

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is the Reverend Anthony Tzortzis of St. Anthony's Hellenic Orthodox Church of Springfield, Illinois. Father Tzortzis."

Father Tzortzis: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Oh Christ, the true Light which illumines and sanctifies every man who comes into the world, let the light of Thy countenance be shown upon our State Representatives and all loyal officers of our government of our country; that, in need, we may behold the light ineffable, and guide our footsteps alright to the keeping of Thy commandments, through the intercessions of Thy all pure Mother and all the saints. Amen."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Father. Representative Klemm will lead the Pledge."

Klemm 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 Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 160 Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. It's the intention of the Chair today to take all House Bills and Senate Bills that are on Third Reading and Second Reading that could be moved, and at least we're going to call them today. That will take us through the middle of page six, so it could be a long day, or it could be a short day. It's also the intention of the Chair to come back in on Monday, so you can all make your plans accordingly. On the Calendar on page two under the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 2461, Representative Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 2571.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar appears Senate Bill 1510, Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich on the floor? Out of the record. House (sic - Senate) Bill 1581, Representative Birkinbine. Representative Birkinbine on the floor? Out of the record. House (sic - Senate) Bill 1593, Representative McMaster. Out of the record. House (sic - Senate) Bill 1658, Representative Woodyard. Read the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1658."

Clerk Leone: "House (sic - Senate) Bill 1658, a Bill for an Act to release highway easements and to restore access rights to certain described lands. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1658 is the annual highway easement Bill, in which we will be returning approximately 35 acres back to individual ownership, and will return over 50,000 dollars to Department of Transportation. The appraising has all been done, and I don't know of any opposition to this."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? In opposition, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, not in opposition. I wasn't quite clear... clear in... on what the Gentleman said. I wonder if he said, Mr. Speaker, that a certified appraisal had been obtained for each parcel."

Woodyard: "Yes, they have been done. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1658 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 140 voting 'aye',

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page two, Senate Bills Third Reading. Senate Bill 734, Representative Collins. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Regional Port District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 734 is jointly sponsored by Representative Capparelli and myself. Briefly, what 7... how Senate Bill 734 would do, would be to relieve the... the tenants operating of the Chicago Regional Port District of the obli... I beg your pardon. It would relieve the Port District of the obligation to lease to two competing contractors who would operate landings at the port. That is the current law. Unfortunately, because of lack of traffic out there, one tenant has been able to operate successfully, the other tenant has been unable to open... to operate in the past year. Senate Bill 734 would permit one tenant to take over and operate both operations, either by leasing or... from the other tenant, or working in conjunction with them, but it would remove the prohibition now existent in the law, which would state that you must have two contractors. The Bill is designed to promote traffic at the Port District, at the Iroquois Landing. It's... It's imperative that this pass for the viability of the Port, and I would solicit the support of the House."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, in opposition. Oh, no, Representative Bullock. I'm sorry."

Bullock: "I was wondering if Representative Collins would yield for a question."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Collins: "Certainly."

Bullock: "I just got my answer."

Collins: "I may not know it. Why don't you give it to me?"

Bullock: "My answer is that a friend of mine wants this Bill."

Collins: "Yes, that... that answers loud and clear."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "The Bill is as I have explained, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 734 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 144 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Getty, do you have any excused absences this morning?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may the record indicate that Representatives Chapman and Satterthwaite are excused due to official business."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser, do you have excused absences?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, could the journal please show that Representative Virginia Frederick is absent because of official business?"

Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate, in both cases. Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear, on Short Debate, Senate Bill 1510. I was approaching my seat when you erroneously passed me by, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "You'd like to return to the Order of Senate Bills,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill 1510?
Are you asking leave for that?"

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, leave."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks leave to return to Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bill 1510. Are there objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 1510. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Peters in the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. 1510 permits sanitary districts throughout the state to sell notes at a public or private sale, or to enter into agreements for the sale and purchase of such notes. It changes the maximum rate to conform with the General Interest Rate Act under the resi... revised statutes, and, according to the sanitary district, the market has developed in the financial community for general obligation demand notes. This will be a substantial saving to the taxpayers, and also has worked in conjunction with the civic federation approved it. It came out of Committee 19 to 0, and I would appreciate..."

Speaker Peters: "Short Debate. Anyone in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1510 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 130 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bills, Third Reading, page two of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1212, Representative Ropp. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1212, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Corn Marketing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1212 does not, in any way, mandate a corn checkoff. It makes two changes in the current statute. One being that the rules that are drafted by the operating board do not have to be approved by JCAB, and two, should there be an interest... increase the checkoff from 1/4 cent to anything above that, it must go back to the producers for a referendum no sooner than five years after the program had gone into effect. I ask your support on this Bill, Senate Bill 1212."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1212 pass?'. Representative Reilly? No? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1212 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 145 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page two of the Calendar, Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 1581, Representative Birkinbine. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1581, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

House. Senate Bill 1581 is designed to update the Illinois Insurance Code Sections of group life insurance with a model Bill put forward by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. It's designed to enable Illinois insurance companies to write group and health and life insurance plans that presently must be written in out-of-state companies. It passed the Senate by a vote of 54 to 0. It has the support of groups such as the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the Illinois Alumni Association, B'nai Brith, and AMVETS. I know of no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Short Debate and opposition, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I don't rise in opposition, but I do rise because of the necessity to put in some legislative intent, here, and I'd like leave to proceed on that basis."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir. Proceed, Sir."

Getty: "Referring to page eight, line twenty-two, it reads, 'Provided, however, that no such provision shall preclude the assertion, at any time, of a defense based upon provisions in the policy which relate to eligibility for coverage.' Would eligibility for coverage include health conditions?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "No, it would not."

Getty: "Could you give us an example of the type of item that would be covered under such a phrase as 'eligibility for coverage'?"

Birkinbine: "Yes, if a company said, 'We will insure your employees, and somebody was included who was not an employee of the company, that person would not be covered.' If a company indicated... an insurance company said, 'We will insure your employees, except for the corporate pilot

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

of the corporate plane, because that a specially hazardous job.', and, the company went ahead and included that person. That would not be included."

Getty: "So that we may say that when we use the phrase... phrase 'eligibility for coverage', we are referring to a status, as opposed to someone's personal health conditions."

Birkinbine: "Yes, absolutely."

Getty: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1581 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 157 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', one voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1593, Representative McMaster. Out of the record. Page two of the Calendar. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1242, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1247, Representative Friedrich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1259, Representative Christensen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1260, Representative Christensen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1267, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1267 is strictly permissive legislation. What it allows in Cook County is, it allows the assessor to assess on a every other year, rather than at the quadrennial year, as was now the situation. It's permissive. It will have to... it will

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

mean that the Cook County Board would have to grant enough funds so that it could be done, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1267 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 153 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1288, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1288, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the disease of PKU, and other metabolical diseases. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "The Senate Bill 1288... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1288 simply takes out... a couple of years ago, we started a program of requiring the Department of Public Health to test for metabolic diseases, including PKU, and I'm the first to admit, I can't pronounce the whole name, so I'm not even going to try - PKU will do. It's basically a disease that, if you don't test for right within a very short time after birth, it either... the child either develops it or the child doesn't, but if the child does, then the child is severely retarded and severely retarded for life. The record is that, by conducting these tests, we've been able to reduce dramatically the level of such... the incidence of this disease. What we want to do is take... we put a sunset clause in. We want to take the sunset clause out, because the program has worked. Be glad to answer

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

questions, otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1288 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 156 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1296, Representative Greiman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Rosehill Cemetery Company. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill which amends the charter of Rosehill Cemetery. Most of the cemeteries in Illinois are... are regulated by the Cemetery Care Act. However, some of the older ones are not. This particular Amendment provides that when real estate held by a cemetery... by the cemetery company for non-burial purposes, that then they will lose their tax exemption, so that they will be taxpayers like the rest of us, and that's basically what it does. It means that if someone... if a company... if this cemetery company is... has land that it's holding for development, as is the case in this situation, that then, in that case, its land will be taxable. And that's all it does. It merely makes it fair, so that their land will be taxed like everybody else's land."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Barr."

Barr: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Greiman: "Yes."

Barr: "Yes, Representative Greiman, this Rosehill Cemetery was chartered, was it not, by..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barr, excuse me. Will the Gentleman in front of Representative Greiman please move to the side? Thank you. Proceed, Sir."

Barr: "Representative Greiman, isn't it... am I not correct that Rosehill Cemetery was chartered by a special charter issued by the Illinois Legislature, prior to 1870?"

Greiman: "That's correct."

Barr: "And isn't... am... am I also correct that the Rosehill Cemetery Corporation does not support your Bill?"

Greiman: "Yes, that's right. I would say very clearly, they... they have about six million dollars worth of real estate that is... they have now platted for... without putting cemetery lots in, and have entered into negotiations to sell part of and to build on, and they definitely are unhappy about paying taxes on this land, but it's on a very prime commercial street, and they admit that they have no intention whatsoever of putting any graves in this property."

Barr: "No. No. Excuse me, Representative. I understand that, and I think, on the merits of the proposal, I certainly support what you're trying to do, but I think we have a... a serious constitutional question, here, and I'm... I would be interested in your opinion with regard to cases decided by both the Illinois Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court, with regard to institutions specially chartered. For example, Northwestern University and others, prior to 1870. It's my understanding that the courts have held that any attempt by the Legislature to amend those special charters without the consent of the institution itself, are unconstitutional, that they violate

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

the provisions of the Federal Constitution. This goes all the way back to the famous Dartmouth College Case."

Greiman: "I... I would be happy to respond to that. Clearly, there... there could be, I'm sure, and will be some kind of litigation involved. I mean, from the standpoint of the... of the cemetery. There's the tax on six million dollars worth of commercial real estate, so they're certainly going to... going to battle it. However, my opinion is that this can fall within the purview of the... of the Gulf and Western and IC case. In that case, the Illinois Central Railroad had the same kind of tax-free charter... tax exemption, and it changed its corporate character, and expanded its... its charter, and the court held that it was liable for real estate taxes, in part thereafter, because of the... of the nature of the change. In this case, there were some 300 acres of the cemetery, all of it platted for... originally dedicated for cemetery work. Now, they've had a recent replatting, of which 37 acres, which is the commercial... prime commercial land, has not been platted with gravesites. Accordingly, I believe that this would be a sufficient waiver of their... of their right to enable us to make this change."

Barr: "To the Bill, just very briefly, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Barr: "I... I believe Representative Greiman has looked into this question. I think the Illinois Central Case is different here. The Illinois Central had gone through a corporate merger and violated the terms of its own charter, and I think we have a serious problem, when we pass legislation, even though it may be meritorious, as this Bill is, when there's a serious question - I think, a very serious question - as to its constitutionality, and I would urge the Members to vote 'no' on this Bill, for that reason."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill became... came before our Committee. It had a very good hearing, and I have to compliment Representative Greiman on the... the research and the interest he's taken into it. Yet, on the other hand, I did not support the passage of his proposal. In Committee, I was quite impressed with the witness who appeared on behalf of the Rosehill Cemetery. It seems to me, if we go in this direction, we are taking... we're setting something of a precedent, here, relevant to cemeteries. I know we have a number of cemeteries in our western suburban area, whose property may not... it currently being used for grave purposes. Indeed, some of the property... some of portion of the cemetery may be platted for gravesites and some may not, and yet, the property remains. And, it seems to me that unless there is concrete and hard evidence that that property, indeed, is going to be sold for commercial purposes, and there's a great deal of speculation, by the way, in this cases. I listened to it. The presumption is... the presumption here is that Rosehill Cemetery has something in mind to do with this property. It may end up that way, it may not end up that way. I don't know, and the evidence wasn't clear on that point, from either side, but it would seem to me that this is a precedent-establishing type of legislation, if we enact it, and I think Representative Barr has made some excellent points, and I, too, would encourage the Members to think... think about it, and seriously consider not supporting Representative Greiman's Bill, here."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not often that you'll find me opposing my good friend Representative Greiman, and..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

and agreeing with Representatives Barr and Hudson, but this Bill does it. This... This puts me, and George Ray Hudson, and Bob Barr all in the same tank. I think that what we have here is an... an infringement upon a... a state charter, and... and... that was granted prior to 1870, and clearly something we can't do, regardless of what you think of the merits of the issue. It is just something that we cannot do. If the Rosehill Cemetery violates the... the conditions of the charter, they should be taken into court and sued, but we should not attempt to pursue this kind of a remedy. It just... If we do this, it simply invites other individuals, other groups, to come before the Assembly, and try to mend Northwestern's charter, or this charter, or that charter, and... and I don't think that... that we want to be the forum on which those kinds of battles are fought out, and so, I stand in opposition to this particular Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? On this question, Representative Kulas."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Kulas: "Representative Greiman, let's presume that Roselawn (sic - Rosehill) Cemetery sells twenty acres to Jewels, or whatever the case may be. How far back will they have to pay taxes on this twenty acres, then?"

Greiman: "Not... Not at all. They would pay now, as they start, at this point. The Bill, as originally filed in the Senate, had some kind of going back to tax in the past. This Bill does not. This Bill merely says that when you... when you stop using it for cemetery purposes, for burial purposes, at that point the assessor goes in and he makes an investigation and he would then say, 'Hey, they're not using this for... for burial purposes any more. Let us now

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

start taxing it.' So that, there's no going back. There... It starts from when the assessor finds it. It's no longer being used for burial purposes. In this case, the... the lawyer, very articulate lawyer for the cemetery, who appeared before the Committee, admitted that they were not... that they had no plans to use this, ever, for burial purposes. That's what he said."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if Representative Greiman would yield for a question."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bullock: "Alan, where is this property located?"

Greiman: "This property is at Western Avenue along... between Peterson, roughly, and Bryn Mawr. It's prime... prime commercial land."

Bullock: "Yeah, I go that way quite often, to Evanston. What do they intend to use this property for?"

Greiman: "Well, they did... they were negotiating with a Jewel to put up a shopping center there, and that's all I know. The neighbors, several thousand neighbors, have met and have tried to explain their concerns. People who live... people who have relatives buried near the edge of their property have expressed their concerns about it, so that it's been both the graveholders as well as the neighbors have been very concerned about the development of this land."

Bullock: "You don't think that Steven Spielberg has any idea for poltergeists on this, do you?"

Greiman: "I don't think there's any E. T.'s that are living there, either."

Bullock: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I just wanted to make... ask a question of the Sponsor."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will yield."

