensen. DiPrima. Ewing. Farley. Giglio. Harris. Hicks. Hober. Keane. Kulas. Leverenz. Levin. Mautino. McGann. Neff. Richmond. Ronan and Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dunn asks leave to be verified. Leave. The count is 61 'ayes', 20... 29 'nays', and Representative Cullerton on a question... Oh, read the affirmative vote. I'm sorry. He hasn't read them yet. Representative Neff, leave to be verified. Oh, no, you want to be voted 'aye'. Representative Neff voting 'aye'. There are now 62. Representative Yourell? Record Representative... Change Representative Yourell from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Turner from 'aye' to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

'present'... to 'no'. I'm sorry. 'Aye' to 'no', Representative Turner. Representative Eomer 'aye'. Poll the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Earger. Barnes. Birkinbine. Brummer. Churchill. Cowlshaw. Daniels..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Shaw. One moment. Representative Shaw from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Didrickson. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Hallock. Hastert. Hawkinson. Hensel. Hoffman. Homer. Johnson..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Marzuki from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Johnson. Karpel. Kirkland. Klemm. Koehler. Laurino. Mays. McAuliffe. McCracken. McMaster. Mulcahey. Neff. Nelson. Oblinger. Olson. Panayotovich. B. Pederson. W. Peterson. Piel. Pierce. Fullen. Bea. Ropp. Ryder. Saltsman. Slape. Stuffle. Tate. Topinka. Tuerk. Van Dyne. Vinson. Wait. Winchester. Wojcik..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "I don't... I don't want to... I don't want to lose this Bill, and if one or two votes get knocked off, I might. Representative Cullerton and I have talked, and I think there's appropriate vehicles for putting the Bill in the same form that I passed it and Senator Sangmeister passed it in the spring. And I think Representative Cullerton wants to do that. So, we're going to do that this week. So you might as well just take the Bill out of the record now, and it will be back later this afternoon or tomorrow without the Governor's amendatory veto on it. I want to save some time. We're going to be here all day."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I don't know if we can take it out. We can... The Motion can fail. It's under 59. I mean it's around 59..."

Johnson: "It's at... It's at 59. Just... With unanimous leave we can do anything around here, so, if nobody objects let's take it out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I'm not sure about that. Well, let's... let's have the Motion fail, and then you can remake the Motion, too. I think that's a better way to do it. This... What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this Motion, there are 59 'ayes' and 32 'nos', and this Motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost."

Johnson: "Then we could..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You could..."

Johnson: "We just refile the Motion..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You can refile a Motion."

Johnson: "... put together this Conference Committee. That's fine."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right. Senate Bill 176, Bastert. Representative Bastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 176 is a Bill that passed out of here with a very high number of votes. It was changed by the Governor. What the Bill did was, actually, was the assessor accountability Bill. What the Governor did was to make some minor changes in order for the Department of Revenue to make some rules and regs to fall under this Bill. He changed the effective date to those assessments made in 1984 for the 1985 tax year. I ask that, or I move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto on 176."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bastert has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

change with respect to Senate Bill 176. On that,  
Representative Dunn."

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

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

John Dunn: "Is it possible, at the present time, to provide  
equalization of multipliers inside a county, township  
multipliers, for example, and who does that?"

Hastert: "Well, Representative, at this time it is possible to  
change that... to change a multiplier or... apply a  
township multiplier within a county. This Bill says that  
it's the responsibility of the law, and this Bill enforces  
it. It's responsibility of the supervisor of assessor. If  
the supervisor of assessor fails to do it, then the Board  
of Review does it, and both of those bodies, both the  
supervisor of assessor and the Board of Review are under  
the auspices of the county board. So ultimately, it's the  
county board's responsibility to make those... sure that  
those people follow through on the... their constitutional  
and legal duty."

John Dunn: "Does the Board of Review have authority to impose  
township multipliers at the present time?"

Hastert: "This.. They do have... No, they don't have."

John Dunn: "Who does it now?"

Hastert: "The supervisor of assessor and... I'm sorry... The  
Board of Review can put forth a township multiplier at this  
time."

John Dunn: "But... But the supervisor of assessments cannot yet  
do that. Is that correct?"

Hastert: "I can't hear you."

John Dunn: "This Bill would allow the supervisor of assessments  
to impose township multipliers, but at the present time he  
cannot do that. Is that correct?"

Hastert: "This Bill mandates that township assessors assess at

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

thirty-three and a third percent of assessed valuation. There are some... supervisor of assessors whose counties are not at that level at this time."

John Dunn: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Majority Leader, Representative Jim McPike. McPike."

McPike: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

McPike: "Representative, does this Bill stand on its own, or is this to be read in conjunction with 644?"

Hastert: "This Bill is melded into 644. It.."

McPike: "We... We passed that last week?"

Hastert: "Yes, we did."

McPike: "Okay, would you then explain the two Bills as read together? What carrot and stick proposals do they offer to the assessors now?"

Hastert: "This Bill offers a... The two Bills offers a 3,000 dollar stipend to assessors, supervisor of assessors, and with 644 the township assessors if they meet certain criteria. Those criteria are having their taxing districts assessed at thirty-three and a third and meeting certain criteria of coefficient dispersion which is a sliding scale starting at 20 and over a six year period coming to 15."

McPike: "And what is the stick?"

Hastert: "The stick is that the county boards, and this is in 176, the stick is that the county boards will not receive the supervisors' half of... the state's half of the supervisors' salary, if they do not meet that thirty-three and a third level. There are other old parts of this Bill that we amended out of there, and you and I had agreed to do that."

McPike: "Well, to the Bill, I would like to compliment the Legislator for his hard work on this. I think it's an

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

important tool to bring the multiplier in line and to also to force the local officials to do their job. And I, again, would like to compliment him on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, two brief questions if the Sponsor will yield."

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

Brummer: "Does the state currently pay one half of the salary of the supervisor of assessment?"

Hastert: "Yes, it does."

Brummer: "And... And this would provide that that state payment would not be made if assessments were not within a certain range?"

Hastert: "If the... There's... There's two safety valves in this. First of all, if the supervisor assessor doesn't do it, then if the county board of review doesn't do it, under the auspices of the board, then that penalty will be to the board."

Brummer: "Okay, but that will not affect the salary of the supervisor of assessment."

Hastert: "No, it won't."

Brummer: "And what is the date by which that range has to be met for the state to continue to have its obligation of co-payment?"

Hastert: "That was one of the amendatory vetoes on here. The amendatory part of the veto was that it doesn't come until 1984 assessments which is the 1985 tax year."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert to close."

Hastert: "Well, I think this Bill has been fairly thoroughly discussed, and I just ask for your affirmative support."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Representative Hastert's Motion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to House

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Bill 176, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 6 'nos', 1 answering 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House... Senate Bill 176, by the adoption of the Amendment. Now, I understand I went right by Representative Ronan's Bill, Senate Bill 149, which is on Special Subject Call, but he desires to hear it today. Representative Ronan on Senate Bill 149."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 149. This is the gasohol exemption Bill. Illinois is the leader in the country on the production and consumption of gasohol. What this Bill does was to... to exempt the sales tax, four percent of the sales tax on gasohol. When the Bill was changed in the Senate, they changed that to five percent. My original intent was to make it only a four percent exemption, and I agree with the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ronan has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 149 by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 149, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

question, there are 108 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 answering 'present', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. And the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 149 by the adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 187, Brummer, is on a Subject Call. Senate Bill 228, Panayotovich, is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 286, Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson, on Senate Bill 286."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would at this point yield to the Minority Leader, Representative Daniels."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Minority Leader, Representative Daniels. Lee Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a former Member here with us today, Betty Lou Reed, who now works for Congressman John Porter, and if I might introduce Betty Lou Reed over standing next to Jack Davis. Betty Lou Reed. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Welcome back, Betty. Thank you. Now, Representative Vinson on Senate Bill 286."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 286, I believe, is a... was a noncontroversial Bill, and I believe the amendatory veto is noncontroversial. The Bill applies to local governmental units and nonprofit organizations which employ part-time employees. The Bill provided that if a worker was employed simultaneously at a full-time job and a part-time job with the local governmental unit or nonprofit organization and then the worker was laid off from the full-time private job, that the part-time employer, the local governmental unit or nonprofit group, would not be liable for payment of the unemployment insurance tax. The Governor amendatorily vetoed the Bill but endorsed the concept presented in 286."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Minor changes were necessary for the purpose of clarity and consistency. The amendatory veto is technical in nature, and I would move that the House do accept the Governor's amendatory veto in regard to Senate Bill 286."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to Senate Bill 286 by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 286, by the adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action requiring 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's... the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 286 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 304, Representative Giorgi. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill has to do with community action programs. The Bill provided that block grants should be allocated in proportion to the poverty level population served by each community action agency. The amendatory veto would allow the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to allocate the funds according to rules promulgated by that Department, and I accept the Governor's amendatory veto and urge the adoption of it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi moves that the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 304, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Better wait until

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

we clear the board. Is there any discussion? We're having a little problem with the machine. We'll be at ease for a moment. Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 304, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', 1 'nay', and no 'present', and the Motion prevails, receiving the Constitutional Majority. And the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 304, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 306, Representative Keane. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative James Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur in the Governor's Amendment to Senate Bill 306. The Bill dealt with NIFC - the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission - and the size of its... the number of its commissioners. The Governor agrees with the provisions of the Bill, but what he did was he merged the provisions of House Bill 1308 which amends the same Sections of the statute as does 306 so that there would be no conflict. The NIFC - the Northeastern Planning Commission - stands behind the... or has accepted the... and wants the Governor's amendatory veto, and I would ask for the House to accept the Governor's Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Keane moves that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 306, by the adoption of the Amendment. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

recommendation for changes regarding Senate Bill 306, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 104 'ayes', 7 'nays'. The... This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 306, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 403, Representative Jeff Mays. Representative Mays. Representative Jeff Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4... or Senate Bill 403 is very similar to Senate Bill 286 which just... in which we... in action earlier today, we upheld the Governor's suggested recommendations of change. In 286, we applied it to local governments. This applies to not-for-profit agencies and the like. This will assure that not-for-profit agencies who employ part-time people will not be charged back for those people who have been employed full time and then subsequently laid off. The Governor's changes are very technical in nature. They were adopted overwhelmingly by the Senate last week, and I would move for acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mays moves that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to Senate Bill 403, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Representative Sam Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you rule that the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Governor's amendatory veto in this particular case is unconstitutional, because he exceeded the amendatory veto powers. The subject matter which he seeks to incorporate in the amendatory veto, on this particular Bill, is totally unrelated and ungermane to the subject matter in the original Senate Bill 403. And I would ask you to make that ruling at this time."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll be at ease for a moment while we take a look at the Governor's veto. With leave of the House, this Bill will be taken out of the record so that the Parliamentarian can look over the veto message and rule on that point of order. Leave, and the Bill is taken out of the record. And we'll return to it. The next Bill is Senate Bill 448. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyn. Is Representative Van Duyn here? Out of the record. Senate Bill 482, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Helen Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto message on Senate Bill 482. It simply provides additional clarifying language so that the owners of antique boilers for railroad locomotives will make sure that the vehicle has been appropriately constructed. And with this amendatory veto, I think it simply clarifies that the proof has to be on the owner. I would ask for the acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 482, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 482, by the adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. The House does... This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 482, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 501 is on a Special Subject Call. Senate Bill 512, Representative Nelson. Representative Nelson. Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 512. Senate Bill 512 allows the corporate officers of a small business to withdraw themselves from coverage under the Workers' Compensation Act. We have talked about this before this year. And a small business is defined in Chapter 127 as a business which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operations. The Governor's changes have to do with adding a specific definition for the term 'corporate officers' and correcting another problem in the Bill that makes it very much like what we have already done when we accepted his amendatory veto language for House Bill 292. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have, but I move now that we do accept the amendatory veto on Senate Bill 512."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nelson moves that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 512 by the adoption of the Amendment. There... No discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 512,

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 512 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 536 is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 576, Representative Leverenz. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move on Senate Bill 576 that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto. It removes the technicians that work for veterinarians. It's a simple change, a simple deletion. I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Leverenz has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 576. Is there any discussion? Representative John Dunn, Gentleman from Macon."