Cullerton: "If the cemetery decided that they... that this Bill passed, and they had to pay taxes on this land, if they sell... sold it to a developer, would that discourage them from selling the land, do you think?"

Greiman: "My guess is it would probably encourage them to sell the land, they might have to divest themselves. Now, they have the best of all worlds. They are essentially in the real estate development business, and they are holding their lands free of any taxation."

Cullerton: "My question is, though, if they... if they change their mind and decided not to sell, and... and then went back and used it as a cemetery, they wouldn't have to pay taxes on the land."

Greiman: "They would not have to pay taxes. Because it would be... then be used for burial purposes, but they have made it clear that they are not going to use this for burial purposes."

Cullerton: "That's before they've received a tax bill."

Greiman: "Right. Before they receive a tax bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Greiman, to close."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Bowman and Hudson are on the same side, perhaps I'm on the right track. This Bill is a... it's a serious concern. We have a corporation chartered by... by us for burial purposes. We have a tradition of saying to cemetery corporations, as well as under our current cemetery care act, that we respect the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

importance of the burial of dead people. We... We respect the importance of maintaining those as sacred grounds, and we have, therefore, given tax exemptions. Now, we have a situation where a corporation that owns a cemetery says, 'We are no longer going to use this for cemetery purposes. We have a prime piece of commercial land, and we... we are not going to use it for that. We're going to develop it.' And so, to this, we... we look, and we say, 'All right, if you're going to develop it, you're a private developer, then. You're like every other real estate developer, and you should pay real estate taxes. You get... We no longer extend to you this very special exemption of being tax-free. Instead, we give you... you must come into the market place, if you're a real estate developer. If you're holding 30 acres of prime commercial land, you must come into the market place. I think that the change, the replatting of this cemetery takes them out, just as did the... the case of the Illinois Central... takes them out of their tax-free status. The Bill would not immediately tax them. It would require a finding by the assessor, that in fact, the property is not being used for burial ground. It is a fair Bill. It brings equity to the system, and it puts... it puts property which rightly should be on the tax rolls, on the tax rolls. I... I believe in the sanctity of cemeteries and believe that we should not tax them. I... I share my feelings... those feelings about the Cemetery Care Act and as about this charter as well, but I can... I do not feel that developers ought to have... real estate developers ought to have tax-free property. It's as simple as that. I think we, constitutionally, can do this, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1296 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 81 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'nay'. Representative Greiman? The Gentleman asks a Poll of the Absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Alstat. Barnes. Beatty. Bradley. Braun. Capparelli. Chapman. Collins. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative DiPrima votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Domico. Ralph Dunn. Virginia Frederick. Katz. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Martire. Mautino. McAuliffe."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk, hold on. Now, the purpose of the Poll of the Absentees is for those individuals who have not voted to vote. We have gone through the Poll, and people in the beginning part of the alphabet are now getting up, which causes confusion for the Clerk, and for Mr. Greiman, who is trying to keep count, and everybody else. Now, let us return to the beginning, Mr. Clerk, and redo this."

Clerk Leone: "Alstat. Barnes. Beatty. Bradley. Braun."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Record me as 'aye', please."

Speaker Peters: "Wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Capparelli. Chapman. Collins. Deuster. Domico. Ralph Dunn. Virginia Frederick. Katz. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Martire. Mautino. McAuliffe."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Mautino, 'aye'. Proceed. Representative Currie, that's the second time we've missed you. Representative Currie, 'aye'. Representative Giorgi."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Giorgi: "From 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "We've missed Giorgi again. 86 'aye'.
Representative Barnes, 'aye'. Jane Barnes, 'aye'.
Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Absentees.
Leinenweber. Leverenz. Martire. O'Brien."

Speaker Peters: "What happened to Karpziel? Did we go over the
K's. Representative Karpziel, how do you wish to be
recorded, Ma'am? Representative Karpziel, 'aye'. I'm
sorry? From 'no' to 'aye'? From 'no' to 'aye'. Proceed,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Absentees.
O'Brien. Pechous. Peters. Rhem."

Speaker Peters: "Rhem, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Satterthwaite. Schneider."

Speaker Peters: "Schneider, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Stanley. Stearney. C. M. Stiehl. Terzich.
Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels, from 'present' to 'aye'.
Representative Irv Smith from, 'present' to 'aye'.
Representative Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Are we ready, Mr. Clerk?
Representative Griffin, from 'present' to 'aye'.
Representative J. J. Wolf, from 'present' to 'no'.
Representative Flinn, from 'present' to 'aye'.
Representative Huff, from 'present' to 'aye', and
Representative Richmond, from 'present' to 'aye'. Any
further requests? What's the count? Representative Ewing?
What's... Pardon? It's... It's over. The required
number. There are 96 voting 'aye', 34... 34? 34 voting
'nay', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a
Constitutional Ma... This Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared 'passed'.
Senate Bill 1324, Representative Daniels. 1324, read the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1324, a Bill for an Act in relationship to interest rates and tax anticipation warrants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill - Senate Bill 1324 as amended by Senate Amendment #1, changes approximately 30 statutory references to the 9% or 70% of prime commercial rate interest rate ceilings, which needed to be changed in accordance with Senate Bill 59, which the Governor signed on May 12, 1982. Senate Bill 59 amended the Municipal Code, the Public Corporation Bond Interest Act and Industrial Building Revenue Bond Act, increasing the annual interest rate ceiling to the greater of 9% or 125% of the rate of the average municipal bond yields. This is a corrective piece of legislation. I know of no opposition. It passed the Senate by a vote of 55 to nothing."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Friedrich? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall Senate Bill 1324 pass?". Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kulas? Mautino, 'aye'. Mautino. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 147 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1360, Representative Kustra. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kustra."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1360 is the Bill which increases the maximum Illinois State Scholarship Commission monetary award from \$1,950 to \$2,050. The original Senate Bill provided for a \$2,250 award. A Senate Amendment reduced that to \$2,050. That's where it stands now. The Bill came out of the Higher Education Committee on a 12 to 1 vote. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "How does the appropriation for scholarships this year compare to the total appropriation for scholarships last year?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kustra?"

Kustra: "The... I don't know whether I have the appropriation level, but the maximum award this year is 45.9% of the FY '83 average private tuition and fees, whereas, last year it was 48.1% of the average tuition and fees."

Kane: "The reason... The reason I asked about the appropriation level is that, if we increase the maximum award, and the total appropriation is not expanded to reflect that increase, then what we will have is larger amount of scholarships going to fewer people. That's why I asked about the appropriation."

Kustra: "It's my understanding there is money in the appropriation for this 50 dollar increase."

Kane: "Well, is that your understanding, or is that your knowledge?"

Kustra: "That's my knowledge."

Kane: "Could you tell us what the... what the two... the... the relative appropriations for this year and next year are?"

Kustra: "For the increase, there's 2.4 million."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Kane: "And, is that earmarked specifically for the increase?"

Kustra: "Yes, it is."

Kane: "Okay."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Wikoff: "Could you tell me, Bob, how... what the average maximum grant to a public school student might be?"

Kustra: "It's around \$1,000."

Wikoff: "In other words, this increase is... in no way is going help any public school student. Yes or no?"

Kustra: "There's four million in there for public tuition increases."

Wikoff: "Yes, but the increase that you are asking is not going to be of any benefit to any public school student."

Kustra: "That's correct."

Wikoff: "And, in line with the... Representative Kane's questioning what you are doing by increasing the amount per student, you are actually diminishing the number of students which can achieve scholarship funds. Is that not true?"

Kustra: "Not necessarily. There's still an increase over last year."

Wikoff: "I think that's an evasive answer which a... you're not normally for. I think pure mathematics will show that when you do increase the amount of funding to individuals, it's going to lessen the amount of individuals who are going to be able to achieve some aid and assistance through scholarship, and Mr. Speaker, I would just like to urge people to give very dear consideration to this, and... and urge their opposition to this increase. I don't think it's warranted."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will. Eagerly."

McPike: "Representative Kustra, your answers are... are never evasive on the House floor, and Representative Wikoff indicated that that last one might have a little evasive. My concern, I think, is similar to Representative Wikoff's. It's my understanding that the average grant to a student going to a public university, the average grant is 750 dollars. The average grant of a... for a student going to a private university is 1500 dollars. This Bill of yours increases the maximum amount going to a student going to a private college, so that if the total amount of dollars available for scholarships does not increase, the direct effect of this Bill is to give more money to kids going to private schools, less money to kids going to public schools, and therefore, is it not true that the... the direct effect of this Bill will be to... to give fewer students scholarships?"

Kustra: "I won't deny, Representative MCPike, that that's one way of looking at it, but on the other hand, the Board of Higher Education recommended that the maximum award equal 65% of average tuition and fees at private colleges and universities. This figure, which of course, is not at all to the liking of the private colleges and universities in the... in the State of Illinois, is much below that, and the maximum award of 2,050 dollars, which... which this Bill would provide would fund 45.9% of the average private tuition for next fiscal year. So, this is... is hardly a Bill which hands over large numbers of dollars to private school students. As a matter of fact, the private school community feels that this is too low."

McPike: "To the Bill, then, Mr. Speaker. I understand that private schools would like us to pay the full tuition cost,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

which we do not do. It's my concern that we make available to students in Illinois, scholarships monies... scholarship money so that they can attend a state school: University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, or whatever it is, so that they can afford to go to these schools. In times of limited revenues that we are in today, if we increase the monies going to the private schools, there's no way that we can get around the fact that we are, therefore, decreasing the amount of monies available for scholarships to state schools. There's no way of getting around that, and that is exactly what this Bill does. This Bill simply says that we will, this coming year, give fewer scholarships to kids that want to attend the University of Illinois, or Southern Illinois University, or whatever state school they choose to attend; we will simply give fewer scholarships this year than we gave last year, because we are using the monies to fund private schools. Now, I don't think that's right. I think the first obligation of this Legislature should be to make monies available for students going to our public universities, and then, if we can afford it, and only then, should we then increase the amount going to private schools. This Bill certainly does just the opposite, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. To provide a few answers, if I may; last year the Illinois State Scholarship Commission funded grants for 92,000 students, Representative McPike. Under this Bill, they will grant students in the number of 89,000. In other words, this Bill will remove 3,000 students from receiving grants from the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. If we kill this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bill, Sir, you would have, with the same amount of dollars, without the increase to private schools, you would pick up at least 1,000 of those students that would be going to public universities. If we were to, indeed, increase it to cover the cost of tuition increases an average of about 15% around the state, we would need an additional four million dollars just to cover the cost - the increased cost - of tuition for students that are currently receiving ISSC grants. In other words, the Bill is four million dollars short of taking care of the same students that we had last year. If we turn around and increase the maximum grant, we're going to reduce it by at least an additional 2,000 students. So, it is very much a question of priorities. It's very much a question of whether or not we're going to provide in one area or another, or whether, in fact, it is even enough to take care of the problem. It's further compounded when you put in the community college system. Let me tell you what happened. Last year, the ISSC needed additional grant in the amount of about three million dollars. They didn't have it. They decided what they would do was come back and ask students to repay, to repay every grant less than 50 dollars, that they received. I had a student at Carl Sandburg Community College in Galesburg that was on Public Aid, that had to repay the 50 dollars. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit to you very much that the ISSC, in this budget, leaves a great deal to be desired. We certainly are really coming down heavy on the community college system. We know their... their tuitions are low; therefore, the maximum grant will be low. If we... If we translated this into community college students alone, instead of the four year institutions, we could pick up at least an additional 2,000 students with the same amount of money."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Kustra: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise in support of this Bill, and it... it's kind of hard to get through all the different arguments that are being made, here. First of all, perhaps Representative Kustra will later comment, but the figures I..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Sir. Give the Gentleman your attention, please. Will those not entitled to the floor, please leave."

Reilly: "Thank you. The figures I have indicate that the Bill, as it has... the... the scholarship Bill would provide funding for 91,358 students. Perhaps Representative Kustra, when he closes, can discuss that. Second of all, this isn't the appropriation Bill that we have before us. If there are those who think the appropriation Bill ought to be increased, then, when that is before us on Second Reading, that would be the time to deal with that issue. Thirdly, the Senate increased the appropriation to reflect this Bill; that is, the substantive Bill. I would assume, as a logical matter, that if the substantive Bill were defeated, that we would revert to an earlier and lower appropriation level, so I don't know that we'd get very far on that argument. But, the main point I want to make is, all this talk assumes that, somehow, the state is not providing support for public higher education. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars on public higher education. It does not seem to me misplaced, as a matter of long-standing state policy, that we support private higher education also. It has an important part to play; a very noble, long-standing part to play in higher education in this state. The Board of Higher Education, not notably unfriendly to public higher education, says that we ought

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

to be providing something like 65% of the tuition and fees. This would only bring us up to about 49%, so it seems to me that we have a long-standing state public policy that we want to encourage private higher education. This does not even keep pace with inflation, in terms of what's happened to tuition there. It seems to me it's a perfectly reasonable Bill. It's not as if this is the only place, after all, where we provide money for public higher education. We will be appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for that purpose. This is a good Bill. It ought to be supported. It ought to be passed, and it ought to be signed into law. I would ask for favorable votes on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry?"

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Kustra to close."

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's been some debate on the question of how many awards the figure of 91,000 award has been used. At this particular time, that's an estimate of the Scholarship Commission, and there's really no way to know how... whether the awards will get to 91,000 or not. There's been some question raised about the size of the appropriation. Obviously, if the number of the awards come in at 91,000 or whatever, and they eat up the appropriation, that's the end of it. The awards will stop at that particular point. What concerns me, however, is the... the general issue over public versus private education. I hate to see this General Assembly get bogged

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

down into a debate on that subject. I think those who have watched the Board of Higher Education know that when it comes time to apportion funds for higher education in this state, the Board of Higher Education does not look at it as a matter of, well, if we appropriate for the public's, we're taking it out of the private's pocket, or vice versa. It seems to me that this particular Bill is, in fact, a reduction - a substantial reduction - in what the Board of Higher Education has recommended, and I would ask for your favorable consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1360 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Representative Stuffle to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Stuffle: "Well, looking at the board, this is probably futile, but the arguments made against this Bill were accurate. Any way you cut it, you're taking money from students who don't have money. You're taking money from public universities and putting in in private. There's no question about that. You can talk about the equity in the structure of tuitions all you want, but you're taking money from the public students, who tend to be less wealthy, from less wealthy families than the private school students. You're giving it to private schools. You're doing nothing to help, but only to hurt, the private school... the public school sector; and for those reasons, you ought to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell to explain her vote."

Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have children that have graduated from both private and public universities in this state. We happen to be in a unique position in DuPage County. We have five private colleges and one large

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

community college, in fact, the largest one in the state. If we did not have all those five colleges, which are, frankly, jammed to the hilt, then a lot of the students who can now commute to those colleges in my county, would be forced to go to our state universities. You who want to cut back on the private universities better realize that if you don't want to start increasing the number of students in your public universities, you better give consideration to the fact that an awful lot of the students are absorbed by these private universities."

Speaker Peters: "There are 113... 15 votes... 16 votes. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 126 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no'... 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1367, Representative Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1369, Representative McBroom. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to fire protection districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Bill does exactly what the synopsis says. It amends the Fire Protection District Act to allow the deposit of district funds in financial institutions in which a district trustee has a minor percentage of ownership. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Hey, what's happening to the machine? Clear the board? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1369 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Wolf, 'aye'. On this question... J. J. Wolf... On this question, there are 149 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1371, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1371, a Bill for an Act to continue the Mississippi River Parkway Commission of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill continues the Mississippi River Parkway Commission. When we reinstated it a couple of years ago, we put an automatic repealer date of two years to see how the Commission did. It's done a heck of a job, and what we're doing now is just continuing it further. We have bipartisan sponsorship - Representative Richmond on the other side of the aisle, and I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Darrow: "Is there appropriation associated with this Commission?"

Mays: "Yes, there is."

Darrow: "And how much is that appropriation?"

Mays: "20,000 dollars."

Darrow: "And, you said it's done a heck of a lot. What's it done?"

Mays: "Well, up in your district, Mr. Darrow, we've been working with the Department of Tourism, Department of Transportation, to try to get the butter... the Butterworth Parkway improvements going on. We've also done work in our... you know, all of the districts along the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Mississippi River, we've been trying to do some work in."

Darrow: "Does this legislation... Does this Commission have any benefit to the City of Chicago?"

Mays: "No, I don't believe so. We could divert the river."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1371 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 144 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1375, Representative Karpel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1384, Representative Yourell. Out... Out of the record. Senate Bill 1387, Representative Getty. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1387, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1387 is a Bill which addresses itself, in large part, to a problem caused by the theft of signals by the so-called 'black boxes' that are used to decode microwave transmissions. This would make it clear that it is an offense to do this, and it would pro... provide for Class A Misdemeanor penalties for either using these so-called 'black boxes' or underground decoding devices, or for permitting the sale or conspiring to sell such equipment. It also prescribes certain interference with or theft of other utility and public communication services. I would ask for your support of this Bill, which would bring our criminal law up

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

to date with the electronics area."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Representative Getty, what's the... the need for this law?"

Getty: "As I indicated, Representative Terzich, we have made steps forward over the past years, in communications media. There presently are microwaves that are used to send signals. They are send... sending these signals in the airwaves. They are private signals, and they can be stolen by persons using illegal decoding devices. This is a Bill that would specifically prescribe this sort of conduct. It would also make it clear that it would be illegal for you to steal your electric service or your gas service without having it pass through the proper metering devices."

Terzich: "Well, does that mean that someone who has an expertise in electronics could not make one of these things? I believe they can make them out of kits from Radio Shack, or what have you. Why do we have to say to these people that it's a criminal offense to do such a thing?"

Getty: ""Well, it's already a criminal offense under federal law for you to interfere or intercept a transmission that is a private transmission. These transmissions are coded or scrambled. I... A person who would buy a decoder for a specific transmission, or a descrambler for a specific transmission would be in effect stealing that signal. This is already illegal under federal law. The Federal Government has asked the various states to pass laws making it illegal, and to prosecute such offenses on the state level. To date, more than half of our states have already passed them. They are in the law. The other states, I am told, through recent communications with the Federal Communications Commission, most other states have them under consideration, including Illinois. This would bring

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Illinois law into conformity with existing federal proscription."

Terzich: "Well, would this also, then, you could even extend this over to these video cassette recorders. A lot of people are, you know, transcribing TV programs and movies and everything else, and why don't we extend it over to the video cassette recorders?"

Getty: "Well, why don't you introduce that Bill, Representative?"

Terzich: "Because I think it would be bad legislation. Everyone would have to turn in their tapes, and also, their little 'black boxes'. I think this is a bad Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

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

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Getty, what is the penalty for engaging in this kind of activity?"

Getty: "Class A Misdemeanor."

Leinenweber: "And that is up to a year in jail, and what is the fine?"

Getty: "Up to 1,000 dollars."

Leinenweber: "All right. Is there a differentiation in gravity between the person that manufactures and sells these 'black boxes', and the person who happens to use one?"

Getty: "No."

Leinenweber: "In other words, if I was an electronic whiz, and I bought the proper parts and put one together in my home, just for my own use, I would be guilty of the same offense as the individual who, on a larger scale, for remuneration, makes these for other people. Is that correct?"

Getty: "Well, you might be making them for the manufacturers. You know, I don't know really Representative what you're referring to."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Leinenweber: "I'm just saying, the person who would do it on his own - let's say, make one for his own private use... the penalty is the same as if that person made 1,000 of them and sold them door-to-door."

Getty: "There's no question that this is a minimum type of penalty. It doesn't go to the extent of a felony. It is a misdemeanor type of offense. It has a range of a misdemeanor offense, and it would be the same for anyone violating this type of law - it would be the same."

Leinenweber: "Let me..."

Getty: "The federal... The federal penalty is already there, also."

Leinenweber: "What is the federal penalty?"

Getty: "I am not sure what... what that is. I'll try to ask staff to get that for me."

Leinenweber: "All right. The second... The second question would be, would this, in any way, cover the situation that... I remember there was a Bill a few years ago... that prohibited, or made it illegal for you to hook your TV set up to an existing cable connection in a home. Let's say you buy a home, and there's still a cable there. They haven't taken it out. Would that cover this situation?"

Getty: "No, it has nothing to do with cable."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Getty: "That is... That is, by the way, the law now. That was passed. That is the law. This is similar to it, in that it would do the same thing where no cable is used, but it's a microwave type of transmission that is used. It would make stealing of the subscription television services, such as on TV, just as illegal as stealing a cable."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was just answered."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

the... There being none, Representative Getty to close."

Getty: "I'm going to take this out of the record, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't been able to answer Representative Leinenweber's question about the federal..."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1389, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1389, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's a rather simple, I think, non-controversial Bill that... that I bring to you this morning, that passed the Senate overwhelmingly. It came out of Committee unanimously, in the House, that allows podiatrists... podiatrists to advertise their services in conformity with the regulations already promulgated in other disciplines in the medical profession... profession, and... and has had the stamp of approval on those guidelines from JCAR. It's already passed through the JCAR procedure. That was the effect of Senate Amendment #1. It simply brings into conformity the... the un... the unconstitutional provision that has been held in other states, that the medical and other disciplines in other professions cannot advertise. It retracts that... that decision of the Supreme Court, and I think it's non-controversial, and if you're all walking precincts, you're going to need your podiatrists, so you'd better vote for it."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative Davis, in Amendment #1 regarding continuing education, it allows the department, by

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

administrative rule, to waive continuing education requirements. Would you explain just exactly what that means? Are you eliminating it?"

Davis: "Well, no, we're not eliminating at all. Apparently, there has been some problems... the Amendment was brought by the Department of Registration and Education, Joe, and was brought on the basis that there are, since the... the continuing education provision of the Podiatry Act is new, there were no provisions for exemptions for continuing education in the event of illness during the time frame of the license renewal; and they wanted provisions so that they could waive, on a temporary basis, the provisions for continuing education until the person, if he were ill, or if he were unable to... to conform, to waive on a temporary basis, until he was able to perform."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, I'd like to just ask one question of the Sponsor. In Senate Amendment #2, you removed the word 'ethical' from the Act. Why do you remove the word 'ethical'? Aren't podiatrists ethical?"

Davis: "As far as I'm concerned, every podiatrist in the State of Illinois is not only ethical, but truthful. Ethics, as you well know, Representative Slape, since you have been put up to this by Bullock and others; as you well know, ethics is a... is a self-discipline by the profession itself."

Slape: "Right."

Davis: "And I... I have no question that the word 'ethical' is always in the minds of the podiatrists."

Slape: "Okay, then, very well."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill, and as a point of information, I have a podiatrist who has been very, very sick, and unable to fulfill the continuing

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

ed requirements, which are not that bad, but he should have been able to... he was planning on starting in January, and he's been in and out of the hospital about five times since January, and has just been unable to make the class and, in his case, it's a... it's a very, very valid and documented hardship. There is... without this Bill, his license would be taken away, and it would be a very much of an inequity; and, for that reason, I would support and ask your vote for this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Representative Davis, what is the minimum requirement going to be for the continuing education requirement... minimum requirement?"

Davis: "I'm sorry. I didn't understand you, Representative."

Giorgi: "What is the minimum... minimum requirement going to be for continuing education?"

Davis: "It has not changed in this Bill."

Giorgi: "What is it? What is it, physically?"

Davis: "I... I frankly do not know. The staff is here. I do not know the answer to that question, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "You don't know the answer to the question."

Davis: "No, I do not know the answer to that question."

Giorgi: "You're talking about continuing education to qualify it... for his license to be continued, and you don't know what the minimum requirement is? What the hell kind of a Bill is it?"

Davis: "Between... Between... Well, it doesn't address that subject, Representative Giorgi, but it's between fifty and fifty-five hours of continuing education, and is identical to the Optometrists' Act."

Giorgi: "This... My synopsis says this, 'Requirements of continuing education may be waived'. That's one part; and the other is, 'Have met the requirements of continuing

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

education under this Section'. You've got to know what your minimum... you've got to be able to tell me what the minimum requirement is to qualify for continuing licensing. You should know that."

Davis: "Well, Representative... Well, Representative Giorgi, I'd love to tell you, but this Bill does... only refers to that continuing education and the exemption or waiver from it. It has nothing to... It's in the Act itself, and this Bill does not track that language in the Act, so..."

Giorgi: "I understand the... the hardship provision for waiving is, but you ought to be able to tell me..."

Davis: "Fifty to fifty-five hours. Fifty to fifty-five hours."

Giorgi: "In other words, if a podiatrist... if a podiatrist goes to a conference cocktail party, is that..."

Davis: "No."

Giorgi: "Does that qualify him?"

Davis: "Fifty to fifty-five hours of approved higher continuing education."

Giorgi: "Fifty-five hours?"

Davis: "Fifty to fifty-five hours."

Giorgi: "Does your staff person know if they're monitoring that rule in the Department of Education and Registration... monitoring that rule of fifty-five hours?"

Davis: "As far as I understand, that is the case, and it is no different than any of the other continuing education provisions in all of the other disciplines."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "No, I don't wish to close. I think the Bill's been adequately explained, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1389 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are
160 voting 'aye', one voting 'nay', none voting 'present'.
This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. Representative Conti, for what
purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for
the purpose of an introduction. Our esteemed colleague has
his family here from out of state, from California...
daughter Sue Hudson-Fox, his son-in-law, Tom Fox, and the
three grandchildren, Julie, Jeff, and Jennie, and of
course, his lovely wife, Mrs. Hudson, sitting up here on my
right. Welcome to the State of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 1429, Representative Oblinger. Out
of the record. Senate Bill 1436, Representative Mulcahey.
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act to delete the
population limitations on municipalities that levy a tax on
gross rental receipts of hotel rooms. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
Bill, Senate Bill 1436, simply eliminates the minimum
population requirement to enact a hotel/motel tax, which is
now found in the statutes; 25,000 population for
municipalities, 100,000 for counties. This is done by
Resolution only. Currently, Chicago and Cook County
already has this under a separate Act, and therefore, is
not affected by this Bill. Proceeds of municipal tax is
for tourism, conventions, other special events. The county
tax for tourism, conventions, expositions, and so on and so
forth. The fiscal impact to state revenue on this is
absolutely zero. Municipalities like Nauvoo and Cairo,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Galena and so on, which depend very, very heavily on tourism would no longer be disbarred from the way the current Act is. Actually, there are seven municipalities in the state whose population fell below the 25,000 limit after the last...census, who would benefit from the Bill. We've got bipartisan in this. I know of no opposition. I would move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1436."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he'll yield. Representative Mulcahey. Proceed, Sir."

Wikoff: "Dick, do you intend this Bill to place any limitations on how home rule municipalities may impose or expend hotel/motel tax that are presently enforced?"

Mulcahey: "No, Sir. No, Mr... Representative Wikoff, none whatsoever. This Bill is not intended to limit home rule powers in any way, shape or form."

Wikoff: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brummer. Further discussion? Being none, Representative Mulcahey to close."

Mulcahey: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1436 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 162 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back up one. Senate Bill 1429, Representative Oblinger. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Will the Gentleman in front of Ob... Representative Oblinger please be seated?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act to amend the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities
Confidentiality Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is in result of a heinous murder that was committed here in Sangamon County. The nurse wanted to testify to what a mental patient had told her about being responsible for the crime. However, because there was no law allowing this, she refused to answer in court. This Bill adds one more exception to the mental health code. There are already nine exceptions. This one is, that it will only be done 'en camera' in the Judge's chambers, and if... you have to have a very definite reason for calling the person in - the same types of reasons you would have for a search warrant."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1429 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 159 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1447, Representative Vinson. Sam, 1447? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1447, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the redemption period of real estate foreclosures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We debated this Bill at some length yesterday, on Second Reading. I think the Members are familiar with it. What this Bill does is to correct a technical error in legislation the General... General Assembly passed last

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

year. This clarifies, so that everybody knows and can understand, the length of the redemption period in the State of Illinois, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1447 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 143 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1470, Representative Stiehl. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. C. M. Stiehl. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning the authority of the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1470 actually does nothing more than correct some of the... the codification of the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. Its primary purpose is to clarify and ensure that the Commission, as a unit of local government, may enter into voluntary intergovernmental agreements with other units of government. It just... In addition to that, it corrects some of the names of the local governmental units that have been changed. I would ask for an Affirmative Vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

Younge: "Representative Stiehl, you said that this was merely a Bill to clarify the powers of the Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission. Isn't it true that the Bill takes

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

away the need or the requirement that the plans that this Commission makes be reviewed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs?'