John Dunn: "Yeah, who wants this doggie Bill?"

Leverenz: "Would you repeat your question, Sir?"

John Dunn: "No."

Speaker Matijeich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 576, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', no 'nays'.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 576, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Leave of the House, we will now revert back to Senate Bill 403, Representative Mays. And on the point of parliamentary inquiry by... by Representative Sam Vinson, the Chair will rule that the Governor was within his scope by the Amendment offered on Senate Bill 403. And Representative Vinson further on Senate Bill 403."

Vinson: "Yes, would the Chair elaborate on that ruling?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No."

Vinson: "The Chair does find that the amendatory veto is germane?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Is in order."

Vinson: "Was it germane to the Bill?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Vinson: "It was germane, and for that reason, it's in order?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mays to close. I think Representative Mays has closed. So the question is, 'Shall the... Shall the House accept...' Representative Mays, do you want to close? He's running back to his..."

Mays: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 403, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Motion, having received the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 403, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 581, Representative McCracken. Representative McCracken on Senate Bill 581."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to override the Governor's amendatory veto of 581 for the reason that the Governor has amended this procedural change in the law to apply prospectively only, even to causes of action which have already arisen but not yet been filed. That is in contravention of the historical practice of making procedural changes in the law to apply both retroactively and prospectively. This does not create any new rights under the law. It merely facilitates the bringing of a suit and the defense of a suit relative to unincorporated associations. Essentially, it places them in the same posture as other entities under the law. I would ask that the General... or this House override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken has moved that Senate Bill 581 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Is there any discussion? We'll have to wait a moment. We're having a little trouble with the machine again. Representative Dunn, are you seeking recognition?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

John Dunn: "If this Bill becomes law, how do you define voluntary unincorporated association? And how do you provide for continuity of membership of that association during the pendency of litigation?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "The judgement, as I understand it, or the right to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

sue would be against the entity itself regardless of its change in membership. The membership, I believe, is required to be kept under current law, so that it would have the same type of accounting as corporations currently do."

John Dunn: "And... And then what... How do you know who your defendants are if the... if the neighborhood block club is a voluntary association today, but tomorrow the membership all changes? Who are the defendants? And... And if you get a judgment, from whom do you collect?"

McCracken: "The defend..."

John Dunn: "Last week's membership or this week's membership?"

McCracken: "The defendant is the association. It is not the individuals, as I understand it, under this Bill, because the suit can now be brought in the name of the entity rather than each individual member so that the judgment would be against that entity."

John Dunn: "And what are the legal implications of that if... if the entity is not a partnership, a corporation or some other legally recognized entity that we know how to get at?"

McCracken: "Well, it... it isn't correct to state that a voluntary unincorporated association is not a legally recognized entity. Savings and loans are voluntary unincorporated associations. There are business-type associations and other not-for-profit or charitable organizations, so that... so that the entity does have recognition in the law currently."

John Dunn: "So you're saying that the term is defined somewhere?"

McCracken: "Yes, Sir."

John Dunn: "I haven't... I haven't looked for it, but it does... Does it exclude things like an ad hoc group that is formed this week and is out of business next week?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

McCracken: "It... It would not exclude it by its terms. No. However, a voluntary unincorporated association under Illinois law can only be formed by agreement of the members. That agreement typically is in writing but doesn't have to be."

John Dunn: "I guess what I'm really saying is if you... if you get a judgment against such an association as is described here, and they... they smell the judgment coming, they will do something to disband or disappear, and obtaining a judgment would be waste of time."

McCracken: "Well, it isn't any different than the current status of a partnership. The law has been recently changed to allow suit against partnerships in their own name now. So..."

John Dunn: "But I think if you get a judgment against a partnership, you can pursue against the members, but... I'm prolonging this too much, I guess. It may be an alright Bill. I just don't understand it."

McCracken: "No. Typ... Typically, what I ... Typically what I would expect to see now is that associations and their bylaws or the articles would create a system of... of enforcing judgments against the entity as to the members current at that time. I would expect that to occur."

John Dunn: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

John Dunn: "I hope what the Sponsor's indicated does happen, but he has more faith in unincorporated associations than I do. Most of them operate quite informally. A lot of them have no bylaws. They just agree to meet and do something. And do something that gets them in trouble, this says that their association will be exposed to a suit which may be a good concept, but I don't know what you do with the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

judgment after you get it. So I really question, not the intent of the Sponsor whose intention is well meaning, but the implications of the Bill if it becomes law. I'm not sure it will be so helpful as it appears."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign."

Johnson: "Representative Dunn represents Decatur which is a heavy labor union intensive area. The classic example of where this Bill would be applicable is with respect to labor unions. It doesn't seem reasonable to require a labor union, when trying to pursue its legal rights, to name each one of the 3,000 members of its union as a party plaintiff. For one thing, it adds about 70 pages to all the pleadings. And likewise, where a labor union or another association is a defendant in the case, it doesn't make sense to require every member of the union to be named as a party defendant. This Bill is really intended to make some sense out of what's really an archaic status of the law in Illinois and makes Illinois almost unique in... in terms of the ridiculous excesses that the current status of the law requires to go to. I think this is a good Bill, and it's one that's only permissive anyway. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 581 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes three-fifths vote, 71 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 100 'ayes', 10 'nos', 1 answering 'nay' (sic - 'present'), and the Motion prevails. And Senate Bill 581 does pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, having received the Constitutional three-fifths vote, and this Bill is hereby declared passed."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Senate Bill 582. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 582 was the technical correction Bill for the Illinois inheritance tax abolition. The Governor's amendatory veto only changed the effective date of the Bill to conform with the effective date of the original abolition, which is January 1st, 1983. I find no objection to it and would, therefore, move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Churchill moves that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 582, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Having none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 582, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. It's final action requiring 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays', and the Motion prevails. The House... Having received the Constitutional Majority, the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 582, by the adoption of the Amendment, and the Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 591 and 619 are on Special Subject Call. Senate Bill 713, Representative Satterthwaite. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 713. It is clarifying language, and I believe that there is no objection to the change. It really clarifies that we are

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

talking about medical research and high technology parks, rather than industrial parks which was the language of the original Bill. And I move for acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 713, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman? Turn your light off. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 713, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action requiring 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 713, by the adoption of the Amendment. And the Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 736, Representative Homer. Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would move to override the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 736. I don't believe... Mr. Clerk, perhaps you'd want to put the Bill... Thank you. Senate Bill 736 was a Bill that authorized constitutional officers to accept monetary grants from private sources for the purpose of the official administration of duties of their office. The Bill, as initially passed, required legislative oversight in the form of appropriation authority before these monies could be spent. The Governor's amendatory veto would eliminate the legislative prerogative to appropriate for

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

these funds. The purpose of the Motion to override would be to reinstate the legislative prerogative and to require, in fact, legislative appropriation before these funds could be spent. I would, therefore, urge you to vote 'yes' to override."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer moves that Senate Bill 736 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Is there any discussion? There's a... Representative Mays. Representative Mays, are you seeking attention?"

Mays: "Yes, thank you. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Mays: "What specifically was the change that the Governor made on this Bill, Representative?"

Homer: "Okay. Under the original form of the Bill, Representative Mays, the... before these monies could be spent by any constitutional officer, even though they were given by a private grant, it would still require the legislature to appropriate those funds. The Governor's veto eliminated the need for the Legislature to appropriate those funds. So under the Governor's amendatory veto, if a grant were made, then that constitutional officer could go ahead and spend that money without any control at all or oversight by the Legislature. The override would put back in the legislative prerogative to appropriate, or rather the requirement that the Legislature, in fact, appropriate before those funds could be spent."

Mays: "Thank you very much. To the... To the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Mays: "It would seem that by not accepting the Governor's recommendations for change on this piece of legislation, we would, indeed, be inhibiting the ability or the desire of private individuals or groups who contribute to a given organiz... to a give constitutional officer or not. Take,

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

for example, you know, in the case of the Attorney General's Office where apparently they have some funds that are going through on a donated basis. They've given it to that specific Office under the faith that that Office will expend those funds in a responsible manner. However, once the Legislature gets involved in trying to appropriate funds that are not, indeed, public funds or there would be a question as to public funds, I think this would inhibit the choices that would be made by the individual or group that would like to give a contribution for a specific area of his concern."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinscn."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion on Senate Bill 736. I understand, I think, the purposes and intents of the Governor's amendatory veto. And I understand Representative Mays' points about those and those are well taken. But I believe, in this particular case, there's another point that can be made. The Legislature would have, under the Bill that would become law if we override the veto, appropriation authority for the money. We would be able, with that, to have some control and some influence on how that money is spent. And by facilitating this process, we might make it possible to some limited extent to avoid the need for further taxation. We may be able to avoid... to accomplish good public policy and good public policy objectives with no need for appropriated tax money. And I believe that for that reason this is a good process to create, and I believe it will be held adequately in check by the Legislature's authority in the appropriations process and by, for that matter, the Governor's authority in the appropriations process in respect to vetoes. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote on the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Gentleman's Motion to override on Senate Bill 736."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gordon Ropp."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Ropp: "Representative, would you give us... Does this Bill set any minimal or maximum amounts that might be given to those constitutional officers, or give me an example, would you please?"

Homer: "No, there is no minimum or maximum amount specified at all. Recently, a private foundation in Chicago gave a 100,000 dollar grant to the Attorney General's Office for the purpose of senior citizen advocacy litigation. Without this specific enabling legislation, that grant money would have to be forfeited or returned. As Representative Vinson very well expressed, this applies, of course, not just to one office, but to all constitutional officers. And we, certainly, would want to encourage, I believe, private foundations to grant money to the state to allow the state constitutional officers to do jobs that they would otherwise have to do only at the taxpayers' expense. But specific answer, Representative Ropp, there is no minimum or maximum amounts set forth in this... in this provision."

Ropp: "One other final question. Can a group that wants to give a constitutional officer certain funds, can they state specifically how those funds are to be spent and does that constitutional officer have to comply, or can he use his best judgment in how to spend those funds after the grant is given?"

Homer: "No, they... The law would specifically provide, and this is also in response to a... to a concern expressed by Representative Mays that the... the expenditure of that gift or donation would be limited by the terms of the gift, as in all cases where a donor has given money with the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

expressly stated purposes for which it is to be spent. So the constitutional officer, for example, would not be able to accept a grant for one purpose and spend it on some other purpose without being liable to the donor. So they are limited by the expressed intent of the person or the foundation who gave the grant."

Ropp: "In other words, whatever that particular foundation would want to... want to do, that constitutional officer would have to comply with the giver."

Homer: "That is correct."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Klemm. Dick Klemm."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Klemm: "Will these trust funds that are established for these accounts, would they be audited by the Auditor General?"

Homer: "Well, that was... that's an excellent question. I think if the Governor's veto were not overridden there would be some question as to that, because there would be a question as to whether the Auditor General would have any jurisdiction where the Legislature did not appropriate or have the authority to appropriate. Clearly, if the veto is overridden and the Legislature does have the authority to appropriate, then very clearly the Auditor General would have the duty to audit these expenditures."

Klemm: "Alright. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "I think that we've thoroughly discussed the Bill, and I think some legitimate questions have been risen here... here today which were answered, I think, very well by Representative Vinson with regard to those raised by Representative Mays. I would just simply ask for your affirmative vote in overriding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Representative Homer's Motion, the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 736 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action requiring three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 107 'aye', 4 'nays', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, prevails. And the... Senate Bills 10... 736 does pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Senate... I understand we went by Senate Bill 619, Representative McCracken. It's on a Subject Call, Special Call, but he desires to hear it now. Senate Bill 619, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for returning to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur in the Governor's specific recommendation for changes embodied in the amendatory veto to Senate Bill 619. This is the prior inconsistent statement Bill which passed out of both bodies and provides that where a witness at trial, if he were to testify inconsistently with the statement previously made by that same person under any of the carefully restricted circumstances provided in the Bill, that witness could be confronted by the attorney for either side with that inconsistent statement that he had previously made. Then whether the witness acknowledged the prior statement, denied it, or attempted to explain it away or claim that he or she does not recall it, the prior statement would be admissible substantively for the fact finders consideration. The changes which were adopted from the original Bill by Floor Amendment were to limit the application of this Bill to situations commonly known as the hostile witness situation. The Governor's Amendment, I think, is persuasive on the issue of whether or not that is a relevant concern in this area. I believe that the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Governor's correct in not accepting what was my Amendment on the floor in the House in the spring, and I would concur in the amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken moves that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to Senate Bill 619, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was, I believe, drafted, and its genesis came from a professor at the University of Illinois, Mike Graham, who wrote an article for the Michigan Law Review which I have reviewed. And I spoke with Mr. Graham concerning this legislation, and he felt that it was important that, for the purposes of legislative intent, a few things be read into the record. And I certainly agree with him, and I perhaps could do it in the form of a question with Representative McCracken. The Bill states that... on... the original Bill on lines 18 and 19 that the witnesses... one of the conditions, before these inconsistent statements be admissible, is that the witness is... that the statement, itself, narrates, describes or explains an event or condition of which the witness had personal knowledge. Now, in his law review article, he makes it clear that this is personal knowledge of the event itself or... in the criminal area of the crime. It's not personal knowledge of the admission, itself, but of the crime, itself. Representative McCracken, is that your understanding of our intent with respect to this Bill?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I know I'm supposed to say yes, but I'll be candid.

I did not think that was the limitation on it."

Cullerton: "Okay. That's why it's important, I think, that we...

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

that we cover this, and I did talk to the gentleman, Mr. Graham who's a professor at the University of Illinois. Let me just indicate that only a witness with personal... I'll even quote from his article. 'Only a witness with personal knowledge of the subject matter of a prior inconsistent statement can be cross-examined about whether the statement is truthful. And the requirement excludes from evidence all prior statements of a witness that merely narrate a third person's declaration unless the witness also has personal knowledge that the facts underline a third person's statement. Thus a witness's prior statement that he had heard a criminal defendant make an incriminating admission would be inadmissible as substantive evidence unless the witness had personal knowledge of the incriminating conduct itself. In effect, the personal knowledge requirement excludes from evidence those statements most open to fabrication.' I would, secondly, point out that in the next line of the Bill, it says that the... the statement... another condition is that the statement is proved to have been written or signed by the witness. Now law... The statute doesn't say this, but it's my understanding that this means it's proved to the courts' satisfaction and that standard would be more probably true than not true. And I would further point out that Subsection 2(c) says that the statement is proved to have been accurately recorded by a tape recorder, video-tape recording or any other similar electronic means of sound recording. The reason why that's in the Bill is to specifically discourage oral statements or, to put it another way, to encourage law enforcement officials to use tape recorders or video-tape recording in taking statements of witnesses. So with... with those... with that background of the Bill, and I can assure Members of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

General Assembly that Mr. Graham was really the motivating force behind the Bill, and with... I think we should, in fact, incorporate in our legislative intent the... of the article that he drafted concerning the Bill. And for those reasons, I would support the Bill and support the Governor's amendatory veto when he took out an Amendment that I put on in the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 619, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. It's final action. It requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 106 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 answering 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. The House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 619 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 919, Representative... Steczo. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to accept the Governor's recommendation for change on Senate Bill 919. The Governor made two changes in the Bill in his amendatory veto. One dealt with a retroactive tax exemption for the Prairie Path Corporation. The Governor deleted that language. He indicated that this same Corporation had filed a petition with the Illinois Department of Revenue for a tax exemption, and the fact that this one would be retroactive would mean... would require refunds by Cook County taxing districts and, therefore, would be unfair. Secondly, there was a

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

provision that dealt with a clarification of property tax exemptions for park district properties. The Governor deleted that language saying that it was surplusage; however, although it was not surplusage and no one from the Governor's Office bothered to call either myself, Senator Zito or the other persons involved who could clarify that or staff, nevertheless, that language was stricken. Because that Bill is scheduled for a Subcommittee hearing and will be heard during the next Session, it's our intention, Mr. Speaker, to concur with the Governor's recommendations, and I renew my Motion to accept his recommendations for change on Senate Bill 919."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 919. Is there any discussion? Be at ease for a moment. We're having trouble with the machine again, and a repair man's on the way, by the way. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 919, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. This requires Three-Fifths Majority because of the immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, prevails. The House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 919 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. 942 out of the record. Senate Bill 995, Representative Tate. Representative Tate."

Tate: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. It's just a very

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

technical change. He was... The Governor was uncomfortable with a little of the language, and I move to accept. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tate moves to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 995, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I... I couldn't understand the explanation of what the amendatory veto does."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tate, do you want to run through that again? Representative Tate is going to run through this again."

Tate: "Well, Representative Cullerton, if you look at the stated reasons for the Governor's veto message, the... probably the last three sentences are the most important. The Bill originally said, 'with the intent of illegally obtaining the proceeds of an insurance policy'. The Governor substitutes one sentence, 'with the intent to defraud an insurer', and that is virtually the only change. He did not... he was uncomfortable with the conclusionary language."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is that acceptable, Representative Cullerton? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, if Representative Vinson wanted to find a Bill where the Governor exceeded his authority, he might want to look at this one. I think this would be a good one... because the Bill doesn't do anything at all, and this does even less with his amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tate to close."

Tate: "Well, that should be a good reason for you to vote for it then, Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

to Senate Bill 995, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 5 'nays', 8 answering 'present', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. And the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 995, by the adoption of the Amendment, and the Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 996, Ronan, is on a Special Call. He wants to go with it. Senate Bill 996, Representative Ronan, Gentleman from Cook."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto of Senate Bill 996. All it does is restores the original language of the Bill, and I move to accept his recommendation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ronan moves to accept the Governor's specific recommendations with regard to Senate Bill 996 by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is... Oh, Representative Johnson, I'm sorry."

Johnson: "I agree that the Amendment... the amendatory veto doesn't substantially change the Bill, but just so people know what they are voting on... would you ask Representative Ronan if he'd just tell us briefly what the Bill did when it went through the first time?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yeah, it's in the analysis, Representative Vinson."

Speaker Matijevich: "How about for those of us who can't read, Representative Ronan?"

Ronan: "Okay. What... what this Bill does, it's... it restored the seven day time limit in place of the seventy-two hour notification to return property. In other words, if

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEPARTMENT

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

somebody steals a car, they have to return it within seven days. That's all."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I'm going to vote for the Bill. That really isn't what the Bill does; but, since that's the best explanation we've gotten out of Honan for the last couple of weeks, I'd better accept it and vote for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 996, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action, requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 answering 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 996 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1001 is on a Special Call. 1025 is on a Special Call. 1033, Special Call. 1070, Special Call. Senate Bill 1104, Representative Wolf. Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the provisions of Senate Bill 1104 be adopted, the amendatory veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Senate Bill 1104, as passed by the Legislature originally, dealt with the suspension of drivers' licenses for second offenses in the passing of school buses, together with a provision to require that school buses be required to stop at grade crossings on four lane highways having a speed in excess of 45 miles per hour. The Governor, in his amendatory veto to restore the provision that would exempt school buses from having to stop at such grade crossings, inadvertently exempted all

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

types of vehicles, which he hadn't meant to do. If the amendatory veto were to be sustained, it would be in conflict with federal regulations dealing with the safety and the control and transportation of hazardous material. The Governor, after he amendatorily vetoed the Bill, recognized the error in the amendatory veto and furnished a letter to this Sponsor, as well as to the Sponsor in the Senate, and now supports an override of that Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf moves that Senate Bill 1104 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Is there any discussion? Representative John Dunn, Gentleman from Macon."

Dunn: "Now, I'm confused. Will the Sponsor tell me, if this Bill becomes law, do school buses have to stop at railroad crossings where the speed limit is greater than 45 miles per hour or not?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "If this Bill passes, school buses will have to stop at grade crossings on four lane highways having a speed in excess of 45 miles per hour."

Dunn: "Is that good?"

Wolf: "Well, I won't discuss the merit of whether or not a school bus should stop or it shouldn't stop. The Governor, in his amendatory veto, had a concern that the stopping of school buses would create a hazard and probably or possibly contribute to rear end collisions and maybe incur the safety of the school children inside. There are also concerns of others that the not stopping of a school bus or the... not stopping of a school bus would also have hazards. So, I am merely saying that we should override the Governor's veto in this particular instance and then address whether or not school buses should stop or shouldn't stop at a later stage."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Dunn: "And the provisions regarding to suspending driving privileges are still in the Bill."

Wolf: "That's correct."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gordon Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just kind of a question relative to a situation that is a fact, and I wanted to find out whether or not what I'm about to relate to you this Bill has any... any effect upon. I am aware of a situation where there is a four lane highway, and the current provision in the law is if the bus stops on a northbound side of this highway, and you are an automobile going southbound, if you don't stop, your driver's license is also taken away. I'm somewhat questioning whether or not that is a good provision in the fact, if there are medians, and I wanted to know whether or not this Bill has any effect on that kind of a situation where you have to stop on the opposite side of the road for a school bus that is stopped on the other side. You understand?"

Wolf: "I'm sorry, Representative Ropp. I was talking with another Representative here."

Ropp: "Well, a constituent in my district just has lost his driver's license for a month, because he was on a four lane highway where he was told he was supposed to stop on one side of the road because a school bus was stopped on the other road going the opposite direction. And I'm wondering whether or not this particular Bill deals with the situation in any way, shape or form; and, if it doesn't, what do you think about it?"

Wolf: "No, I don't believe that this Bill addresses that particular situation, Representative Ropp. This deals with the suspension of driver's licenses for second offenses in the passing of school buses. I don't think it addresses

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

itself to the situation that you described."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1104 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. It's final action, requires a three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', and this Motion has received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority vote and prevails, and Senate Bill 1104 is hereby declared passed, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Senate Bill 1111, Senate Bill 1111, Representative Jeff Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1111 establishes the veterans' checkoff for the Illinois Veterans' Home Fund. The Governor did make some changes in the Bill to bring it into conformance with both the other checkoff Bills that he signed, the non-game wildlife Bill, and the Child Abuse Checkoff Fund. So I move that we accept the Governor's veto... or the Governor's recommendations for change on Senate Bill 1111."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mays moves that the House do accept the Governor's recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 1111 by adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 1111, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action, requires 71 votes because of the immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', and this Motion, having received the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 1111 by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1116, Representative Mautino. Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1116. As originally presented, 1116 mandated that the EPA set forth and compile an annual report identifying the types and the quantities of hazardous waste generated in this state in existing facilities and the rate for future disposal of hazardous waste, as well as any place that treats or storage... or stores waste. It was further amended that it was the public interest to encourage recycling of materials such as paper and paperboard so that the Pollution Control Board and the Illinois EPA would be encouraging this recycling effort and adopt rules and enforcement thereof. I just received information and correspondence that the Governor is not opposed to any override of his amendatory veto in House... in Senate Bill 1116. The correspondence is to the Senate Sponsor, Senator Bill Marovitz. And, therefore, in accordance with the Governor's wishes and the Sponsor and the intent of the original legislation, I move to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1116."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino has moved that the... that House Bill... or Senate Bill 1116 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1116 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires a three-fifths vote.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, prevails. And Senate Bill 1116 is hereby declared passed, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Senate Bill 1157, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on Senate Bill 1157. This Bill amends the Code of Civil Procedure to clarify that the exemptions of personal property owned by a debtor from either judgement, attachment or distress for rent apply only to individuals. It attempts to clarify that such exemptions do not apply to small businesses. However, it does not specifically provide that personal property which is used for personal rather than business purposes is so exempt, so that the Governor's amendatory language provides that such personal property exemptions apply only to individuals and only to personal property which is used for personal rather than business purposes. So, I agree with the Governor's change, and I would move that we accept his change."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regard to Senate Bill 1157, by the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 1157, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Requires 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'ayes', 5 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. And the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1157, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1195 is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 1218 is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 1269, Representative Steczo, the Gentleman from Cook."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to accept the Governor's recommendations for change on Senate Bill 1269, the Bill which broadens the definition of disability to allow more people with a mobility handicap to have handicapped license plates. The Governor, in his amendatory message, suggested the inclusion of one word, the word 'or' to allow those people who do not use any assistive devices, but yet have difficulty in walking over two hundred feet, the ability to have those plates. The inclusion of that word makes it more clear, and it's more in line with the task force report that was issued last year. In fact, the Bill that we passed, Senate Bill 1269, was supposed to have originally had that... this provision in it. So, that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my Motion to accept the Governor's recommendation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to Senate Bill 1269, by the adoption of the Amendment. On that, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let the record show that I rise in support of this legislation for my good friend and neighbor, Webber Borchers."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to Senate Bill 1269, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action requiring 60 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', and the Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. The House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1269, by the adoption of the Amendment. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1301 is on a Special Call. Senate Bill 1307, a Special Call. We're going to pick up a couple Bills out of the record and return to them. Senate Bill 448 on page seven, Representative Van Dwyne. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Dwyne, on Senate Bill 448."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I move that the House concur with the Senate in overriding the Governor's veto, and that Senate Bill 448 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Senate Bill 448 amends the Civil Administration Code and prohibits the Department of Nuclear Safety, or any other state agency, from approving, registering, or licensing the site of any low-level nuclear waste repository, or any facility for the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel unless specifically authorized by state law. And I won't go into detail unless somebody wants me to, but the Senate overrode the Governor's veto on this Bill, I think, 56 to 1. And that I would hope that the House would concur in that action and override the Governor's veto, his veto notwithstanding."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Van Dwyne has moved that Senate Bill 448 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