Stiehl: "Yes, but that has the approval of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, and this is when a local agency, at the request of a local government, enters into an arrangement with the local government."

Younger: "So therefore, the Bill takes away the requirement that the... a regional planning committee... commission, the Southwestern Illinois Regional Planning Commission, have its plans reviewed by the State Government. Is that not true?"

Stiehl: "In many instances, it doesn't have to do that at the present time, when they're simply doing reports or recodifications for local governmental entities."

Younger: "The... The law now is, isn't it true, Representative Stiehl, that the coordinating instrument of State Government, and the instrument of State Government that reviews the plans of these regional planning agency is the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Would you explain for us, please, why we would not any longer want these regional planning commissions to be under the supervision and to be... their work to be reviewed by the State Department of Commerce?"

Stiehl: "Representative Younger, the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs evidently felt that this was more... a more expeditious manner in which to assist local governments. They have approved this change. It evidently was worked out with the local planning agency, local governments and the Board... 100 member Board of Trustees on the SWIMPAC."

Younger: "Representative Stiehl, further, would you explain to me the difference between a body... a body politic and a unit

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

of local government. I understand that one of the changes that you wish to make in the legislation of the Southwestern Illinois Regional Planning Commission is that it become a unit of local government. Would you explain the difference and why that is requested?"

Stiehl: "Yes, just a minute. Let me get the information."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Younge, have you concluded?"

Younge: "Representative Stiehl has not answered the question."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry."

Younge: "She looking up an answer."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry, Ma'am. Proceed, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Well, Representative Younge, as I understand, in changing that, it was to allow them to enter into certain voluntary arrangements with intergovernmental units which they, under the present code, were not able to do. It was simply to help some very small units of government; and, they felt that this made it more expeditious."

Younge: "I see. And all of this would be without the review and approval of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs under the legislation, as it is written. Is that right, Representative Stiehl?"

Stiehl: "Representative Younge, as I've said a number of times before, this has the approval of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. The arrangements that this agency entered into would be at the request and the approval of any local government."

Younge: "The... Isn't it true, Representative Stiehl, that a unit of local government has the power to tax, has the power of eminent domain, has the power to zone; in other words, in giving a regional planning authority, the Southwestern Metropolitan Planning Commission, the category of a unit of local government, are we, then, giving them these powers?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Stiehl: "No."

Younge: "But, your request is that we make them a unit of local government, not reviewed by the state. Is that correct?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Epton in the Chair."

Younge: "I would like to speak to the Bill, Mr..."

Speaker Epton: "Please proceed."

Younge: "I think that we ought to look at... with great caution, and I am opposed to this Bill because it does the very thing that many of us had really wondered would be the case when these regional planning commissions were originally set up. First of all, it was said that all they would do would just be to plan, and they would plan on a regional level. Now, here, we have a Bill before us, giving the Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission the authority to sit down with planning commissions in other states - in Missouri and other states - and draw up plans that are not reviewed by the State Government. I think this is a very dangerous precedent. I think that it would be a very dangerous precedent to make this Body a unit of local government. Each of us knows the difference between a... a public body politic and a unit of local government. I am opposed to this legislation for those reasons, and I am opposed to it because the Representatives in the area that is covered by the Southwestern Region Planning Commission have not been talked about, about these matters, and I think that the... the fear and the threat that we have from regional government shows up today under Senate Bill 1470, in that we give additional powers to this regional planning commission that is not reviewed by the State Government that funds it and gives it all of its authority. We will have, in that area, a regional government that will be planning without the approval and the... without the looking over the shoulder of the State of Illinois. And, I

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

think it is totally irrelevant that the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs has sanctioned it. Now, we're sitting here now, about to consider what is called the enterprise... Bill. In that Bill, the effort is to give a great deal of power to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, and here, we've got a regional planning agency that is seeking to get out from under the jurisdiction of the State Government. I say to you, that we ought to vote 'no' to this. We ought to look at this with great caution, because it is a transfer of power from the State of Illinois to the regional level, and for them to be out there unsupervised, as a unit of local government, has great danger for the people of that area, and also for the sovereignty of the State of Illinois; and, therefore, I think that we ought to vote 'no' against this Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Peters in the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like permission to close, as a hyphenated Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed. Excuse me. Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Flinn to close."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Lady from East St. Louis is making a big ado about nothing. In the first place, this... this is nothing but a clean-up Bill. This is something that was requested by all the mayors in our area, and all the people who belong on the council of the Southwestern Planning Commission. The Department of Commerce has requested that they get out of the oversee part, because it was simply unnecessary paperwork they were doing for nothing, and it accomplished absolutely nothing, and the Bill passed the Senate with 44 votes. It sailed out of Committee over there. It sailed out the County and Townships Committee,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

and it's nothing in the world but a clean-up Bill. I don't know what the Lady's complaining about, but it could be who the Sponsors are."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1470...'
Representative Younge, on a point of personal privilege."

Younge: "Yes, on a point of personal privilege, what I am complaining about is that the Department of Commerce will no longer have jurisdiction over regional planning bodies, but it will have the power and is given the power, under what they call a clean-up Bill, a 'merely' Bill, to go out and make plans and to build houses and do anything they want to do with other governments in other states. I think that is a major change in government, and what I'm complaining about is that we ought to have the satisfaction of knowing that the executive body that we find here; the Department of Commerce, is looking over those regional planning bodies. I think this has to be looked at with great caution, rather than having them... this is the same body that, for nineteen years, has not even been able to get approval as an economic district by the EDA."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "And so, therefore, it is not just a 'merely' Bill. It is a major change in theory of government."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1470 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 128 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1471, Representative Ralph Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1471, a Bill for an Act to amend the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Illinois Coal and Energy Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, Ralph: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1471 revises the Coal and Energy Bond Act to permit the state the flexibility to be consistent with current and future federal tax changes. Bring the... It brings the interest rate limitation on... up to date and permits the use of Bond Act money for electrical generation projects other than steam. The Amendment, which was put on in Committee by Chairman Meyer and... and Minority Spokesman Schraeder, would allow the state to negotiate Coal Bond Act contracts consistent with the most favorable federal tax treatment allowable at the time the contract was executed, while securing the contract for capital facilities. That... I'd be glad to answer any questions, and urge passage of... of Senate Bill 1471."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1471 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 153 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', one voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1487, Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act to provide for the preservation of Illinois farmland. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill establishes... creates the Farmland

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Protection Act, which establishes an interagency committee of governmental agencies, chaired by the Director of the Department of Agriculture. These agencies shall be required to submit policy statements regarding farmland preservation and impact statements regarding farmland conversion. An agricultural impact study must be prepared if the Director of Agriculture determines that a state funded capital project, which will lead to conversion of farmland to non-agricultural purposes, is not in compliance with the agency's policy statements on farmland preservation. This legislation will make statutory, Governor Thompson's Executive Order #4, which has been in existence for two years, on farmland preservation. This is supported by the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the Illinois Farm Bureau, and I know of no opposition to the legislation."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

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

Dunn, John: "Does this Bill now have the controversial Conservation Tillage Act in the fifty dollar per acre subsidy provision in it?"

Dunn, Ralph: "That's a good point. I believe that Representative Rigney did add that on yesterday."

Dunn, John: "So, that is now part of this Bill. It that correct?"

Dunn, Ralph: "That's correct."

Dunn, John: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, just very briefly. I rise in... reluctantly, in opposition to the Bill. We have difficult times in the State of Illinois, and in our Appropriation Committee yesterday, it was pointed out that Governor Thompson and Director Mandeville of the office of the Bureau of the Budget have

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

indicated that there will have to be another 80 million dollars in cuts, if we are to balance the budget this year, because of the downturn in the economy. In view of that, I don't see how we can enter into a program that will provide up to fifty dollars per acre in subsidy for what may be a very worthwhile farming practice. This practice can be implemented on a voluntary basis. It's to the advantage of the farmers in their own communities, in their own areas, to engage in this practice on their own soil, and to encourage others who are like-minded, to do this; so, I think we should, at this time, defeat this Bill, and wait until the economy takes an upturn before we get into a subsidy of this kind of nature, which is not in the Governor's Budget; and I'm sure will not be in any reduced budget that the Governor eventually presents to this General Assembly."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Sir. Excuse me. Representative Daniels in the Chair."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My purpose for rising is just to clarify the intention of Senate Bill 1487, and to make clear that, in support of this Bill, or in consideration of this Bill, both the Sponsor and the principles of the Bill in no way want to harm the construction of the Central Illinois Expressway, which they would, indeed, claim is already on the books and moving, and would not be hindered at all by this piece of legislation if, indeed, it became a Public Act; and so, it's just to clarify legislative intent. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

McPike: "Well, how many new welfare case workers will be required to administer this welfare program?"

Bower: "This is not a welfare program."

McPike: "Will this require any new case workers to monitor the 1,000 farmers that are going to be receiving this... these welfare payments?"

Bower: "It's not a welfare program."

McPike: "Then, I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

McPike: "I would probably just have to repeat what I said yesterday. The Secretary of the...The Director of the Department of Agriculture, Ray Block, went to Washington and Reagan...John Block - I'm sorry - went to Washington and became Director of the Agriculture Department under Reagan, and immediately he struck out against the welfare payments that he called going to the dairy farmers. And, he said it was costing the taxpayers of the United States something like \$25,000 an hour every day of the year in order to provide welfare payments to dairy farmers, and he thinks that we ought to stop it. I think that after he is successful in stopping the welfare payments to the dairy farmers, I think the next thing he is going to attack will be the welfare payments going to the tobacco farmers, welfare ...the welfare payments going to the peanut growers, the welfare payments going to the tobacco industry, the welfare payments going to the sugar industry. So, here we are, in Illinois now, starting our own welfare program. What we're going to say to farmers is that, 'We're going to pay you up to \$1,000 in welfare payments for trying a new method of tillage'. Now, it would be the same thing for us to say this to any other industry in

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Illinois. Let's say that Representative Bower has a printing industry in his district and he says to his printing district, 'The State of Illinois would like for you to try a new printing press. Now, we think it will be more efficient and more effective than the printing press that you're currently using, but if it's not, we'll pay you \$1,000 anyway just to try it'. Now, this will be sort of a subsidy or a transfer payment. We won't call it welfare for the printing industry. It will just be a transfer payment from the government to the printing industry in order to encourage you to use this new printing press. Or if you're manufacturing toasters, we'd like you to try a different method of manufacturing toasters, and we'll give you \$1,000 welfare payment to manufacture toasters in a different way. Well, everybody would kind of laugh at a Bill like that, but this is exactly what this Bill does. It says to the farmer, the State of Illinois has suddenly discovered a new way for you to farm. It's called no-till, or whatever it's called. We'd like you to try it. And in fact, we think it's so good, we're going to give you \$1,000 to try it. We'll give you a welfare payment, in fact, we'll do this to the extent of a million dollars. We'll pick out 1,000 farmers all across Illinois. I don't know how many case workers it's going to require us to monitor all these new ...new welfare payments. But, whatever case workers we will need in the Department of Agriculture in order to monitor this new welfare program, that will have to be paid for. So, we'll have all these new case workers running around Illinois monitoring the 1,000 farms, the 1,000 farmers that are going to receive these welfare payments. Now, that's a million dollars. Yesterday in Appropriations Committee, we heard parents from the Adler Center in Champaign, Illinois tell us about their children

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

that were being transferred across the state, and it was very, very difficult to sit in there and not be touched by the stories that these parents told. It would cost the State of Illinois nine hundred and sixty thousand dollars to keep Adler open. We don't have the money, the Governor says. But what Representative Bower says is that although we can't fund Adler, we can provide a new welfare payment...a new welfare program for farmers for one million dollars. Now, if that isn't mixing up priorities, I don't know what is. If the State of Illinois today can afford to give farmers in this state who have always stood for private industry and a free enterprise system, if we can afford to start a new welfare program for these farmers, and at the same time, tell the mentally disabled that we can't care for them, then we are getting our priorities ass backwards. There is no reason for a new welfare program in the state, and I think that we should defeat this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, this is the second day in a row that I've been jarred out of lethargy by the previous speaker to hear him speak what sounds so imminently sensible, and I find out it's on the same particular Bill. He's absolutely right. This is a welfare program, the exact type of thing that the Reagan administration is trying to do away with down in Washington. I don't know why we, Republicans, would be voting for anything like this because it's contrary to the direction this country ...we're trying to lead this country into after decades of mismanagement by the Democrats and this...with this type of program. This is their type of program, a giveaway program, to people who don't need it. The Gentleman was absolutely right. This is...This Bill was a good Bill until the Amendment got on. It's now a terrible Bill. The Senate had the good sense to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

kill the previous effort that we sent over which had the same welfare program in it. So, let's not give the Senate a chance to ..to foul things up by sending this to the Governor. So let's not pass it now."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I don't really understand Mr. McPike's crocodile tears.