On that, Representative Sam Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. I think that by dealing with the least significant fact first, we can get to the real merit of the Motion. I don't believe it was a 56 to 1 vote in the Senate. I think it was a 38 to 17 vote. The Bill barely snuck by in the Senate, but we ought to show the good judgement to reject something that did slip by them. The idea that you are going to have the General Assembly act on what should legitimately be Executive Branch decisions on every issue affecting State Government is ludicrous on its face. I believe that what we ought to do is create agencies, grant those agencies proper authority, restrict that authority when they abuse it, replace the people when they abuse it, but we... we ought to have a proper delegation and a proper separation of functions in government. It's a clear mistake to have this whole subject held hostage to the immediate passions of people and particular to the... particularly to the immediate passions of a small group of people. We've got to have places to dispose of these things if we are going to use these products. American business can't continue manufacturing, can't continue growing unless you can dispose of these wastes. And I believe it would be a serious mistake to try to irreparably block disposal facilities of this... this type in the State of Illinois. We are a primary state in this area, and we ought to continue to be one because this is where growth is going to be. This is legitimately an example of high tech industry. I would strongly oppose the Gentleman's Motion, and I would urge a 'no' vote on his Motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

of the House. I also believe that we ought to vote 'no' on the Motion to override. This General Assembly and future General Assemblies should not get into the business of siting. We don't do that now. We are not sitting here day to day making decisions that are better made by geologists and technical people when it comes to siting nuclear power plants, and we should not get into the business of deciding where sites for disposal of low-level nuclear wastes should be. What we did, when we passed House Bill 2234, is set up a siting procedure, giving the Department of Nuclear Safety the right to set certain rules and regulations regarding siting to ensure that the public health and safety would be adequately taken care of. Also in House Bill 2234, we agreed that there should be adequate provision for public hearings to be held, and what we would do, if we passed this Bill, overriding the Governor's veto, is to go exactly counter to what we have already said we are going to do in 2234. This Bill says that the Department of Nuclear Safety, nor any other agencies, shall do any of the following unless the specific site is expressly authorized by state law. I submit to you today that we simply do not want to get into that kind of decision making. Think of yourself sitting down here next Session in the Legislature. Do you really want to have to vote on a Bill choosing a specific site over the objection of your colleague and friend from that area? Do you want to be in the position of the Representative trying to block that kind of a vote, when everyone else down here would be voting against you, but it would be putting it somewhere out of their back yard? I submit to you that what we ought to do is accept the Governor's amendatory veto. I oppose this Motion to override, and I hope you would join me and vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of Representative Van Dwyne's Motion to override. I find it very difficult to accept the fact that the Legislative Body, who for many years have been giving away their authority and their integrity to bureaucrats and special interests, would, in fact, do it again here with this most important piece of legislation. Why is it so difficult for Members to stand up and vote their convictions for the constituents that they represent? I have been in this particular box that Representative Nelson mentions for the last five terms. You see, the problem with voting in the General Assembly is that everyone has to be counted, and that's our representative form of government. When you do happen to have a facility in your geographical area, you are more susceptible, and you do more investigating and more reading and more in-depth evaluation of the possible ramifications if something goes wrong. All in all, I think that this General Assembly and future General Assemblies should never give up their authority, their authorization, nor their advice and consent as it pertains to any hazardous or low level nuclear waste site in this state. I guess my statement is, what are the Legislators elected for? To represent the people of an area. If, in fact, those people have concerns about possible low-level hazardous waste sites, as it pertains to public health and safety, they should have a voice in this General Assembly. Because we all know here that if a bureaucrat makes a rule, regulation or determination, you have to move mountains, literally, to have that determination and decision reversed or qualified. Therefore, it's probably one of the better pieces of legislation on the question. It gives authority back to the General Assembly, and there should be an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 448."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join with Representative Mautino in asking for support of this Bill. I believe that the General Assembly cannot shirk its responsibilities to make sure that there is adequate and safe siting. I certainly don't believe that we can push this waste material on anyone else, but I think we have the responsibility for making certain that it is reasonable and that the people are protected. There are going to be strong arguments for any siting of these particular dumps anywhere, but I think that's what is needed is more discussion. Certainly, the geological and scientific backgrounds are going to have to be there; but, when decisions are made by non-elected people, they do not always represent what is best for the people of Illinois. I think this is certainly true in our failure to override the veto on mental health. The Department is in disarray, yet, they are going to make the decisions. The administration is going to make the decisions. The bureaucracy is going to make the decisions. I would concur that this is a good piece of legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ray Christensen."

Christensen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly agree with the previous two speakers and am in favor of Van Dwyne's Motion to override. Who should have more right to protect the people in their district than the Legislators? It's real nice, you know, when you don't have any of these areas... these sites in your area, it's pretty easy to sit back and say somebody else should have the say-so. I think there should be many, many hearings, and the final say should be up to the Legislators. And I support the Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dick Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

question?"

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

Klemm: "One question I have, and I do share concerns that you are expressing in that there should be some sort of local input, I guess, and I was wondering if the Bill we passed last Session, which I think was Senate Bill 172, concerning siting of landfills and waste disposal sites, if, in fact, that would still apply to this low-level nuclear waste siting provision?"

Van Dyne: "I didn't... excuse me, but I didn't get the last part of your question. I think it was; doesn't Senate Bill 172 also cover siting of low-level or nuclear spent. No, it does not. In fact, the Governor, in his veto message, in the second paragraph, says this Bill does three things: Number one, it requires a specific law to be passed to allow the siting of any low level radioactive waste disposal facility in Illinois; secondly, it requires legislative approval of any commercial spent fuel reprocessing facilities to be established in Illinois; and, three, it requires public hearings in communities near a radioactive waste facility prior to the issuances of a license. Then he goes on to say that he agrees with the second and third provision. And if you agree, and I won't read the last part of this paragraph, if you don't want me to, but I will if you would, he agrees, he says, with the last two provisions. He does not agree with the first provision. Now, if you refer to Senate Bill 172, which does give the counties veto power and puts them on an equal footing with... as far as siting is concerned with the EPA, you must also agree that spent nuclear fuel rods and even low level nuclear fuel waste is a heck of a lot more important to the people in the State of Illinois because of the wide-spread havoc that this may perpetrate upon our

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

citizens. So, if you do agree with the general consensus of Senate Bill 172, in that it does give the counties equal rights, as far as siting, then you should agree that the State General Assembly should also have the same power of... veto power that we are asking for in Senate Bill 447 over the Nuclear Regulatory Commission."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 448 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a total override and requires a three-fifths vote, and it's final action. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 42 'nays', and Representative Van Dyne asks for a Poll of the Absentees. And Representative Nelson, if it does reach 71, is going to verify the vote. The Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Ewing. Harris. Levin. McAuliffe and Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Marzuki: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to be verified, if there is one. Leave. What's the count, Mr. Speaker (sic Clerk)? There are 70 'ayes', 42 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and this Motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Bus Yourell on Senate Bill 1218 on page eight. It's on a Special Call, but the Sponsor desires to have it heard now. Senate Bill 1218. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1218 does several things. Most importantly, it changes the date for the circulation of

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

petitions for candidates that will be running in... appearing on the ballot in 1984. The Governor felt, and I think rightfully so, that would penalize those candidates that have already started to circulate petitions, and in his amendatory message, he indicated that the effective date for that part of the Election Code should be January 1st, 1984, and I agree with that. And also, in other areas of the Bill, he indicated that we should charge what it actually costs for the reproduction of documents, rather than set a set fee like two dollars for the reproducing of precinct sheets that would indicate the Republican and Democratic voters. I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations relative to the amendatory veto contained in Senate Bill 1218."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to Senate Bill 1218, with the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1218, by the adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Requires 71 votes because of the immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 4 'nays', and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to Senate Bill 1218, by the adoption of the Amendment. And the Motion has received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, and the Bill is hereby declared passed. On page eight, Senate Bill 1195, the Senate... Senate Bill 1195, the Majority Leader, Jim McPike. It's on a Subject Call, but he desires to hear the Bill now.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Senate Bill 1195."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill in its original form allowed financial institutions to make revolving credit loans in excess of \$5000 secured by mortgages or deeds of trust on real property. The Governor would add to that that whenever such a loan is made, the interest to the borrower must be disclosed in compliance with the Federal Truth in Lending Act, or any further Amendments thereto. So, I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 1195 by the adoption... with the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regards to Senate Bill 1195, by the adoption of the Amendment?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. It requires a simple majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and this Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1195, by the adoption of the Amendment, and the Bill is hereby declared passed. The House will now proceed to the Order of Motions which appear on page ten. There are some Motions that have cleared the House Rules Committee and are now in order. On that Order of Business appears House Bill 1365, Representative Shaw. Is Representative Shaw... Representative Shaw on House Bill 1365 on the Order of Motions."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Shaw: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for a suspension of the appropriate rule where this 1365 could be heard in the... in Insurance tomorrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Shaw has moved to take House Bill 1365 from the Table, discharge Committee on Insurance and advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Piel."

Piel: "A couple of quick questions, Mr. Speaker. First of all, a question of the Clerk. Can you tell me when this Motion was filed, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "It was filed yesterday."

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

Shaw: "Yes."

Piel: "Representative Shaw, a couple of quick questions in reference to your Motion in reference to the Bill. In reference to the Motion, when was this heard... or when was this Bill heard in Rules Committee?"

Shaw: "Today."

Piel: "The Motion was filed to discharge Committee, and the Rules Committee heard the Bill this morning, right?"

Shaw: "That's right."

Piel: "Can I ask you a question, why you filed the Motion yesterday when the thing hadn't even been heard in Rules Committee to go to Committee? Did you know what... you know, I mean, obviously, we didn't even know what Committee it was going to be going to yesterday when the Motion was filed?"

Shaw: "It was my understanding that it was going to Rules."

Piel: "Well, it went to Rules, but you've made a Motion yesterday to discharge... to bypass the Committee, and it hadn't even been assigned to a specific Committee, is that correct?"

Shaw: "I... I didn't hear it. I didn't hear you."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Piel: "Well, you made the Motion yesterday to bypass Committee, and you didn't even know what... what Committee it was going to be assigned to. And it was heard this morning in Rules, and now you are asking to bypass the Committee on the Motion that was filed yesterday of a Bill that was heard this morning."

Shaw: "No, I don't think you... I don't think you understood..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could... Could the Chair intervene? The Bill was heard in Rules Committee, but it has been in Insurance Committee, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright."

Piel: "Well, it hasn't been heard in Committee yet, but first, can I ask why this is of major importance now? Correct me if I'm wrong, Representative. Isn't this identical to the same House Bill 1500 that we heard twice last week? We took two votes on this last week?"