I want to give him a chance to answer me is the reason I mention his name in debate. In all of the magazines, all of the government reports, you will find that the farmers are functioning and trying to produce you food on less than 70% of what is supposed to be a fair price, considering the return of their lands and that kind of stuff. The State of Illinois has passed mandatory conservation laws, and this is one way that you can get them spread throughout the state. In our area we have used this type of farming for many years. We will not qualify for your \$1,000 per farm because we have already tried it. This is for an experimental type basis. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Conservation have both backed this type of program for several years. And, I think that the Bill is a good Bill. I think we should pass it. I know that the majority of farmers in my area will not even bother to try to comply because by the time they get done with the book work it'll be worth more than \$1,000 to keep it up. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I, too, am going to be opposed to this Bill. I've opposed add-ons for the Arts Council, a million two. I stood there and opposed the nurses' scholarship, veterans' scholarships, voted to close down the Dixon Center, and all these other tough decisions that you've got to do on

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Appropriations Committee. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, we're in tough straights. The money is not there, and I'm not even going to argue about the merits of the program. All I'm going to tell you, it's another million dollars that is unbudgeted money, and we've got different priorities and I hope we'll get some 'no' votes up there."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to clarify the definition for some of the people on the other side of the aisle as to what welfare is and welfare payments. I don't believe I've seen anybody who received welfare payments do an awful lot of work. And, certainly these people who are involved in this kind of a program, which I don't frankly think we need at this time either maybe, but it's not a welfare kind of a thing. You mentioned priorities, too, young man. Priorities...Let me ask you if you don't think the priority number one in any person's mind is, 'Where do I get the next meal?; Where do I eat?; Do I get good quality food?'. And, in essence, that's what we're attempting to do here, to assure long term generations of the freedom that we have in this country and this world, that in Illinois and in the United States we still have soil, good, rich, and that it still stays within our territory so that we can produce food. We're attempting at this time to assure people that through minimum tillage that we can keep this soil on our farms, rather than to see it erode down the streams, the creeks, the rivers and on into the Gulf of Mexico. It's important to be concerned about conservation. It's also important to be concerned about the conservation of the dollars that we don't have. I'm going to be a little bit concerned on this, and I'm probably going to vote against it on the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

premise that I don't think we've got the million dollars this year. But in terms of priorities, the priority is that we should keep soil on our farmlands and don't let it wash away. And the concern is that the number one thing we have is that we have enough land that we can continue to produce, and I'm strongly in support of conservation matters. I just don't think that at this time a million dollars can be put into the budget and in fact, then, will have to be somewhere deducted in the Department of Agriculture's other budget or some other special interest concern that the State of Illinois has."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I said yesterday we couldn't afford this program. That's one reason for not supporting the Bill. But I have another concern and one that has not been brought out yet. When you use no till process for farming it's almost mandatory to use a lot of chemicals. Now, I think we have a concern in the State of Illinois about chemical pollution, and it will be a problem that the farmers are going to have to address in the future. I think this needs to have some more research done on it before we encourage a program where a lot of excessive use of chemicals will be necessary. I would advise a 'no' vote at this time."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, to clear up some misconceptions. When Representative McPike asked Representative Bower if we need some welfare workers to administer this program, I think what we ought to do is get some of the fellows that are in gamblers anonymous and give them a job to rehabilitate them because the money for this program is going to come from gambling dollars at the track. But I, you know, I'm

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

interested in listening to the farmers. They think the money that...for dairy support and they think the money for ..for rice subsidies and sugar subsidies and tobacco subsidies comes from Russia. Well it's the same income tax dollar that you're sending to the Public Aid recipient. You can't divorce it, and it's the same income tax dollar that goes to fund your defense...your defense procurements. People with these plants..with these plants in their towns that sell defense items to the Federal Government that's an income tax dollar, and that...if one of the..one of Congressmen is brighter than the other Congressman, he'll get their money into welfare..into food stamp rather than defense. You guys think this money is made out of thin air, and it's only for the welfare recipient. Well, the same way to subsidize the farmers is the same tax dollars that supplies food stamps. So, don't be too proud of what your efforts are doing."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Bower to close."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. No one has spoken, except Representative McClain, to the original intent of the Bill which is a very important piece of agricultural legislation. Representative Rigney has put a millstone around this legislation. It has to go back to the Senate for concurrence regardless. I would urge you to give an 'aye' vote and let the Senate take his Amendment off."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Senate Bill 1487. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Oblinger to explain her vote."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I resent the fact that it's being called welfare. Twenty years ago we got \$2.50 a bushel for our corn. We still get \$2.50 a bushel and we still work harder and we still pay more for those manufactured products. As to subsidies, I stood here and voted for a 20 million dollar subsidy to a manufacturing plant, and I don't resent that because it saves jobs. And I want to save land. I think we ought to vote for this. It's the kind of thing that we ought to do if you're really interested in production of food."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bower to explain his vote."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask, if we could have 70 votes, we will remove Representative Rigney's Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Bower, Postponed Consideration? Postponed Consideration. House Bill ..er..Senate Bill 1492, Representative Meyer? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1496, Representative Reilly? Read the Bill, Mr Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1496, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1496...Senate Bill 1496 provides open competition among the insurance carriers who write workmen's comp coverage. This is a Bill which will have an effect, positive effect, on rates paid by Illinois businesses by allowing them, by forcing them, requiring

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

them to compete openly as every other business does, as our theory of free enterprise would require. Presently, essentially by law, these companies get together and separate jointly, which means there's no competition on price. There's competition in other ways, but not on price. The estimates are that this could save 5%, perhaps more, perhaps as much as 8%, in addition to the cut that the Governor and Director O'Conner recently negotiated with the carriers in response to previous complaints. I think it's a good Bill. It's a Bill that both business and labor can support. It's certainly not the whole answer to the problem of the cost of doing business in Illinois, but it is a step in the right direction. I would ask...I'd be glad to answer questions, and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion on the question of free enterprise? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very good Bill, and it is a step in the right direction. In 1978, September 1st, 1978, workers' compensation rates in Illinois were reduced 7.6%, and employers received a 60 million dollar refund at that time. One year later the rates went up 23.8%. Last week the ...the insurance industry in Illinois agreed to an 8.3% reduction in rates. So, in the last five years insurance rates in Illinois for workers' compensation have gone up a total of 7.9% over a five year period. During that same five year period, the consumer price index has gone up 48.7%. So, while consumer prices have gone up nearly 50%, the cost of workers' compensation rates in Illinois has gone up 8%. This Bill, the Director of the Department of Insurance believes, will reduce rates approximately 5 to 8

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

percent. And if he is correct, and I hope he is and most people agree that he probably will be correct, the competition in the marketplace will probably reduce rates in Illinois by about 5 to 8 percent. If that indeed happens, what it will mean is that over a five year period in the State of Illinois, while the consumer price index has increased 50%, workers' compensation rates have not gone up at all, zero. So, this..this false cry of the wolf's at the door in Illinois, that the..the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers' Association have been making for five..for the past five years doesn't hold a lot of water when it's examined closely. Workers' compensation rates have not only been stable in Illinois, but while everything else has gone up in price, they have remained constant. I think this is a good Bill. I think it's great that rates will go down another five percent, besides saving the hundred million dollars that was announced last week. Because of the roll back, now it appears that ...that employers in Illinois will save an additional 90 to 100 million dollars for an overall reduction of perhaps 15% in a period of maybe six months. I think this Bill should go out of here without any opposition at all."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of the Bill, but for the record and for the edification of the Members, I want to make it quite clear that this will give an opportunity to lower rates. It's going to put the bidding on a competitive basis and afford quality coverage at affordable prices. However, I don't want anybody in the chamber to get the wrong concept of this Bill. The fact remains that there are many reforms that are needed to be made in the workers' compensation statutes. This is a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

start, a step in the right direction, but we must return in future Sessions to get at some of the real problems. This addresses one part of it, and it's a good start, but I don't want anybody to misunderstand that rates are going to reduce for every employer in the state because they won't necessarily reduce for everyone. It will reduce them for the most part across the board and give employers a break that they've been looking for. But I do want you to be mindful of the fact that other things need to be done in future Sessions. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman to close, Representative Giorgi is going to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the Cosponsorship of this Bill with Representative Reilly, and I must agree, for the first time probably in labor litigation on the floor of this House, I agree with Representative Fred Tuerk. It's the first time I think we've agreed in 16 years. But, I think that something should be said. There were many of us that felt that the Workman's Comp Act of '75 should have resulted in the exorbitant insurance rates that took place after that, and there were 44 changes made in the Workman's Comp Act to try to placate businesses and employers, and it finally took court decisions to point to the errors of the insurance industry's ways. The insurance industry was able to wrangle some outrageous increases and the courts said, 'You must refund the money because your rates were exorbitant'. I think this is fine because it's going to allow the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

marketplace to regulate rates, and I think it's going to result in lowered premium rates. And I heartily endorse the concept, and I hope the entire General Assembly votes for it."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Giorgi, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1496. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, any time we've got a workmen's comp Bill that ...that Representative Tuerk is for and Representative McPike is for, I think I would ask that you record me, 'I don't know'."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 163 'aye', none voting 'no', none 'present'. Senate Bill 1496, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1500, Representative Reilly? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1500, a Bill for an Act relating to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr...Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Governor, by Executive Order, and to some extent, the Federal Congress, by cutting off the appropriation, has abolished the Law Enforcement Commission, or is in the process of doing that. We, by a lack of appropriation last year, abolished the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Commission. What this Bill does really is put into Statute those results, transfers those functions to the Department of Children and Family Services where, in fact, they already are, and organizes that by Statute. It also creates within that Department the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Division of Youth and Community Services which, organizationally, as I say is really already there, and mandates that they coordinate with the local agencies that provide those kinds of services. I'll be glad to answer any questions. Let me get one out of the way, and hopefully perhaps, the only one, because I really know of no organi...no opposition to this legislation, that I know of. Some of you had some calls from some people thinking this Bill somehow had something to do with CETA and somehow gave that function to the Department. That was simply a misunderstanding. It has nothing whatsoever to do with that, and in a meeting yesterday, that was made clear to the organization at least that represents the CETA agencies. I don't know if that word's gotten back to the grass roots, but that, in fact, is clear to them and they are satisfied. So, at that point, I think it is clear. I'd be glad to answer questions. Otherwise I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1500 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative J. J. Wolf, you're recorded as 'aye'. Okay. One hundred and sixty-one 'aye', 1 'no' and none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1500, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1518, Representative Keane? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1518, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1518 permits one school board within the state to levy a tax for four years

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

for the provision of primary health care services. As you may remember, we've had this Bill before. It's the Posen-Robbins School District in the State of Illinois. It provides through...It's provided through a grant by the Johnson Foundation for health care. The community is in desperate need of it. The Bill allows that...that they use...that they can have this funding. They're now funding it out of educational funds. This Bill would provide them a four year levy where they...where they could levy in order to make the program self-supporting. There was an Amendment put on the Bill which dealt with the orphanages, and I would ask...I'd be happy to answer any questions. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm familiar with the program being operated by ..by this school district. They are providing a service which is very important in this community, and the community wants to maintain and continue the program. It provides for voter approval and I would encourage the...your support of this legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1518. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 152 'ayes', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1520, Representative Kustra? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1520, a Bill for an Act to amend

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kustra."

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under existing law, a public school teacher at the elementary or secondary level who would like to get an additional teaching certificate to teach in another area can have his or her transcript evaluated by the State Teachers' Certification Board. That law does not provide the same opportunities for nonpublic school teachers at the elementary and secondary level. This Bill would add to the law that...those words which would give private school teachers at the elementary and secondary level that same opportunity to have their transcripts evaluated in order to obtain teaching certificates. The Bill passed out of the Elementary and Secondary Education by a vote of 22 to nothing. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1520. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 161 voting 'aye', 1 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1534, Representative Watson? Out of the record. 1539, Representative Bell? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1539, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bell."

Bell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1539 is part of the package that has been put together of a year long study of the Taxpayers Federation along with the Board of Realtors. What we're

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

attempting to do is require that the Department of Revenue not include in its sales ratio studies vacant lot sales or the initial sale of residential property that has been converted to a condominium. We are finding that some assessors are underassessing the various vacant lots and by doing that it's raising the multiplier on the residential owner. Vacant lots and condominium sales often reflect a large increase in sales price before the assessment have been increased to reflect the higher developed value. Also, we are finding some assessors tend to under-assess vacant lots. Any sale where the property is under-assessed, for whatever reason, causes a low assessment to sales ratio and higher multiplier which hurts all taxpayers. This situation is made more serious in developing areas where vacant lot sales are over represented in the sales ratio study. I'd certainly appreciate a favorable vote on this."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Representative yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Bullock: "Representative Bell, I serve on the Revenue Committee and this Bill was heard in that Committee, so I think you have a general idea as to my concerns about the Bill. This Bill attempts to eliminate from the Department of Revenue certain administrative prerogatives. Is that correct?"

Bell: "All it does is to eliminate from determining the multiplier the impact of the vacant lots.."

Bullock: "Okay, well that's quite substantial because..."

Bell: "...And condominium conversions."

Bullock: "Yes, that's quite substantial because really that's the Bill. So, the Department of Revenue then does not support

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

this Bill."

Bell: "They have not taken a position on it. They have not...To the best of my knowledge, they are not taking a position."

Bullock: "Well, my understanding is that they came before the Revenue Committee and did, in fact, testify in opposition to the Bill. Have they since changed their position?"

Bell: "I really don't remember them testifying against it. I don't believe on this one they did..."

Bullock: "Okay, well, perhaps they changed their position. But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Bullock: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you should take a sincere look at Senate Bill 1539. Senate Bill 1539, if it were to pass, and I certainly hope that it does not, would in fact be shifting liability to you, the property taxpayers. What this Bill in effect says is that when the assessor or the individual that determines the value of a vacant lot, and they want to place the value of that lot at \$1.00 and include that in what is called a 'Sales Ratio Study', that we should not allow the Department to make a fair determination of the value of that vacant lot. I think that most of you know that what we need in urban areas, and perhaps in some of the rural communities, at least in Chicago, we have a large number of vacant lots, abandoned lots. We have a large percentage of slum lords, people who walk away from properties and have no intention of improving those properties whatsoever. So consequently there's an inordinate amount of tax revenue that's lost, and this Bill would, in fact, be an incentive for that situation to continue. I think most of us in this chamber believe that we should apply a carrot as opposed to the stick to have people improve land and to put that land back on the tax rolls. If you allow Senate Bill 1539 to pass,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

we won't see that happening because there will not be an incentive for individuals to improve parcels of land. But in fact, there'll be an incentive for them to do exactly what they're doing today and allow it to remain vacant. I stand in opposition to the Bill. I voted against it in Committee. I think the Department of Revenue's position initially was correct. I don't know their position as of today, and that is, that the Department should maintain the responsibility and the authority to make judgments with regards to these parcels of land. And I certainly...and the Gentleman just came up and mentioned to me that the Department of Revenue is still in opposition to this Bill, and they did come before the Committee and stated opposition to the Bill. And I hope that the Minority Spokesman, my esteemed colleague from Lake County, will in fact support me in this regard. And I hope Representative Pierce speaks to the measure. But it's not the Department of Revenue's position to support the Bill. They, in fact, oppose the passage of 1539, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Now for the facts, the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that the last speaker on this measure is very sincere in his ideas about what the passage of this Bill would do. But I would point out to all of you that they have been including the sales ratio studies on vacant lots when the state determines your multiplier. And it's one reason, not the only reason, but one reason that your county multipliers have been soaring. If you want to do something to help control those soaring multipliers then you'll vote for this Bill. And we all know that those soaring multipliers are causing a great deal of increased taxes for all of our homeowners. I think it's a good Bill and one