Shaw: "I think you... I think you misunderstood... I think you misunderstood the Motion, Sir."

Piel: "No, I'm asking you a question. I'm asking a question in reference to the Bill. Is this identical to the 1500 that we heard twice last week?"

Shaw: "Yes."

Piel: "And at that time it was defeated. We defeated this same thing twice last week. Now, my question is, why shouldn't this Bill be heard in Committee? You want to advance it to Second Legislative Day."

Shaw: "No, the only thing that I'm asking is that this Bill be heard in Committee tomorrow. I think..."

Piel: "No, the way the Motion states, Representative... you check the Calendar on page ten, the Motion says, 'I move to take from the Table, discharge Committee on Insurance and advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Day'. So, it's not a situation of you wanting to hear this thing in Committee. It's a situation..."

Shaw: "You are absolutely right. You're absolutely right. You're absolutely right."

Piel: "Well, you just... Now, wait a minute. You want to advance to the Second Day or do you want hear it in Committee, because you just said you wanted to hear it in Committee?"

Shaw: "No, the Second Day."

Piel: "Okay, you don't want to hear it in Committee then?"

Shaw: "No."

Piel: "Then we'll get back to my original question. If this was defeated twice two weeks ago when we were here, we voted on this thing twice, why shouldn't this be heard in Committee first? I cannot see why you want to bypass Committee. This is a... you know, this is a Bill that deals with the licensing of brokers and agents, and I think it should be heard in Committee, and I want to know why you don't want to hear it in Committee. Why you..."

Shaw: "Well, I had this same Motion filed before, and it never got heard. That's why I filed this particular Motion."

Piel: "You still haven't answered my question, Representative. My question is, why should we bypass Committee on this? You are talking about a very important Bill. You are talking about a Bill that you want to bypass Committee. What is the importance of bringing this out right now without going to Committee? That's the... that's the whole... what the Committee process is for in the House of Representatives, is to bring up questions and one thing and another, and I think that it should definitely be heard in Committee, where the people are experts on the insurance... the insurance laws, et cetera, et cetera, and you are proposing a Bill that will change the licensing of brokers and salesmen and the Act, and you don't want to hear it in

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Committee. Why don't you want to hear it in Committee?"

Shaw: "Well, Representative, the same people that make up that Committee is on the floor of the House. They are Members of the House, and I'm certain that you can get adequate debate on the floor of the House here."

Piel: "We've had adequate debate on this, Representative. We defeated it twice, and I don't know why you feel that this thing should not go to Committee. I would ask... you know, I can't get the logic here at all, and I've been getting a runaround on some of the answers. But I would ask all Members to look at this very closely. This is the Bill that we defeated twice last week. It was brought up on two different occasions by Representative Shaw, on two different Motions, and I would ask everybody in the House of Representatives to go through the normal process that we go through, sending Bills to Committee, having them heard adequately in the Committee, bringing them out to the floor, after it's gone through a full hearing in Committee, and not bypass the Committee process. And so I would ask the Members of the House to vote 'no' on the Motion on House Bill 1365."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the Motion is to move... to take from the table House Bill 1365, discharge the Committee on Insurance, advance 1365 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote, 71 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 'ayes', 42 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the Motion is declared lost. House Bill 2327, Representative Leverenz. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

House. I move to advance House Bill 2327 to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved to advance House Bill 2327 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee. Is there discussion? There being none, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Oh, 60 votes, I'm... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106... Mays 'aye'... 107 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 answering 'present', and the Motion prevails. And Senate Bill... House Bill 2327 is advanced to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee. Senate Bill 143, Hannig. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would move to discharge the House Committee on Senate Bill 143, which was exempted by the Rules Committee this morning. Earlier in the year, we passed House Bill 1257 which deals with hazardous waste fees. It passed this Body as an agreed Bill. The Governor did make some amendatory changes, but unfortunately, when we moved to accept those changes, there were some technical errors in the way we moved to accept those changes. So what we want to do with this Bill, 143, is simply use it as a vehicle to get 1250... 1257 in the proper order as the Governor proposed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill... Representative Hannig has moved that Senate Bill 143 be discharged from the Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources and advanced to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. There is no discussion. Those in favor signify by voting

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the Motion prevails. And Senate Bill 143 is discharged from the Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources from further consideration, advanced to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Senate Bill 1309, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "I move to advance Senate Bill 1309 to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved that House... Senate Bill 1309 be moved to the... advanced to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee. Being no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', and the Motion prevails, and Senate Bill 1309 is advanced to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 143. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1309. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Community Living Facilities Licensing Act."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. I think I know what you want, but, Representative Van Dyne, for what purpose..."

Van Dyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You do know, and I don't want to complete the whole scenario, but couldn't we just go to that Order and just move it to Third so it's in passage stage when we get this ironed out?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We're not on that Order of Business, Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "Yes, you are, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, that's Senate Bills, Second. I think yours is a House Bill."

Van Dyne: "Okay, well, it's still Second Reading."

Speaker Matijevich: "You should have a Senate Bill. We might be in business. On the Order of Total Veto Motions on page three of the Calendar. Senate Bill 139 is on a Special Subject Call. The next Bill is Senate Bill 302. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz on Senate Bill 302 on a total veto Motion."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We would move to override the veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 302 for the age-old problem of that which money is spent by the state should be appropriated and scrutinized through the appropriations process. And on Senator Carroll's Bill, that I believe was overwhelmingly passed in the Senate and the House, the Governor chose to veto the Bill. It would provide that something probably close to one half of one percent is the total amount of money that we talked about, but in 302 it would provide that all monies spent by the state, specifically here

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

within the college and university system, would be appropriated through the General Assembly. I would now move for the override of the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 302."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz moves that Senate Bill 302 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that, Representative Sam Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 302. I believe it would be a terrible mistake for the General Assembly to absolutely and totally tie the hands of state agencies in this regard. Currently, an extraordinarily high percentage, I believe in excess of 99 percent of funds appropriated... of funds expended by Executive Branch agencies, are appropriated by the Legislature. What this Bill would do would be to seek to extend that appropriations authority for that last half percent. Now, the reason I oppose that, not because I oppose the appropriations process or the legislative process. I obviously believe in both, and I believe Membership heard me stand and speak for the appropriations process on a Bill earlier this afternoon that Representative Homer handled. But what we face here is the potential for all kinds of very serious problems. We face here situations where federal disaster funds may be communicated to state agencies who then could not expend the disaster funds to relieve the disaster which had occurred simply because we had not met and appropriated the money. Or we face the option of having to be called into Special Session constantly to act on... in that particular area. Mr. Speaker, we face the situation where you may have a situation..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Vinson. I

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

understand the Sponsor wants this out of the record. Is that correct, Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "That is correct."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright."

Leverenz: "I want to check his voting record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The next Bills out of the record up to Senate Bill 583. Senate Bill 583, Representative Levin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 688, Representative Larry Hicks. Representative Hicks on Senate Bill 688."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to override the Governor on this, please, and move to override the Governor, please. Total override, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks has moved that Senate Bill 688 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Hoffman on that."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request of the Sponsor of the Motion to briefly explain it for the edification of the Membership."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill basically provides for additional three days of harvest of the taking of bucks... of deer separate and apart from the regular deer hunting season, and that's all it does."

Hoffman: "And the Governor vetoed it, and what was the reasoning in his veto message?"

Hicks: "The Governor said that the Department had that authority already if they wanted to use it, but it was our contention that the Department does not have, and we... takes legislat... this Legislature to do so."

Hoffman: "Alright, I'm... I'm sorry, Representative Hicks. I've just picked up the veto message of the Governor and he

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

indicates, as you have said, the Department of Conservation already has the authority to expand the hunting season by a maximum of four days, and you are contending that the Governor is not correct and that this Bill is necessary. Is that how I understand your position?"

Hicks: "Well, it's our... it's my position that this is necessary; that the people of my district who... are a very big deer hunting season, would like to see that expanded. And if the Department can do it, we would like for them to do it. They have not wanted to do so. So we would like to see it extended."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suppose that one would take a position on this based on their interest in wildlife, either dead or alive, and on that basis I suppose the Judgment should be made. Seems to me that with the Department already having the authority to expand the hunting season up to a maximum of four additional days that that kind of authority is proper and should remain with them. And it would seem reasonable to me that the Governor's veto was reasonable and should be sustained."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brunsvold."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, proceed."

Brunsvold: "Representative Hicks, it says that taking of bucks by shotgun or at the end of either or both shotgun harvest periods. Now, there's two split seasons, right?"

Hicks: "Yes, Sir."

Brunsvold: "Would that mean that we could have two split seasons of six days each?"

Hicks: "It would be my understanding they could add on to each of the split seasons, yes, if they want."

Brunsvold: "At the end of the... at one of these split seasons."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

So that means it's going to take place during the week, because it's usually Friday, Saturday and Sunday are the two seasons as they existed, you know, now. So we'd have like Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday either at the end of either split season."

Hicks: "That could be possible, yes."

Brunsvold: "And this is... you know. I really don't think that that many bucks are going to be taken in this... in this additional period, and you know, I would support this position, but during the week, I don't think you're really going to have lot of hunters out there anyway."

Hicks: "Well, the thing is it is only for bucks only, it's not for the whole deer population. So I don't think we have to worry about having a drastic effect upon the deer population in the State of Illinois."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks to close."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill is a very simple Bill. It simply extends the period for an additional possibility of four days to the harvest of deer. It's not going to have any drastic effect in any way on the deer population. Having just day before yesterday run over an eight point buck, I know what it's like out there on the highways with all these bucks. So it's not a severe effect upon the deer population. I'd ask for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hicks moves that Senate Bill 688 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action, takes three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 62 'ayes', 42 'nays', 7 answering 'present', and

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

the Motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. We skipped over two Bills that I understand the Sponsors do want to have heard. Senate Bill 520, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran. Representative Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, could we take this out of the record for just a minute?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Is 521 out also, Representative O'Connell? Out of the record. Senate Bill 726, Representative O'Connell. Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, there are two of us. Representative Terzich also filed a Motion to override. I'd defer to him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 726 creates the Illinois - Michigan Canal Corridor Civic Center Authority of Cook County Act. The duty of the Authority is to promote the Illinois - Michigan Canal and those capital projects which are in support of the operation of the Illinois - Michigan Canal Corridor and operate and maintain boat ramps, nature paths, camp grounds and other recreational facilities in the metropolitan area. The Bill did provide... took out the right of eminent domain, and it also may issue revenue bonds. And it does not have the power to tax or issue general obligation bonds; however, it may issue revenue bonds. This is to promote the Illinois - Michigan Canal so there isn't any duplication of participating units of local government. It's a good Bill, and I would appreciate your support in overriding on Senate Bill 726."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved that Senate Bill 726 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

On that, Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm inclined to agree with the Governor on this particular issue. It seems to me that the inclusion of this kind of a program, regardless of how worthy it may be, to set up an Illinois - Michigan Canal National Corridor and tie it in with the Civic Center Authority of Cook County stretches the credulity - killed that one - of the idea of a civic center. Now, it does do some exemptions, but to provide the inclusion of a Illinois - Michigan canal into a civic center authority really seems to stretch the definition of the term 'civic center authority'. It's a, as the Governor said, a significant departure from the original purchase... purpose of the program. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, at some point in time, as Members of the General Assembly, representing not only the people of our district, but the people of the entire State of Illinois, we have to come to grips with the issue of bonding future generations into a permanent fiscal servitude. This is one of those pieces of legislation, added together with all the others, that do that. As Representative Ebbesen has so often told us, the pension system alone, that debt alone may put us all and our children all in a permanent position of indebtedness. This just adds to that problem. The Governor has recognized this, and I think for the majority of the Members of this Body, this is a very easy piece of legislation to not support and a very easy piece of legislation to vote 'no' on, and I would recommend and encourage such a vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Will the Sponsor respond to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Oblinger: "Representative Terzich, what is the reason that the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Springfield Civic Center is left out from the tax exemption?"