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

that ought to be supported."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to disappoint the Gentleman from Cook who spoke a minute ago. He was very correct, however, in pointing out that the Department of Revenue, although they did not oppose 1537 or 1538, did oppose 1539 and 1540. But I'll disappoint him in that I'm going to support this Bill. The greatest increase in taxes we have in Illinois without representation ...taxation without representation is in the state multiplier. If there ever was a method of taking someone's property from them without due process, without a hearing, or without a vote, it's the state multiplier. One reason why the state multiplier is so out of line is they are considering in fixing that multiplier the initial condominium sales and vacant lot sales. Now, this Bill doesn't affect the assessment of those vacant lots. The assessor should still assess them properly. He hasn't been even with this provision in the multiplier. So it certainly hasn't encouraged him to assess some property...where assessments have been low on vacant lots and on condominium conversions. So, acknowledging that, realizing that, we say, why should the homeowner be punished? Why should the owner of property be punished in having his taxes which are fully assessed go up even more by the state multiplier which he has no real opportunity to protest because of some assessment errors on vacant lots? Therefore, this Bill is a good one. It doesn't tell the assessor not to properly assess those vacant lots or condominium conversions. It acknowledges the fact that the assessors haven't always been doing it properly and it's led to a state multiplier that was much higher than it should be on homeowners. So, although the matter is a little complex, if you feel in your county the state

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

multiplier is too high, as it certainly is in Cook County - I don't reside in Cook County - In Lake County we have a 1.0 multiplier because we assess properly - but in Cook County, which has a multiplier, that multiplier is too high on residential properties because certain sales are considered in arriving at it and the Bill here, by Representative Bell, attempts to remedy that situation. It has bipartisan support here in the House, and I support it in order to reduce the unconscionable multipliers which is taxation without representation."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Miller."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Gentleman, Representative Bell, to close."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Keane, the hyphenated Sponsor, will close."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can only echo the statements that were made by those who rose in support of this Bill. There's a...We're talking about two different things. I have...Whether we tax vacant property at a higher level in order to get that off of the vacant tax...off of a vacant position is one thing. What we're talking about in this Bill is the use of the multiplier on vacant...studies for vacant lots. We're talking about two different things. This applies to the multiplier. In no way does it affect or does it address itself as a means of increasing taxes and thereby stimulating construction on vacant property. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1539

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber. Would you record Representative Macdonald as 'aye'? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 157 'aye', 5 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1539, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1540, Representative Bell. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1540, a Bill for an Act in relation to revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bell."

Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the final package of the Bills that were put together and introduced at the request of the Taxpayers Federation and the Realtors. What 1540 does, it excludes from the sales ratio study personal property and sales finance charges which are referred to as points associated with a sale. It adjusts sales prices on a basis equivalent to a qualified 20% down, 80% conventional 25-year mortgage. It sets a benchmark financing arrangement for adjusting creative financing sales prices at a 20% down, 80% mortgage, interest rate equivalent to the Illinois Mortgage Loan Commitment, rate published monthly by the Federal Home Loan Bank in Chicago. It provides that certain data necessary to adjust sales price for creative financing be collected on the green sheets, which are the real estate transfer documents. And it also provides that criminal prosecution may result from willfully admitting this information to the green sheets. This Bill passed the Senate 58 to zero. It, again, is attempting to take out some of the inflated factors that affect multipliers and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

raise the multiplier for the homeowner and with a 58-0 in the Senate, I certainly would appreciate a favorable vote in the House. And my hyphenated Sponsor, Representative Keane, will also close on this, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I...Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "In Senate Amendment #1, there's reference in the Digest to adjusting the sales price to cash value when the financing...that is used is different than the prevailing cost of cash, and there's a definition of the prevailing cost of cash as being established as that which is 20% down and 80% financed over 25 years. Can...Is that type of financing really available today, 20% down and 80% financing over 25 years? It was my belief that...that that type of...what was conventional financing three and four years ago is no longer available in the...in the...particularly in the residential financing area."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bell."

Bell: "That is the figure that's being used as a benchmark by the Realtors and the Taxpayers Federation, and as of April 30th, on that type of financing they say that the rate was 17 percent."

Brummer: "Okay. I..I don't have any quarrel with what you're trying to do with this Bill. I think the concept is a good one. I just would like to know where, in the State of Illinois, I can get a loan to finance a home and pay 20% down and get a 25-year mortgage with a guaranteed rate of interest for that 25 years. I just don't think it can be done."

Bell: "It's getting more difficult all the time. I'll agree to that. But, if you shop hard enough at some of the Savings

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

and loans, you still come up with a few good deals,
Representative..."

Brummer: "Well, I..I have some friends that occasionally buy some homes. If you can give me the name of one institution in the State of Illinois where I can get that type of financing, I'd like to have the name because we'll get some...some constituents to them for additional loans."

Bell: "I'll...I'll certainly check around for you."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "I think Representative Bower would help you move to Chicago, if you'd like, Representative Brummer. Further discussion? Being none... I'm sorry. Representative Wolf, the Gentleman from Madison."

Wolf, Sam: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Wolf, Sam: "Representative Bell, you referred to the green sheets a moment ago as being used to determine what excessive charges were included. Is the green sheet that we use at the present time to be revised?"

Bell: "It would be revised to add these new factors on it."

Wolf, Sam: "I think, as you know, at the present time in the sale of a lot of real estate throughout the state the sales price, itself, many times is inflated to compensate for discount points charged by lending institutions."

Bell: "Correct.."

Wolf, Sam: "Now, unless the green sheet is accompanied by a settlement sheet, or a loan closing statement, it seems to me that it would be difficult for the Department of Revenue to determine in some cases as to just what the inflated price or the excessive charges were. Would you...or, is it your intent or the Department of Revenue's intent in their guidelines to establish the inclusion of loan closing statements in order to determine what excessive charges are

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

involved?"

Bell: "Yes. The green sheets would have to be changed to capture the four, five more bits of information, the amount of down payment, interest rate, length of mortgage, et cetera. And that we would request that they do that..or, they would have to do that."

Wolf, Sam: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Sponsor has done an excellent job explaining the Bill, and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1540 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 161 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1540, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1559, out of the record. 1588, Representative Barkhausen? Out of the record. 1590, Representative McAuliffe? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1590, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Crime Victims Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1590 (sic, Senate Bill 1590) would add people who were...the dependents of people who were killed by reckless homicide to the Crime Victims Compensation Act. The Bill passed out of the Senate with a unanimous vote, 54 to nothing. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

here."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1590 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 163 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1590, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1592, Representative Collins? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1592, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1592 was introduced at the request of the Secretary of State. It would authorize the Secretary of State to maintain two signature checking accounts with balances not to exceed \$5,000 for accounts to be used in purchasing evidence and employing persons to obtain evidence. Present law authorizes the Secretary to expend funds from a contractual services for this purpose. This Bill would facilitate the ..the Secretary of State's Office use of funds to..to purchase evidence. Amendment #1, which was offered in Committee, would..would extend the same authority to the Department of Law Enforcement, the only difference being that in the case of the Department of Law Enforcement there would not be the \$5,000 limitation on the accounts. I would attempt to answer any questions and I would solicit support for the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1592. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

voting's open. Representative Kane?"

Kane: "I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question. Are these funds subject to appropriation for this particular purpose, or are these funds going to be hidden in other line items?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins to explain his vote. Would you repeat that?"

Kane: "There is no limit on the funds for the Department of Law Enforcement. Will there be a specific line item appropriation for this purpose, or will the funds be hidden in some other line item so that there will be no control?"

Collins: "No. No. The purpose of this is so they would not be hidden. This evolved out of the consideration of the Legislative Audit Commission over the years. These would be specifically identified."

Kane: "And appropriated, not only for the Secretary of State's Office, but for the Department of Law Enforcement?"

Collins: "Yes, that is correct. And appropriated."

Kane: "And appropriated for this specific purpose?"

Collins: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 158 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1592, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1594, Representative Collins? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1594, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Library Act and an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1594 is the result of a recommendation made by Federal auditors which would allow the Secretary of State to deposit non-state, non-federal monies into a State

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Trust Fund and to direct payments from user libraries in Illinois to appropriate library contractors to avoid co-mingling these funds with Federal monies in Federal Service Fund #R-70. The State Trust Fund would allow the State Library to act as a clearinghouse between the over 200 Illinois libraries and the computer library center to ..to...which would result in services per user dollar, better...cheaper...pardon me...services per user dollar than if the libraries were individually billed. I would ask for the favorable consideration of Senate Bill 1594."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1594. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 161 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1594, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Peters in the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 1606, Representative Tuerk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1606, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, back in 1981 Congress passed...and there was two Bills and they were signed into law. And the Amendments made by the two laws require that the state conform with legislation making significant changes in the extended benefit provisions of the unemployment insurance law. If we don't conform with the Federal law, then we are at the disposal of the Feds in terms of perhaps losing federal dollars, and this legislation is very important to the state. It provides

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

that the...the state would have to pay the federal share for extended benefits, and the state employers would pay an additional federal tax if this law...Senate...this Bill, Senate Bill 1606, were not passed into law. It's one of those things where we have to act. It's important that we do, and therefore; I would ask for your favorable support to the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bradley: "Representative Tuerk, in the Digest I notice that the ...Bruce was the Sponsor over in the Senate and it was ...the Sponsorship was changed from 'Kirk'. Who was the original Sponsor of the...this important legislation?"

Tuerk: "Senator Bruce."

Bradley: "In the House."

Tuerk: "Oh, in the House? Well, there happened to be some sort of a mix-up on that. I believe that Representative Brummer picked up the Bill and there was some consideration at that time as to who the Sponsor really was, and it was determined I was."

Bradley: "Did..Did Bruce send a letter over to change the Sponsorship, or how did that work?"

Tuerk: "I believe he did."

Bradley: "Was there some problem getting it out of Rules, or what? Why..Why.."

Tuerk: "I don't know.."

Bradley: "...Why was it necessary to change the...on this important piece of legislation..."

Tuerk: "Well, I imagine because it was so important that that's the reason he wanted me to handle it."

Bradley: "If it was going to get to this point, it was imperative

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

that you handle it. I..Is that correct?"

Tuerk: "Well, you might figure that. I don't know what all transpired in the background. But I know I ended up as the Sponsor."

Bradley: "Well, I don't know either. That's why I thought maybe you might enlighten us as to what went on in the..in the..."

Tuerk: "Maybe I can catch up with all the inner workings there and then report to you at a later date."

Bradley: "That would be fine. I would appreciate that."

Tuerk: "Fine."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1606 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting's open. Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I'd like to vote 'yes'. I just want to be assured that this won't prompt about 200 'no' votes on this or 150 'no' votes if I vote 'yes'. It's a good Bill and ought to pass."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 165 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1621, Representative Ewing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1621, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Truth Taxation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill, as amended, provides for some relief in the publication requirements in the Truth in Taxation

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Act...Truth in Taxation Act which was passed last year by this General Assembly. It also provides relief for school districts in Cook County, only in Cook County, where there was a problem with...they had included their debt service in their levy to see whether they came under the auspices of the Act, and then the Attorney General issued an opinion saying that was incorrect. And I would be glad to answer any questions or would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Barr."

Barr: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question? I'll resume on the assumption that he will, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask Representative Ewing, you stated that this Bill does grant a... an exemption for certain taxing bodies - school districts, I guess - who did include that service in their levy. Is that correct?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Barr: "For... For what year is that relief granted?"

Ewing: "That would be for the... the levy for the taxes that are coming out right now."

Barr: "But... But, it would not extend to future years, is that correct?"

Ewing: "No."

Barr: "And does this Bill, as amended, grant blanket relief for any violations of the Act for the 1981 tax year?"

Ewing: "No, it does not."

Barr: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Huff: "Well, will the Sponsor enlighten me as to just how this will relate to the taxing body in Phoenix? Are you familiar with their problem?"

Ewing: "That question came up in debate, and it does not deal

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

with the problem in Phoenix. I'm not... You'd have to refresh my memory as to that problem, but I know that when it was explained earlier, it did not... it did not apply to that problem, Representative."

Huff: "It didn't... It did not apply to that. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Topinka. Representative Topinka."

Unknown: "Go ahead."

Topinka: "Yes, I'd like to call the question, Mr. Chairman (sic, Mr. Speaker)."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1621 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 162 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1630, Representative Pierce. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the North Shore Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1630 authorizes one sanitary district in the state, the North Shore Sanitary District in Lake County, to create a working cash fund in the same manner that every city and village in the state, regardless of size, and of the Metropolitan Sanitary District does. The need for the Bill is that, because of the delay in taxes in Lake County, tax anticipation warrants have to be issued at 11% interest rate, and it is felt the district can save money out of its

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

general revenue fund if it can create the working cash fund. Eventually, they're going to use their charges, and the working cash fund won't be needed; and, therefore, an Amendment in the Senate limited the effect of this Bill to four years. Yesterday, Representative Giorgi put an Amendment on the Bill, which allows Rockford and other districts to have, if they want, a five member board of local improvement on their sanitary districts; but, the basic part of the Bill deals only with the North Shore Sanitary District in authorizing the working cash fund for their purpose of saving interest rates."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1630 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Birkinbine, to explain his vote."

Birkinbine: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, maybe the Sponsor of the Bill would like to explain. Our analysis says that one portion of this Bill would allow the Sanitary District to levy a property tax without referendum."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 124 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1653, Representative Tate. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1653, a Bill for an Act in relation to airports. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tate."

Tate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1653 amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act and the Transportation Bond Act to provide uniformity of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

language between the two Acts. This clarifies that financial assistance to airports may include reimbursements for land acquisition and engineering costs related to projects financed in whole or part by the state. The legislation has been requested by IDOT, from questions raised by the Bureau of the Budget. It is presently the practice of the Department of Transportation or Department, to reimburse airports for these purposes. It does not involve any additional revenue... expenditures for the state. The Senate passed the same Bill 54 to 1 with no opposition in the Committee. I encourage a 'yes' vote on it."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Darrow: "Would you give us an explanation of Amendment #2?"

Speaker Peters: "Any further questions, Representative Darrow?"

Darrow: "Well, I'm asking for an explanation... explanation of Amendment 2."

Speaker Peters: "Oh. I thought you got it. Representative Tate."

Tate: "It... It just clar... Amendment 2 was requested by the Bond Council of Chicago. It just clarifies language that is already presently in the Act."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speak... Thank you, Sponsor. Let me address the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Darrow: "What I'm concerned about, according to our analysis, Amendment #2 of Senate Bill 1653 provides that 75 million dollars in Series B Bonds, earmarked for mass transportation in suburban areas of the RTA, may be spent on construction of transportation facilities, in addition

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

to equipment purchases. I'm a little leery of anything along these lines. I'm surprised the Gentleman from Decatur is concerned about the RTA and the Chicago suburban region, but I'd look very carefully at this legislation."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Is this the... the set-up legislation to do anything with 'Palwaukee Airport'? About four or five years ago, the state came very close to putting down new runways in a privately owned airport. Does this have anything to do with that?"