Terzich: "The Bill, simply for the Illinois - Michigan Canal is simply... it came under this particular Act. Actually, the Bill does not provide, under the Illinois - Michigan Canal Corridor, does not provide for any state monies. It has no bond obligations to the state and, under no circumstances, it's written in the Bill, shall any bonds issued by Authority be or become an indebtedness or obligation of the State of Illinois or any other political subdivision or municipality within the state. So there... there's no cost. All they can issue is revenue bonds. I'm glad Representative Hoffman mentioned that."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Nelson: "Representative Terzich, what I don't understand about this Bill is how it will interface with the National Park Service. What we're about when we talk to members of our congressional delegation and our Senators is creating a corridor national park in Illinois, and I just cannot for the life of me figure out how civic centers would operate in conjunction with a national park."

Terzich: "From what I understand, the Bill simply provided under that particular segment as far as civic centers are concerned. What it will do is it will set up a governing and administrative body of authority and the board shall consist of eleven members of all of the local units of government along the Illinois - Michigan Canal so that they could coordinate the progress of developing the Illinois - Michigan Canal project with the Federal Government, rather than all of these different local units of government

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

duplicating boat ramps and many other facilities along the canal. This will provide a body which consists of all of those units of government so they could coordinate it with the Federal Government projects."

Nelson: "That's just not true. It is not all of the units of local government, because the Bill ends at the end of Cook County. And the proposed corridor goes beyond that. What I don't understand is why that provision is also in the Bill."

Terzich: "Why it's just the Cook County area, or beyond that?"

Nelson: "If you... What you said was that all the communities are included, and what I say is that's not so."

Terzich: "Well, that's true. I mean you can take the whole State of Illinois as not included in the plan, but the majority of the local units along the canal are."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Nelson: "I think that I have, in my questions to the Sponsor, explained my objections to this bad piece of legislation. I think that it is a duplication of money that will be spent by the feds to create a national park. I think that surely there are people at the local level who will work with those persons in the national park service to create something that is good for Illinois, and I would submit that this particular piece of legislation is totally unnecessary."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "Well, again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good piece of legislation. It passed out of the House quite substantially with approximately 100 votes. It passed out of the Senate by a vote of 48 to 6. We do have to promote the Illinois - Michigan Canal. It does set up a good governing body. It costs the state no

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

tax dollars whatsoever. It's all under revenue bonds and with no cost and a great promotion of a great national heritage. And I would appreciate your support of overriding Senate Bill 726."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved that House... Senate Bill 726 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action requires three-fifths vote. Representative Van Dwyne, Gentleman from Will, one minute to explain his vote."

Van Dwyne: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explanation of my vote, I want to bring out one thing that hasn't been brought out, which I think is probably one of the most important parts of the piece of legislation, other than the formation of the Illinois - Michigan Canal National Corridor Civic Center Authority, and that is the clarification that even the Governor alludes to here in the assessment of the taxes on some of the past..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 'ayes', 30 'nays', 5 'present' and Senate... this Motion, having received the Constitutional... Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify the vote, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman asks for a verification of the affirmative vote. The... Representative Terzich asks for a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Nash asks leave to be verified. Leave, and Representative Nash is verified. Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Harris. Keane. Levin."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Van Dwyne asks

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

leave to be verified. Representative Preston asks leave to be verified, and Representative Turner asks leave to be verified. Leave. Representative Jane Barnes asks leave to be verified. Leave. Did we poll the absentees yet?"

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Absentees. McAuliffe and Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count, Representative (sic Clerk)? 76 'ayes', 30 'nos'. We'll... we'll poll the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Barnes. Berrios. Bowman. Braun. Ereslin. Erockins. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen. Churchill. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. Deuchler. DiPrima. Demico. Doyle. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallock. Hawkinson. Huff. Jaffe. Kirkland. Klemm. Koehler. Kraska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Markette. Marzuki. Matijevich. McGann. McPike. Mulcahey. Nash. Oblinger. O'Connell. Olson. Panayotovitch. Pangle. Pierce. Fiel. Preston. Bea. Rhem. Rice. Richmond. Bonan. Bopp. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Topinka. Turner. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. Wait. White. Wolf. Yourell. Zwick. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gene Hoffman on questions of the affirmative vote. Marzuki asks..."

Marzuki: "Leave."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to be verified. Leave. Proceed. Proceed, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bullock. Is Representative Bullock in the chamber? Here he is. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative James Keane

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

'aye'. Keane 'aye'."

Hoffman: "I see Capparelli. Representative DeJaegher... I see.  
I'm sorry."

Speaker Matijevich: "DeJaegher is there."

Hoffman: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Doyle is in the aisle over  
here."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Representative Giglio."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giglio. Is Representative  
Giglio in the chamber? I don't see him here. How is he  
recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative who? Doug Huff?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, Representative Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Doug Huff. Is Doug Huff in the chamber?  
How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Representative Hannig, for what  
purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hannig: "Could I be recorded as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Hannig from 'present' to 'aye'.  
Hannig from 'present' to 'aye'. Proceed, Gene."

Hoffman: "Representative Bonan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bonan. Representative Bonan  
is not in his seat. How is Representative Bonan recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Proceed,  
Gene."

Hoffman: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 75 'ayes', 30  
'nos', 4 voting 'present', and this Motion, having received

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, and Senate Bill 726 is hereby declared passed, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. Senate Bill 731, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 76... 776 on a Special Call. Senate Bill 1020, Representative Panayotovich. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sam Panayotovich, on Senate Bill 1020."

Panayotovich: "Mr. Speaker, may we take this out of the record for one minute, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1122, Representative John O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House (sic - Senate) Bill 1122 does two things. First of all, it provides that the township highway commissioner would have the authority to determine the amount of the levy for road purposes. The reason why we've inserted that provision in the Bill is that it is our belief, by the supporters of this measure, that the highway commissioner is in a better position to make that determination than would be the board of trustees. This is not to say that it would preclude the board of trustees from having final veto power over the amount of that levy. That could be determined by the board of trustees through the budget process. The main issue here, of course, is that the township... the road commissioners would have the expertise and the knowledge of the road situation to make the determination as to the levy. Secondly, it provides, and this was agreed upon by the Governor in his veto message, despite the fact that he vetoed the Bill entirely, he did acknowledge that it is appropriate that the township have the flexibility to allow for a special meeting where the question of increased tax levy for road purposes in addition to the annual meeting could be called with the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

traditional posting and publication requirements. I stress that there is no change in the posting and publication requirements of this special meeting. It simply acknowledges the need and the flexibility on the part of the township that if there is need for funds, that they would not have to wait until the annual meeting to call the meeting to address the question of additional funding. So, I would then ask for your favorable vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative O'Connell has moved that Senate Bill 1122 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. On that, Representative Tate, the Gentleman from Macon."

Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Representative O'Connell's Motion. Quite simply, there is no better one than the highway commissioners to determine what the tax levy should be. They're out there everyday in the fields...I mean on the roads. They know the conditions of the roads. They know their own needs better than anyone else. We have assigned them to do a job, and there is no one else in a better position to do that job. And I would encourage support of this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1122 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. And this Motion, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, prevails, and Senate Bill 1122 is hereby declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Panayotovich, are

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

you ready? Alright. Representative Panayotovich on Senate Bill 1020."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 1020. It was a Bill designed to be an incentive for businesses to come... to be brought into the enterprise zones. The Bill passed out of both of the House and the Senate with a 174 votes out of a 177. I think that the Governor made a mistake in overriding the veto. I think all of the Representatives and the Senators in this General Assembly voted wisely, and I would move for an override on this Senate Bill. And I would like to let Representative Birkinbine close."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Panayotovich has moved that Senate Bill 1020 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. I don't think we ought to override this particular veto, because overriding this veto really opens the floodgate on extending and increasing the Illinois State Income Tax. Now, we see in the first quarter's economic performance in this fiscal year and what that economic performance tells us is that the conferees on the income tax package last year, in adopting revenue and cost estimates, were absolutely on target. The economy has recovered to some extent and what that has generated is exactly the amount of money that was predicted by the conferees in coming up with the revenue package for this state. If we incur substantial additional costs for the State of Illinois over the course of this Veto Session and over the course of next spring, then what we are doing is saying that we have to extend the income tax, and we have to increase the income

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

tax. And a vote for this Bill is nothing more than a vote to increase the income tax, and that's not something we ought to be doing. We ought to reject this concept, and I request a verification if it should appear to get the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further discussion, Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would especially like to ask Members of my side of the aisle if I could have their ear for a moment, because I know that our Leadership has been asked to work against this Bill. I suggest to you that the position of the Leadership is wrong. It's as wrong as the Governor has been on this Bill all along. And I would bring you back to the initial situation where we have an enterprise zone in the first place. It is not a thriving area. It has to be an area where there is virtually no business. All along the Governor's people have been concerned about a possible loss of revenue from this utility tax break. Presently, the State of Illinois is getting a 100% of nothing out of this, a 100% of nothing. I ask you con...I suggest that you consider the potential steel mill on the south side of Chicago, the rail mill that we're hoping to have built there. Presently, the State of Illinois is getting every single one of those utility tax dollars which is absolutely zero. Now I suggest to you that if, indeed, this tax break becomes a part of the enterprise zone policy, if, indeed, it provides enough of an incentive for such a mill to be built, admittedly, for the first five years the state would not enjoy that tax break, but for every single year thereafter, the state would be getting the benefit that otherwise it might not get at all. To say that we're losing dollars on this, to say that this might somehow

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

force us to impose a continuation of the tax that was voted last July is absolute baloney, because what we're getting now is nothing. What we stand to lose is nothing. What we stand to gain is a considerable amount. When the Governor first amendatorily vetoed this utility tax break out of the original enterprise zone Bill, he took, probably, the most attractive segment out of the Bill as far as industry is concerned. I remind you that enterprise zones run for twenty years. This tax break is only a five-year break. Every single year thereafter, the state will be enjoying whatever revenues come from whatever industry is created there, and I remind you, again, that what we're talking about is a depressed area where there virtually is no industry now. I recommend an 'aye' vote. I recommend the people on my side of the aisle do not listen to the ill advice coming out of the second floor, and I suggest that we add this to the enterprise zone Bill in this state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this action. Sitting here listening to the Gentleman from the north shore, I thought that I was back in 1981 in the Congress of United States listening to President Reagan ram through his supply-side economics Bill through the Congress. At that time, we were told the same thing we're told today. If we will just supply industry with the tax incentive that they need, we will establish an unprecedented pattern for growth in the United States. Well, we did that, and the result was an unemployment line that stretched from Washington, D.C to San Diego, California. Two years later, we still have unemployment of 10% in this country, 12% in this state. Now today, we're being told the same things. If you'll

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

just give industry the incentive that they need the old supply side argument. Industry had all the incentive they needed in the 1920's, and they used that incentive to drive this country into the biggest depression of the 1930's unprecedented in the history of this country and then used Reagan's supply-side economics to drive us into the biggest recession since the depression of the 1930's. Once again, we hear the familiar rhetoric, 'give to business so that they will supply the jobs'. Well it's nonsense. Industry has all the incentives they need. All we need to do is have the marketplace. All we need to do is have the people working and have the demand in the marketplace, and that is the incentive the business needs. This rhetoric about giving business more and more and more tax incentives that we cannot afford is exactly what Representative Vinson was getting at. The Congress of the United States could not afford to give away the giveaways that they passed in 1981 and neither can the Illinois Legislature afford more tax giveaways in 1983, unless you want to come back here next year in June and cast another vote for a tax increase. The choice is very clear. If you want to give it away today, fine, go right ahead, but next June be willing to put your 'aye' vote on the line for another tax increase."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hastert."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Hastert: "Could you tell me if there is any impact on local governments on this Bill? Does it cost municipalities, or townships or counties any tax dollars?"

Panayotovich: "To my knowledge, it would not."

Hastert: "To your knowledge. Okay. And so it says, another state picks up any...it's the dollars to the state, is that correct?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Panayotovich: "I couldn't answer that."

Hastert: "Alright. And then, also, you can't answer...I don't want to put words in your mouth..."

Panayotovich: "Go ahead."

Hastert: "...but is there a mandate to this?"

Panayotovich: "There is no mandate in this."

Hastert: "So you're saying..."

Panayotovich: "My analysis that I have here, no."

Hastert: "Well, it's your Bill, you know. You're saying then that local governments do not lose revenue?"

Panayotovich: "They would not lose revenue, to my knowledge, according to the synopsis here."

Hastert: "Alright. That's all I want to know."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I understand the Bill, that it provides for a credit or a refund to recover the amount of any additional charges added to a business enterprise utility Bill as a pass on of municipal or state utility taxes, of municipal or state utility taxes. It would seem to me that there would be, on the basis of that, a loss of revenue to the local municipalities and to the state, and, if in fact, there was a mandate involved, it would provide that the municipal tax would have to be made up by the state if you're going to apply the Mandate Act, and it's probably...it's probably exempt from that. But, I must rise and concur with Representative McPike and Representative Vinson on this. We are... In this area, to a large degree, we're playing a shell game. We're playing a shell game with businesses. We're playing a shell game with employees. We're playing a shell game with local governments in the area. The truth to the matter is that this economy and the economy in the United States, the

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

economy of Illinois is going through a wrenching and a terribly difficult period of adjustment. To suggest by these kinds of things that the jobs that are gone in some of these areas represented by many of the advocates of these kinds of programs will ever return, is a cruel hoax perpetrated on the unfortunate employees of businesses who have gone under or gone out and will never, ever return. Solution to the problem is not in these kinds of programs. The solution to the problem is redirecting these people in proper channels to the areas where employment will be found in the future; because, in many of these areas that we're most concerned about, that will never return. We will do nothing but heighten expectations which cannot come to fruition by our efforts or by anybody else's. And I rise and stand in support of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Panayotovich to close."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been corrected for Representative Hastert. The five-year period that would go...the municipalities would lose that tax money in a credit form, but the way the Bill would be is that they would not even...either a credit or a refund. Hopefully, they would not even pay it, in answering your question that the municipality, for a five year period, would lose the tax money that would have been paid on the utilities. If I'm answering...I stand corrected on that. Again, as I said when I opened up and I was going to let Representative Birkinbine close but he spoke. It's the incentive that we need to the enterprise zones. It's a twenty-year package. We have such depressed areas here in Illinois. Again, as a reminder, I know that Leadership spoke out on both sides of the aisle, but, again remember, 174 out of 177 people voted for this Bill. The Governor made a mistake in vetoing it, and I ask for an override."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Panayotovitch has moved that Senate Bill 1020 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action, requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... Matijevich 'no'. Change Matijevich to 'no'. 54 'ayes', 43 'nos', 10 answering 'present'. And this Motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Bus Yourell in the Chair."

Speaker Yourell: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Lake County, Representative Matijevich, rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave of the House and this has been cleared, I understand that the recessed Rules Committee now meet in the conference room by the Speaker's Office for the purpose of further considering the unfinished business that we had today with regards to exempt Motions in that Committee. I ask leave of the House that we now meet. It'll be about a ten minute meeting."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman asks leave to have a meeting of the Rules Committee while the House is in Session. Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. All Members of the Rules Committee will please retire to the Speaker's corridor, conference room in the Speaker's corridor. Next Order of Business is on page two, Senate Bills, Second Reading. Representative Davis. House Bill...Senate Bill 546, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 546, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to criminal identification and investigation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Davis, amends Senate Bill 546 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Davis. Cut of the record. Alright, the Bill has been read. Senate Bill 546 has been read a second time. It'll be held on that Order. What reason the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino, rise? Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "I'd like to announce that the Insurance Committee will be delayed for about a half hour tomorrow from 9:00 to 9:30 to be met in the assigned room."

Speaker Yourell: "For what reason does Representative Mulcahey rise? Representative Mulcahey. Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, while I have the chance and while there is a lull, I just want to make the announcement. The Energy Environment and Natural Resource Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. And on your Calendar on page 11 it says room 114, but I think that has been changed and the Members better check it tomorrow morning. I think it's been changed to D-1 in the Stratton Building. So, at least, look in D-1. If we're not there, we'll be in 114. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "You ready, Representative Mulcahey? Representative Brummer, for what reason do you rise?"

Brummer: "Yes, I am the Sponsor of House Bill 1347 and 1348 together with Representative Piel. Those two Bills are in Interim Study in the Revenue Committee. I have cleared with Chairman Pierce and the Minority Spokesman on the Revenue Committee, Woodyard, and would request that there be a waiving of the posting requirement with regard to those two Bills so that they maybe heard in Revenue Interim Study tomorrow."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the posting requirements set forth in Rule 20 (b) so that the House... What Committee, Sir?"

Brummer: "Revenue Committee."

Speaker Yourell: "House Revenue Committee may meet at... What time?"

Brummer: "Well I think they're scheduled to meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow."

Speaker Yourell: "9 o'clock on November 2nd, in room..."

Brummer: "118"

Speaker Yourell: "118. Is there leave? Is there objection? Leave being granted, the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Mulcahey, are you ready for your Motion relative to the posting requirements to suspend Rule 20 (b)?"

Mulcahey: "I so move, Mr. Speaker, so that this Bill can be heard in Elementary and Secondary Education Committee Thursday morning at 8:30."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the posting requirements set forth in Rule 20 (t) so that the House Elementary and Secondary Committee may meet at 8... What time, Sir?"

Mulcahey: "8:30."

Speaker Yourell: "8:30 a.m. on November 3rd in room..."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, also, add to that Bill number is House Bill 1140. And this, I understand, has been cleared with both sides of the aisle. It's been cleared with this side of the aisle for sure."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Is Representative Richmond on the floor? For what reason does Representative Davis rise?"

Davis: "Well if we're on the order of announcements, I'd like to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

remind those Members appointed to the Statewide Building Code Committee created by Resolution 245, there will be a hearing tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock in the Stratton Building in D-1."

Speaker Yourell: "On page four of the Calendar, under the Order of Business, Reduction and Item Veto Motions, appears Senate Bill 378, Motion #1. Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan in the chamber? On the Order of Reduction Item Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 394, Representative DeJaegher. Representative Ronan. Let's back up and pick up Senate Bill 378. Motion #1, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'll be with you in a second. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the...asking the Legislature to reestablish the nurse scholarship money. All of the Members of the House are aware of this legislation. It was overridden in the Senate last week under the leadership of Senator Prescott Bloom. It's not a partisan issue. Obviously, what our goal is, is to reestablish the funding for the baccalaureate program and nurse programs. It's a very needed piece of legislation. We've passed it out of the General Assembly numerous times in the past, and I assume that we have bipartisan support to pass it out again. The Governor vetoed it, but I think he's wrong. I think the money is necessary."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 378 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was back in the Rules Committee, and I only heard part of the Gentleman's explanation. Would he be kind enough to repeat that for me, please, just briefly?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "What I'm asking for is the legislature to override the Governor's veto and reestablish the \$300,000 in money for a baccalaureate nurse scholarship program. It's an issue that's been debated before the House numerous times. We've always gone along and said that this is a much needed program. And I would appreciate the support of everyone in the chamber."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative Ronan for your explanation. There was a time in this state and this country when we had a shortage of nurses. That is no longer the case. There is no justification to take state money to encourage people to go on and get a baccalaureate degree when there will be no demonstrable benefit to the public who is footing the Bill. There would certainly be a benefit to those nurses who enrolled in a program and were supported by the loan program that was involved. I think the Governor's correct when he stated in his veto message, while he supports financial assistance programs for Illinois students and undergraduate education, he doesn't believe that individual scholarships or loan programs should be created for each of the disciplines. We have a very handsome loan program, grant program in place in the state. We have a variety of federal programs in place, and certainly these individuals are eligible to participate in that particular program and be competitive along with everybody else. And it's for that reason and that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in support of the Governor's veto of this specific program. Number one, there is not a demonstrable need in nursing today. And, number two, there are other avenues available both on the national and federal level, and I would encourage the people to look in that direction."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I'm truly amazed at some of the things the previous speaker had said. First of all he says that we have a handsome scholarship program in this state. The truth is that we do not and that is precisely because we do not that we have not been educating an adequate number of baccalaureate nurses, and that is the need for this legislation. The Governor has said in his veto message that he doesn't believe in doing it for a lot of specialized disciplines. Well, on that I can agree with the Governor that we don't need to do it for a lot of specialized disciplines, but I do think that where there is a need, where we have been short in the past that we ought to make up for that shortage. And here, we have a situation where, unlike the previous speaker would have you believe that this is going to be paid for by the public with no public benefit, I submit that the public benefit will be substantial. We are having a tremendous time in this state trying to control health care costs. Nurses provide quality health care, and they fill roles that are very much needed, and they do it in a very cost-effective way. And so, if we are going to make an investment of public dollars, we could not make a better investment for a better return than this particular item, and I would urge the House to override the reduction veto."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Hastert."

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

Speaker Yourell: "Indicates he will."

Hastert: "Could you tell me, what is the cost of this Bill?"

Ronan: "The cost to the state will be \$280,000."

Hastert: "Okay. 280, and that depends on how many nurses that you have come through, too, right?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Ronan: "Obviously, we may not expend all of the money if not that many people apply for the scholarship program."

Hastert: "Or if it's a big nurse year, we could have more. Correct?"

Ronan: "No, it's limited. The total expenditure for this year would be \$280,000."

Hastert: "Alright."

Ronan: "So that it's a limited program."

Hastert: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Proceed, Sir."

Hastert: "\$280,000, \$300,000, whatever you look at it, it's a third of a million dollars. It's a third of a million dollars here. A third of a million dollars there. Three times, four times, and all of a sudden we're talking about millions and millions of dollars. Somewhere, we're going to have to say no to excessive spending. I think this is the time to say no, and I ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in support of Senate Bill 378, even though the Governor and Leadership on this side of the aisle is opposed to it. I might not be a very good politician. I've only managed to survive six terms down here. But I know that one out of every forty-three registered nurses, registered voters in Illinois, everyone out of...every forty-three women registered voters is a nurse. I have 980 nurses in my district. I'm not going to vote against the nurses and take a chance on not coming back here. And I'd suggest that some of the other candidates, some of the other Republican candidates on this side of the aisle start to think about that. Maybe the fact that there are so few of us here because we voted against everything. This is a chance. It's not going to break the state. \$300,000 is

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

not going to break the State of Illinois. It won't hurt them one bit. And it might make some friends among the ladies, among the nurses. It's for a good cause, and it might get some nurses out helping Republicans next time for a change. They helped me last time, and that's why I'm here, and that's why I'm going to vote for them."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with the sentiments of one of the previous speakers who said that spending a little bit here, spending a little bit there, finally, we get to a point that we can't afford to spend any more money. That's true. We can't. However, in Senate Bill 378, this measure is not the place to start cutting; because, when you start cutting what is necessary to train nurses in Illinois, you start cutting at the very primary health care providing area. It's not physicians who are the prime health care people. It is nurses. When you're in a hospital, the people you ring for that come running when you're ill, first, is the nurse. We have to have people who are trained and responsive, who are well-trained, who are encouraged to get into the nursing field. The money provided by this Bill will do that, and I would urge people to vote for the override of the Governor's line item veto."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I've heard enough. I move the previous question."

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The previous question is moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bonan, to close."

Bonan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in closing, I want to make a few points. As I started my presentation, this is not a

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

partisan issue. I've brought this Bill before the General Assembly five times. Every time we've passed it with overwhelming margins with tremendous support from the other side of the aisle. There are 120,000 nurses in the State of Illinois. In every one of your districts, there is a large number of nurses who work day in and day out to improve the health care situation of this state. It's a profession that needs the opportunity for advancement. This is the kind of program that will allow that advancement. Just to respond to one of the speakers on the other side of the aisle, he says the Federal Government can do it. You're all aware of what's going on in the Federal Government. The Reagan administration has cut scholarship programs to the bone. Nurse scholarship programs have been cut 50% in the last two years. The only way we can address those cutbacks is to institute state programs that can get the job done, control health care costs, service the people of the State of Illinois, and most importantly, keep a profession moving in the right direction. That's why we're sent to the General Assembly. That's what we're mandated to do. I applaud Representative McAuliffe for his courage on this legislation, and I hope that other Members on his side of the aisle join with Representative McAuliffe, use good judgment so they, too, can return a year from now into the General Assembly. I urge everyone to move for the override of this vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 378 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Leverenz to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Just want to make sure we get enough green votes. The budget was constructed with this money in it. I suggest if

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

you lay off on this vote or vote red, I would hope that you would not have to see an emergency room or anything of that nature. We need the votes. Two years in a row, we've put the money in the program. The last time, I understand, through the Emergency Budget Act, or whatever, the money was withheld. So to say that because of our problems with finances this should not go into the budget, is ludicrous. It was constructed with it in it. Let's put a few more green votes up there."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Pangle, one minute to explain his vote."

Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill for several reasons. Number one, I sleep with a nurse when I'm lucky enough to be home, and I certainly understand the problems that nurses are now just the only ones trying to receive higher education. We may have an overabundance amount of nurses in the State of Illincis, but the problem we have in the State of Illinois is we don't have the highly technical trained nurses that this scholarship would help. I highly recommend its support, and I hope we can increase the green vote by many more votes. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "This takes 71 votes to pass. Representative Hoffman to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "No, Mr. Speaker, you answered my question. I just wanted to know how many votes it took."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I kind of think I'll request a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Yourell: "You are in order. Representative McGann, one minute to explain to his vote."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I cannot understand the speaker this evening state we no longer have a shortage of nurses. I am truly appalled at

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

such a statement which is not backed by fact. The community colleges in the State of Illinois have nursing programs going in full force in order to meet the needs of the hospitals throughout the state. If we don't need nurses, we should not have those nursing programs. Finally, the expertise that comes from the recipients of this baccalaureate is sorely needed throughout the community hospitals. I am privileged to vote 'aye', and I urge many more green votes up there. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Klemm, one minute to explain his vote."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the previous Representatives had indicated that you better watch yourself if you go to emergency service if you don't vote for this Bill. And I know it wasn't meant that way, at least I hope not, because I certainly would take offense to thinking that the nurses in Illinois would certainly consider their treatment of a patient regardless of how you vote. I've never found them to be that way. I certainly don't think that type of comment was proper. I do vote and will vote for this Bill, because of... or in spite of that comment."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Bea, one minute to explain his vote."

Bea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There is certainly a shortage of nurses throughout the state and especially in many of our rural areas of the state. We do need this program and in order to train and to fulfill the shortage that we have. Now, in terms of the services at the emergency room, I think the reference was made there that there would be a lack of nurses in order to take care of the patient sufficiently. And so, let's do give support to this Bill and make sure it flies out."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Yourell: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Motion, having received Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails. On the Order of Motions, page ten, appears House Bill 2100. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion. 'I move to take from the Table and return to the Calendar, Order of Third Reading.'"

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to take from the Table House Bill 2100 and put it on the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 2100 is a vehicle Bill for the capital development projects that are going through the legislative process. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Yourell: "The Lady moves to take from the Table and return to the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading, House Bill 2100. Is there discussion? This requires 71 votes. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "It sounds good to me."

Speaker Yourell: "Any further discussion? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. On the Bill, Representative Barnes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Barnes."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a necessary Bill that must pass this week for the bonding of projects for the prisons."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. This takes 71 votes. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page ten, on the Order of Motions, appears House Bill 2327. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2327, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Yourell: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Yourell: "Third Reading. Appearing on the Order...Appearing on page five, on the Order of Reduction Item Veto Motions, appears Senate Bill 394, Motion #1. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, did you just move 2327 to Third Reading?"

Speaker Yourell: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, are you aware that some Members...that Bill just appeared on Second Reading today, and are you aware that some Members wanted to file Amendments to that Bill so that that Bill would prohibit Members from giving scholarships, legislative scholarships, to dogs and other such creatures, so that the Bill would really effectively deal with the... expose that's to occur?"

Speaker Yourell: "Mr. Vinson, we are not on that Order of Business."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Vinson: "Would you ask the Sponsor if the Sponsor would consider taking that back to Second so that Members can deal with that particular kind of reform?"

Speaker Yourell: "Mr. Vinson, we are not on that Order of Business. We are on Order of Senate Bill 394, Reduction and Item Veto Motion. That Bill has been called. It's on the board."

Vinson: "So, we're not going to have a chance to prohibit legislative Members from giving legislative scholarships to dogs."

Speaker Yourell: "We should have had that action some time ago. We're not on that Order of Business, Mr. Vinson. Senate Bill 394, Item Veto Motions, Motion #5. Representative Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of the following items of Senate Bill 394, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On page 19, line item 20 through 25, and on page 19, 26 through 34, for a total of 1.3 million dollars for the operating expenses of our multi-county drug enforcement units. I am pleased that this Motion has a bipartisan support, as witnessed by the fact that Representative DeJaegher, Representative Matijevich and Representative McMaster have joined me in sponsoring this Motion. And the override Motion passed by over 55 to 1 in the Senate. About eight years ago, the Legislature created the multi-county drug enforcement unit, which was to fight drug trafficking throughout the State of Illinois. Over that period of years, they compiled a very impressive record of a 93% conviction rate of those arrested for trafficking in drugs. That was in 1982. In 1981, they had a 92% conviction rate. This program is funded 50% with local funds and 50% by state funds.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

However, the funding has always been rather tenuous. So last year, the State Legislature created the Narcotics Profit Forfeiture Act; and, with that Act, they created the Drug Traffic Evention Fund. Now, this fund was to be funded through sales of assets seized from those who would traffic in drugs, that would be convicted drug peddlers. Those assets would be sold and put into the Drug Traffic Prevention Fund. But this year they've had some trouble in starting up that particular Fund. The Fund itself...The cases are in court. And as we know, due process takes time. And right now, the balance of that Fund is only around \$7,000. Now that \$7,000 does not go far enough in helping to provide the state matching pcrtion for the local funds. And this appropriation would provide the state matching funds for the funds that the local governments have already contributed to this program. And first the local funds are spent and then the Drug Traffic Prevention Fund funds are spent and finally, the state funds. So in all hope, we all hope that the entire appropriation would not be needed this year; and, as the years pass by and the Drug Traffic Prevention Fund prosecutions begin to be coming into the fund, we would hope that not as much state money would be needed over the period of years. So I would be very hopeful that you would join me in overriding the Governor's veto for this very popular and effective program that is throughout the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "Is there discussion? Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of the lady's Motion. She's atsolutely correct. The problem that we've had since the passage of the Bill that would change the method of funding is simply gearing up and getting the assets seized from drug dealers. We have not

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

been able to do that in sufficient enough amounts to generate the kind of dollars that we know are needed in the program. She's also absolutely right when she suggests that all of this appropriation may not be needed. And frankly, much of it probably will be. These units of government, the MEG groups have dealt with a number of problems in the last two years. Over 2,000 arrests and a 1,000 convictions through the MEG group efforts. This is a program that's supported throughout the State of Illinois, one that needs to be an ongoing one to deal with one of the worst problems in our society, and we should support the Lady's Motion on a bipartisan basis, restoring the funds for this necessary and vital program."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this Bill. As I've said before, small and medium-sized communities cannot do this alone. And I think it's been pointed that we have not generated the funds that are necessary to keep this as an ongoing program. It's important in the State of Illinois. It's important to the people of Illinois, and I would urge strong bipartisan support on this particular issue. Thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative DeJaegher, to close."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support. This particular Bill that we are addressing ourselves to needs and must have our support. There are nine units presently operating throughout the State of Illinois. I believe that each and every one of us are quite knowledgeable that this is a very useful tool. As the Governor stated, when the original funding came to this House became available to

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

that unit, this unit is the state's most valuable law enforcement we have against drug traffic and the sophisticated pushing of drugs. I think it's our responsibility to address ourselves to the cause. The cause is drugs. It's destroying the youth of America. It's something that must be done. Funding is not adequate for that particular agency. And as I stated before, that particular agency has a conviction rate in my county, and MEG does serve the counties of Mercer, Rock Island and Henry County. In those three specific counties, they are coming up with a 66% drug conviction rate, something that has been unheard of as far as drug traffic goes. And I think it behooves each and every one of you to become familiar with MEG and the areas that they serve. As I stated before, there are nine units throughout the State of Illinois affecting many counties, many municipalities, many cities. They had done a tremendous job and, hopefully, that you will override the Governor's veto, because funds are not available and, hopefully, that we will have total bipartisan support."

Speaker Yourell: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 394, pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Johnson to explain his vote. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails. Representative McGann, for what reason do you rise?"

McGann: "Mr. Speaker, would you kindly repeat the findings of the last vote? I thought I understood you to say the word 'failed'."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "No, prevailed."

McGann: "Prevails. Thank you very much."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative McGann, do you have an announcement?"

McGann: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 20 (k) for the purposes of an organizational meeting for the Committee on High Risk Infants and Newborns which was created by House Resolution 435. The Committee, if the Rule is suspended, the Committee would meet on Thursday, November the 3rd at 8:30 a.m. in room 122 B of the State Capitol."

Speaker Yourell: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there discussion? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Stuffle, for what reason do you rise?"

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, merely to indicate that we'll have, as posted on page 11, a meeting of the Committee on Economic Recovery tomorrow at 9:30 in room H-2. It'll be a short meeting for the purpose of creating a Subcommittee, and I expect we could be out of there in five to ten minutes."

Speaker Yourell: "Any further announcements? Mr. Clerk, Death Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 537, in respect to the memory of Alice Daniels; 559, by Brookins, in respect to the memory of Howard Spooner, Jr.; and 560, Brockins, in respect to the memory of Luberta McAlister."

Speaker Yourell: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Resolution is adopted. Representative Richmond, for what reason do you rise?"

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request permission, whatever is required, to hold an Ag Committee, a very brief Ag Committee meeting 8:30 Thursday morning."

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

85th Legislative Day

November 1, 1983

Speaker Yourell: "Gentleman moves to postpone the provisions of Rule 20 (b) for the purpose of the posting requirements for Agriculture and to meet in room 118 to consider House Bills 1571, and 1573, and House Bill 825 at 8:30 a.m. Thursday morning. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. 118. House stands adjourned till 10 a.m... Representative Giorgi. Representative..."

Giorgi: "I move that we adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Yourell: "All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House stands adjourned till 10 a.m. tomorrow morning."

01/25/84  
10:50

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 01, 1983

HB-1365 MOTION	PAGE	59
HB-2100 THIRD READING	PAGE	96
HB-2100 MOTION	PAGE	96
HB-2327 SECOND READING	PAGE	97
HB-2327 MOTION	PAGE	62
HB-2328 FIRST READING	PAGE	1
HB-2329 FIRST READING	PAGE	1
HB-2330 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0097 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	4
SB-0143 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SB-0143 MOTION	PAGE	63
SB-0149 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	17
SB-0151 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	6
SB-0176 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	13
SB-0286 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	18
SB-0302 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	65
SB-0302 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	67
SB-0304 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	19
SB-0306 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	20
SB-0378 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	88
SB-0394 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	98
SB-0403 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	21
SB-0403 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	25
SB-0403 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	22
SB-0448 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	50
SB-0482 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	22
SB-0512 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	23
SB-0546 SECOND READING	PAGE	85
SB-0546 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	86
SB-0576 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	24
SB-0581 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	26
SB-0582 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	30
SB-0619 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	36
SB-0688 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	67
SB-0713 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	30
SB-0726 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	70
SB-0736 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	31
SB-0919 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	39
SB-0995 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	40
SB-0996 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	42
SB-1020 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	79
SB-1104 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	43
SB-1111 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	46
SB-1116 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	47
SB-1122 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	77
SB-1157 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	48
SB-1195 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	58
SB-1218 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	56
SB-1269 VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	49
SB-1309 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SB-1309 MOTION	PAGE	64

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - BEVEREND WILLIAM J. PECKHAM	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
RECESS	PAGE	3
HOUSE RECONVENES - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN CHAIR	PAGE	4
REPRESENTATIVE YOURELL IN CHAIR	PAGE	85
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	102
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	103