Tate: "Presently, no, Representative Leverenz. Presently..."

Leverenz: "What do you mean 'presently'? How about next..."

Tate: "There... There are no... There are no airports presently affected by this."

Leverenz: "'Presently' meaning FY '82, and if this is passed and signed, then it would in FY '83?"

Tate: "No."

Leverenz: "No, what?"

Tate: "It does not affect 'Palwaukee' Airport."

Leverenz: "Would a purchase of 'Palwaukee' Airport or... by the state be able to be put through, under this Bill?"

Tate: "No."

Leverenz: "We couldn't do any runways, landingways, taxiways, for them?"

Tate: "You could do projects improved by the state, approved by the federal grant."

Leverenz: "So, that's what I'm trying to head off. Yeah, right. We would, under this, be able to pave the taxiways and the landing runways for 'Palwaukee', under this, and that was stopped once before. This looks like the authorizing language for that."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion?"

Leverenz: "Just trying to see if I can get an answer. He said, 'Yes, it would.'... or staff that it would, but he hasn't said anything."

Tate: "Representative Leverenz, this... this Bill is not doing anything that they are presently not being able to do. It just clarifies some language that... that... and makes both Acts consistent."

Leverenz: "I hope that's right. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, Representative Tate to close. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes."

Currie: "I'm not so concerned that this might be a vehicle for the 'Palwaukee' Airport. My guess is, this is the vehicle Bill for the state to aid Chicago area mass transportation, and I think it speaks very well that the Gentleman, for his... for the Sponsor, that his concern from Decatur is to help out the residents of the City of Chicago, so if that's what this Bill is about, then I think we could probably all happily support it."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is a good Bill, and if you look in your digest, Representative Giglio picked up the sponsorship of the Bill, but was asked to turn it over to Representative Tate, and with that, with that, it does help these... these airports, and it will, and if you just read the digest, on the first paragraph, I think it explains it very well, and that's all we're trying to do. But, it does help, and it will help, Barbara, and it's a good Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Where are we? Further discussion?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Representative... There being none, Representative Tate to close."

Tate: "This way... Senate Bill 1653 in no way amends the RTA Act. As a downstate legislator, I obviously would not want to get into that can of worms. Again, Senate Bills 53 (sic - 1653) amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act, and the Transportation Bond Act, to provide uniformity of language; something we are presently already doing. This is in a response to the Bureau of the Budget that has been requested by IDOT. I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1653 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 128 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1657, Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to take Senate Bill 1657 back..."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to take Senate Bill 1657 to the Order of Second Reading. Is there objection. There being none, leave is granted. 1657, Second Reading. Does he have to read it?"

Ebbesen: "For two purposes, Mr... Mr. Speaker, for two purposes. The Legislative Reference Bureau found a technical error in the drafting of the Bill. It just involves the word 'are', and that would be Amendment #3, and I would like to adopt that Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discuss... Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Ebbesen."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen, Amendment #3."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ebbesen: "Yes. Amend... Amendment #3 was proposed by the Legislative Reference Bureau. It's of a technical nature."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #3. Any discussion? There being none, the... the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1657 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if you would recognize Representative Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Zito. For what purpose do you seek recognition. Second Reading."

Zito: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would... Yesterday, we adopted an Amendment to this Bill, which I think was a very important Amendment. However, we... we have found that with the adoption of this Amendment in this concept, it would greatly endanger the passage of the Bill. While I still believe in the Amendment, I also believe in the Bill, and would ask at this time, since we have a hard commitment from the administration and the other Members, that they would support this at a later Legislative Session. I would move, Mr. Speaker, that we table Amendment #2 to this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Having voted on the prevailing side, Representative Zito moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1657 was adopted. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 151 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay, and the Gentleman's Motion prevails.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Representative Zito, on the reconsideration of Amendment #2. The Gentleman now moves to table Amendment #2. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Ebbesen now asks leave to suspend the appropriate rules so that Senate Bill 1657 can be heard on Third Reading. Read the Bill a third time, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act in relation to various licensing Acts and duties of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1657 amends the Beauty Culture Act, Detective, Nursing, Pharmacy, Optometry, and it relates to fees in general. It is now agreed to by all those that were involved in its drafting, and it really involves the... saving the state nearly a half a million dollars, which would have to come out of General Revenue when all these various... for the Department of R and E, and I would be glad to respond to any questions, but it passed the Senate 53 to nothing, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1657 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 159 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1663, Representative

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ropp. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1663, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Property Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill states... deals with state property, the sale and leasing thereof, and the procedures by which those leaseings will take place. It also deals with the sale of a piece of property, and I urge your favorable vote, because we've already passed the same kind of a vote in a House form a week or two ago."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Question... Question of the Sponsor."

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

Mulcahey: "Representative Ropp, I understand that the... this is going to be sold to the City of Normal for one dollar. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "That's correct."

Mulcahey: "Okay... and the purpose of it is to be used for municipal purposes. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "That is correct."

Mulcahey: "What if it's not used for municipal purposes? Could the City of Normal turn around and sell that property?"

Ropp: "The City would sell, if they chose to do so, or they could, for a non-profit basis, to be used to continue to operate those... that piece of property for human service needs - recreational, Veterans, YWCA, and so forth."

Mulcahey: "What's the appraised value of this property?"

Ropp: "Well, it determines when you want to appraise it. Initially, it started at eight million. After one winter, it dropped down to five million, and we've since been another winter, and that's probably at the same ratio. It

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

would have dropped another portion."

Mulcahey: "So, it's approximately five million dollars, is the appraised value."

Ropp: "Well, that was the last one - December of '81."

Mulcahey: "Okay, and the Department of Administrative Services - are they... do they support this, or... or not?"

Ropp: "I don't think that they would support it, because... I'm not sure why, because, for three years, nothing has been taking place on this particular piece of property."

Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's very nice that the City of Normal has an opportunity to buy this for one dollar, to be used for municipal purposes. However, on the other hand, if it's not used for municipal purposes, there's nothing in this Bill to prevent it... the municipality from selling it; and with an appraised value of some five million dollars or a little less, I think there should be an Amendment that if this ever is sold, that it, indeed, should be returned back to the State of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would the..."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Mr. Sponsor..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Ewing: "Did you indicate to the last question that they had, if they sold any off, it would have to be sold to a not-for-profit public use?"

Ropp: "No, I said the City would not use it for profit, would not sell it for profit."

Ewing: "Well, I don't... I don't think most cities pay tax on their profit, but if they sold it for anything over a dollar, they'd make money on it, wouldn't they?"

Ropp: "That's a possibility."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ewing: "Pardon?"

Ropp: "I said, that's a possibility."

Ewing: "Well, isn't that a profit?"

Ropp: "Well, it would depend if they would have to borrow money to operate it for that one dollar. Yeah, it would probably be a profit."

Ewing: "Well..."

Ropp: "But... But let me say this, that they would be turned around to use for services to benefit the people within the community - recreational facilities, other human service needs, as they now have been requesting from the state for nearly three years."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I spoke against this Bill when the Amendment was put on. I spoke against the Amendment. It's still a very bad precedent for this General Assembly to give away a valuable piece of property for one dollar. Not only are we dealing with the former Soldiers' and Sailors' Home in Normal, we could be dealing anywhere in the State of Illinois, anywhere where there's public property. Now, if you come from a county or a city with a lot of public property, maybe it'll pay off for you, but if you come from a county or an s... district where there isn't very much public property, you can be sure that your taxpayers are subsidizing these municipalities or units of government who are going to get free buys, by this new procedure, by the precedent we're setting here. After this was reported in the paper locally in our area last time, I got very favorable report that this was not a proper action for this General Assembly to take. There are ways that we can make this available to the City of Normal at a nominal cost and still not be giving away the assets of this state. I certainly would request a 'no' vote on this Bill. Make the Sponsors take them back and correct

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

it. Let's not set that bad precedent here today. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. No question that the intent is excellent by the... the Sponsor. This piece of property that started out to be somewhere around 160 acres is down to ten or twelve now because the Department of General Services, I believe, already deeded over the farmland to Illinois State University, so all we're talking about is some... the property that housed the children at ISSCS. The problem is that the... we can't find anybody to buy it. The buildings are deteriorating. There is still a possibility of... of some use being made of some of the buildings on the property, if... if we get rid of it in the next year or two, but the winters are devastating to the property. I would suggest, though, to the Sponsor that possibly taking this back to second reading, put an Amendment on in case of... preventing the City of Normal to sell the property at a profit might soothe some of the... the feelings that and possibly even maybe negotiating with Normal to what a reasonable price might be that they would be willing to pay, but I do think we need an Amendment on it to... in order to pass it, but that's strictly up to the... the Sponsor. I'm going to support him in either case, but I... I would feel more inclined to support the Bill, at least to the point of... with an Amendment preventing them from... from selling the property after they get the deed... the day after they get the deed. There's nothing to prevent them from doing that, and I think it is a precedent we would probably want to stay away from."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

one aspect of this particular situation, people, if they understood it and realize it, would feel more comfortable about. This piece of property is not a piece of property that was purchased by the state. This piece of property is a piece of property given in trust to the state for a specific purpose; the specific purpose being to take care of the sons of those Veterans. Now, this Legislature came along some time later, after that trust was created, and after the state had the benefit of using that property, and abolished the possibility of reverter that was expressly in the deed of trust granting the property to the state. We abolished that potential for reverter, and then, subsequently to that, we abandoned the use of... of the facility for the purpose that the land was given for, when we closed the Illinois Soldiers' and Sailors' Home. I voted in favor of closing the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home that time, because it was impossible, in my judgment - some people disagreed - but it was impossible, in my judgment, for the state to operate the thing at a reasonable cost. So then, we have a situation where that facility is closed. It cannot revert as it was intended to, under the terms of the deed, and the facility is sitting there as a blight in the neighborhood, deteriorating. This state has offered it to every unit of government, every... every sub-unit of government within the state. By that, I mean no other state agency wants to make use of it; not the University of... Illinois State University or any other state agency can make use of it. We cannot use it. It is a blight; it is a deteriorating blight. What the Gentleman proposes in his Bill is simply that we give the... the piece of property to a local unit of government, not to a private person or something, but to a local unit of government, to try to preserve part of this utility for a public purpose.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

I cannot see how anybody can criticize that. I think it's a cheap shot to criticize it, and I have received overwhelming support - letters, phone calls, and so forth - for that position. I would urge passage of the Bill. I would urge an 'aye' vote for the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

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

Dunn, John: "Is... Is there some kind of lawsuit pending which involves this property?"

Ropp: "Personally, I have not seen anything in writing to the degree that there is a lawsuit. There is always a possibility that a portion of the property may have received some concern from two or three generations, back from those early gifts, but I haven't seen anything in writing that says there is a lawsuit pending."

Dunn, John: "Is... Is... Well, that's what you've seen. Do you know, is there a lawsuit pending? There was some comment that... that this land may be subject to a reversion clause which provides that, in the event it is used for other than the intended purpose at the time of the original grant, the title will revert to the ancestors of the original owners. Is..."

Ropp: "Well, I would prefer, at this point, to not see that property continue to deteriorate. I had the... just went by it just the other day and there's grass and weeds two feet tall. It's really a disgrace to the community, and for me to proudly say, 'There's a piece of state property, that belongs to the State of Illinois', and see it in that kind of a condition. I... my gracious, here I'm in the legislator, and I... in the Legislature, and it seems to me like something ought to be done. The City has in no way pushed aggressively forward to take over this property.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

They're saying that we want to provide this kind of service for the people, and they have offered this..."

Dunn, John: "Mr. Sponsor, that was certainly not my... my question. My question was, do you know about problems with the legal title, in the event this is... is deeded to Normal, because that may call for a reversion of the title back to the ancestors the... of the original owners."

Ropp: "Well, should that ever come about, I'm sure the courts would give us the direction on what to do with it, then."

Dunn, John: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. One of the earlier speakers indicated concern about the precedent which may be established by passage of this legislation, and I think that speaker was exactly correct. Taxpayer dollars from all over the State of Illinois were collected and gathered together for the purpose of making an expenditure for construction of the home that is on this ground and for ownership of the land. If the State of Illinois gathers taxpayer dollars together, even though it happened a long time ago, and then makes a gift of the property paid for with taxpayer dollars all around the State of Illinois, to one community in the State of Illinois, then there has been, in effect, special legislation passed to benefit that community. We don't do that in this state, or in this nation, and I think if we're going to... if we're going to do this, we should have the ground appraised, find out what its real value is, and see if the community of Normal is interested in buying it. I know the analysis of our... one of our Amendment analyses here, indicates that the... the property has an appraised value in excess of five million dollars. If that be the case, and General Revenue dollars are so dear here in the State of Illinois, we should follow the... what is alleged to be the practice that's going to be followed by the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Federal Government in Washington, and that is to dispose of property which is no longer needed by that particular governmental operation for fair market value, to get some money back into the federal or state coffers. So, if we can put five million dollars back in the State Treasury by the sale of this land, then we should do it. If it won't move, maybe we can work something out, some kind of trade; but we... we can't really afford to take taxpayer dollars from all around the state and make a gift to the community of Normal without making a gift to the community of Rock Island or Springfield or Decatur or Quincy or Danville or Galesburg, and if we're not going to make all those gifts, then we shouldn't make any specific gifts. So, I would urge that this Bill, even though well intended, be defeated at this time."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

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

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just want to say that this... we have gone through all of the procedures that everyone in this House has indicated that we ought to do, in terms of putting it... appraising it and putting it up for sale. The ques... the point is that here we have, just in monthly operations, a cost that exceeds 50,000 dollars a month. The state has not been in a position to lease enough of any portions of this property to any way cover the cost. What the state is doing is saying now, and we have not provided any service to the community with this property for more than a year. It is a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

situation where we have weeds growing up. It is deteriorating in value and I'm saying that the people of this state, though well intentioned, are needing of additional services that this would provide. The municipality within the City is willing to take this up and provide it for use by the people, not within that particular county, but throughout the Central Illinois area. Lincoln College has expressed interest in coming and using many of the classrooms that are there. They are now using facilities all over the City of Bloomington and Normal. The Veterans have expressed interest, the YWCA and any number of other human service agencies have expressed interests. I have talked to the mayor. He has given his word that in no way will there be any profit derived by the city in this particular piece of legislation. We operate on our word within this chamber and I operate on my word within the people..with the people of the municipality of the City of Normal. I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1663 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Leverenz to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill clearly should fail. The fair market value has not been established by the appraisals. We're not selling it for fair market value. I suggest that this will allow us in a year or three to sell the new State of Illinois Building to the City of Chicago for a dollar."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun to explain her vote."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask questions of the Sponsor. I have a problem with the notion that the state can take a gift from somebody, by legislation extinguish whatever right that person's heirs might have

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

had in the property, and then, having extinguished the right of 'reverter', then turn around and dispose of it at a dollar...for a dollar to another..whatever..for whatever purpose. It seems to me that that would violate the terms of the gift in the first place. You certainly wouldn't want that to happen if you had a piece of property that you donated for public use. And it seems to me that while I understand the interest...the Gentleman's interest in preserving his community, at the same time we should not run roughshod over what are very basic principles of law concerning gifts of property to the government. And for that reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This administration, the Thompson administrations, had a big fact finding study group go throughout this state, make a listing of the assets that are contained within and owned by the State of Illinois. There was a big hearing in the City of Chicago at the First National Bank. There were big publicity items contained in every one of the major newspapers. There was a tremendous display of responsibility saying what assets are contained within State Government. In the City of Chicago we have a number of jewels or assets of State Government, one of them being the old armory located on Chicago Avenue, East of Michigan Avenue. We, in turn, would like to have that turned over to the city for a dollar. But I don't think we've put in legislation like that. I think when you're talking about having the State Treasury...This should be defeated."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steele to explain his vote."

Steele: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that this deserves a 'yes' vote. This property, in the very first place, was given by the people of this community to the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

state. It no longer is needed for the purposes that the people of this community gave it for, and I think it's only proper it go back to the people that gave it in the first place who've indicated an interest in putting it back to public use for the benefit of the people of that community. It's not serving any use now. It's still going to serve the public. It's going to serve governmental purposes, and I think it definitely deserves a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question...Who? There are 90 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'nay'. Representative Ewing?"

Ewing: "Yes. Let's...Let's verify..."

Speaker Peters: "What did he say?"

Ewing: "I asked for a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees: Abramson. Chapman. Deuster. Virginia Frederick. Jackson. Katz. Martire. McBroom. Satterthwaite. Stearney. And, Telcser."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed with the verification of the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alexander. Barr. Beatty. Bianco. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. DiPrima. Doyle. Ewell. Farley. Fawell. Findley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Hoffman. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Jones. Kane. Keane. Jim Kelley. Dick Kelly. Klemm. Koehler. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Leon. Levin. Loftus. Madigan. Margalus. Matijevich. Mays. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Murphy. Neff. O'Brien. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Reilly. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Saltsman.
Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczko. E. G. Steele.
Stewart. Stuffle. Tate. Terzich. Turner. Vinson.
White. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Yourell. And,
Zito."

Speaker Peters: "What's the beginning count, Mr. Clerk? The
count is 90 'aye', 60 voting 'nay'. Representative Ewing?"

Ewing: "Representative Bianco?"

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Ewing: "Bianco?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bianco? Is the Gentleman in the
chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Boucek?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Boucek? Is the Gentleman in the
chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Daniels?"

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

Ewing: "Farley?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Farley? Is the Gentleman in the
chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Fawell?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell? The Lady's here."

Ewing: "Findley?"

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Findley? Is the Gentleman in the chamber?
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ewing: "Garmisa?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Garmisa? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Getty?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Hanahan."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hanahan? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Ewing, Representative Johnson asks leave to be verified. Leave. Proceed, Sir."

Ewing: "Jones."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jones? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Jim Kelley?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jim Kelley? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Ewing: "Dick Kelly."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Ewing: "Do we..."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

Ewing: "Dick Kelly, did we get..."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, he is in the chamber."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ewing: "Leon."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leon. Gentleman in the chamber?"

How is he... He's here. He's in the rear."

Ewing: "Margalus."

Speaker Peters: "Who?"

Ewing: "Margalus."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman's in his seat."

Ewing: "McBroom."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew."

Ewing: "McBroom."

Speaker Peters: "McBroom."

Ewing: "McBroom."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded? I think he said McBroom. Ed McBroom."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Speaker Peters: "Not voting."

Ewing: "Let's leave him that way. Slape."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape. Gentleman's here."

Ewing: "McGrew. McGrew."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McBrew... McGrew. Sam McGrew."

Ewing: "Right."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the roll."

Ewing: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kornowicz. Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the roll."

Ewing: "Winchester."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is here."

Ewing: "Winchester?"

Speaker Peters: "Return McGrew to the roll."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Ewing: "Yourell."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell is in his seat."

Ewing: "I have no other questions."

Speaker Peters: "The count, Mr. Clerk. 80 'aye', 60 'no'.

Return Representative Garmisa. Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "How is the Lady recorded? Balanoff."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Balanoff: "Please change that to 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Vote the Lady 'aye'. The count is 82 'ayes', 59
'nays'. Representative Ropp. Postponed Consideration.
Senate Bill 13...What is that 12? I can't read it. Senate
Bill 1256, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr.
Clerk. Wait a minute. Is that... Are we on... Is that
Second Reading? Alright. Page five of the Calendar,
Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate. Representative
McG... Senate Bill 1256, Representative McAuliffe. Read
the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1256, a Bill for an Act to amend an
Act providing for housing assistance to disabled veterans.
Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Meyer, Amendment #2."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a technical correction
that was suggested by the Department of Personnel so it
would clarify that the Committee Amendment did not relate
to pensions, but only to service time and vacation time."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I would ask the Parliamentarian to see if this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Amendment is germane."

Speaker Peters: "In the opinion of the Chair, the ger... the Amendment is germane. Discussion on the Amendment? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, would the speaker yield to a question? Representative Meyer, I didn't hear your explanation of the... of the cause, or the effect, or the reason for the Amendment. Would you go through that again?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Meyer. Ted Meyer."

Meyer: "Yes, Sir. Committee Amendment #2... pardon. Committee Amendment #1 dealt with the problem that existed in Representative DiPrima's district and my district where five employees were laid off from the Department of Labor as a result - several years ago when Governor Walker federalized OSHA. These five employees lost their vacation time, because they were gone over two years. This would permit them to have their vacation time."

Stuffle: "Thank you, Representative Meyer."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion?"

Meyer: "I ask the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1256 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Leave for...Leave for Short Debate. There objection? None. Leave is granted. Short Debate. Senate Bill 1452, Representative Telcser? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."!

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any Motion with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser, Amendment #2."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2, if I
may."

Speaker Peters: "Withdraw Amendment #2? Amendment #2 is
withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Amendment #3 is a request that I put on this Bill.
What it does, it lets people who have served as trustees in
villages to make both contributions to buy in the required
time. I appreciate adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill
1452."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question
is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1452 be adopted?'.
Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed. In
the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 3
is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Leave for Short Debate.
Objection. None. Leave is granted. Short Debate. Senate
Bill 1562, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr.
Clerk. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill
1579, Representative Oblinger. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels, Amendment #2.
Representative Karpiel, on Amendment #2."

Karpiel: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is the exact same thing as House Bill 2516 which passed out of this House a couple of weeks ago with 139 'yes' votes. What this Bill does, again, to refresh your memory, is that it broadens the investment authority for the state pension funds by defining such authority in accordance with the Prudent Person Rule, rather than the list of specific investment restrictions. The Prudent Person Rule is a set of fiduciary standards currently contained in the Pension Code, and these provisions are identical to those governing the investment of private pension funds regulated by federal law. The funds which are going to be affected by this change are the Downstate Teachers' Retirement System, the State Universities Retirement System, the State Board of Investments, which includes; the state employees, the General Assembly and the judicial... the Judges' Retirement System. The IMRF is also included in this."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? I'm sorry. Proceed."

Karpiel: "The purpose of the change is to give greater flexibility to the fiduciaries in investing these funds and to gain a better rate of return on these funds, and this Bill came out of recommendations from the Illinois Study Commission on Public Pension Investment Policies. And it was a good idea a few weeks ago. It's an even... I'm going to give you another chance to vote on a good idea again today, and I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, what happened to this Bill when it got over to the Senate?"

Karpiel: "It was defeated in the ... in Committee."

Ebbesen: "By a large majority in the Committee?"

Karpiel: "6-6-1, Representative."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Representative. This was defeated in the Senate. Do you know what the objections were to this Bill? You didn't address that in your Amendment. What was the objection that it didn't receive a favorable support in the Senate."

Karpiel: "Representative, from my information, it was primarily the Judges' Retirement System that objected to the Bill, and I think there was also some misinformation that the Downstate Teachers' Retirement System was opposed to it which has been cleared up. They are not."

Terzich: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates she will."

Tuerk: "Well, you just answered one of my questions. You say the Downstate Teachers' Retirement Fund people are not opposed to this concept any longer?"

Karpiel: "No, they never have been, Representative. They've been in favor of it right along."

Tuerk: "Well, I had some word from my group back home that they were definitely opposed to it; and, as of yesterday, they were still opposed to the idea."

Karpiel: "I think that some individual teachers and perhaps some of their... some local groups might have been opposed to it, but the Retirement System... they're Board is for it

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

and has, in fact, testified for it in Committee."

Tuerk: "Oh, you're talking about the system, and I'm talking about the retired teacher groups. And they are opposed to the concept. I just wanted that to be part of the record."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the downstate teachers are opposed to this. They were opposed, and they haven't changed their position."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it seems that the same, I guess, misconceptions about who's for and against this and why have come up again, as they did in the Senate Committee on Insurance and Pensions and came up before on 2516. For the record, there have been some individual groups, retiree groups, who have opposed the Bill; and, as I look over on the Republican side, I see Representative Oblinger standing there. She and I discussed this at some length. I see her name is now on the Amendment, as I think it ought to be. Some of these groups have been led to believe some really ridiculous things; such as, they could take pension money and invest them in an unsecured mortgage or something of this nature, which clearly is not the case. Several misunderstandings have been created about the Bill... this Amendment and the earlier Bill, which really have nothing to do with it. All this Amendment does, and all the other Amendment does it codify in a little better language what we did last year in rewriting the investment formulas for the various pension systems that are covered here. That's already a part of the law. What this does in two other areas is provide a definition of fiduciary responsibility already assumed on the part of investors and on the part of trustees of pension systems, and; third, what it does is provide statutory language that would put into the Pension

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Code the concept of the Prudent Man or Prudent Person Rule. That's all it does. It doesn't take from any system. It moves the language that's now in Article XXII (A) down into Article I with regard to the pension system. That's already on the books though. It doesn't change the investment authority at all from what's already there. Now, the Downstate Teachers' Retirement System supports the Bill. The Illinois Education Association supports the Bill. Someone's proposed that the Chicago teachers may oppose it because it changes their investment authority. If you look at the Bill, that's not true either. That was brought to my attention this morning. If you look at the Bill, their investment authority is not changed at all. If you look at the Bill on page 21, lines five through nine, it's retained by reference with the movement of the Section. The language that's struck thereafter is added back at page 11, lines 33 through 35. So, I submit to you that this is a good Bill. It's the kind of Bill that's going to let us get the kind of return on pension investments we need; the 15 to 15 1/2 or 16% return that we ought to be getting instead of the 5 and 6% return. Now, I've stood on this House floor and sponsored and passed Bill after Bill for downstate retired teachers, and we ought to be courageous enough to go back and tell them that they're wrong just as I have done in the ones that have talked to me. They've absolutely wrong. We're not tampering with their pension assets. We're trying to augment those pension assets, and the stuff that's in here is nothing new. It ought to be passed overwhelmingly. There's probably no more greater pool of money with no more insurance behind it than this Bill would provide. This is a great, great proposal that will help this entire state to get back on its feet and utilize some money that exists and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

help those retirees, even though they oppose it. Maybe we should help save them from themselves and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giglio. Giglio. Representative Giglio. Further... No? Further discussion? There being none, Representative Karpziel, to close."

Karpziel: "Yes, thank you. I think that Representative Stuffle covered quite a few important points. It has been brought out that the total rate of return for the five state pension funds in the last five years only averaged a rate of return of about five percent, while pension funds throughout the United States, over the same five-year period, returned a rate of 8.6%. We are trying, with this Bill, we are trying to increase the rate of return on these pension funds; and, at the same time, have prudent financial criteria and...in being very careful with the money that's in these pension funds. The Downstate Teachers' Retirement System does, in fact, support this. The State Board of Investments, the State Employees' Retirement System, the AF of L-CIO, the IEA, the State Chamber of Commerce. There has been several editorials in the Sun Times, and the Tribune and Crane Chicago Business. It's a good Bill, and I request your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1579 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Keane."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Keane, Amendment #3."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 3 provides that any active member... The present law says, 'any active member of the General Assembly Retirement System', and the Amendment adds, 'and until July 1, 1984 any person having

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

service credit therein'. And then it goes on. It's the old law after that. This is specifically designed... The Bill.. The Amendment is specifically designed to take care of the pension rates of Representative Schisler, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call... I would... favorable vote on this. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1579 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Oblinger."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger, Amendment #4."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this simply says that the General Assembly finds that under the provisions of subpart 5 of Subsection (c) of the State Mandates Act, because there was a question about that; that this does not apply because there is no more than a thousand dollar cost to any one agency, nor an aggregate of over 50,000 dollars. Therefore, the State Mandates Act does not apply."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the questions is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1579 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Leave on Short... for Short Debate? No objection, leave is granted. Senate Bill 1599, Representative Piel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1652, Representative Watson. 1652? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1667, Representative McBroom. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1672, Representative Olson.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Out? Out of the record. Senate Bills, Second Reading, page five of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1231, Representative Daniels. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1251, Representative Peters. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1289, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. Representative... 1292, Representative...Senate Bill 1292, Representative Pullen. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Mo.. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Bowman..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #1."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1292 is the successor to Senate Bill 524 of last year. This Bill is designed to remove the licensing requirement from day care centers that are operated by churches and church affiliated organizations. The proponents of the measure tell us that their intent is not to eliminate the licensure of day care... day care but merely to get the... the schools out from under the Day Care Act. Well, if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I think Amendment #1 would help to clarify the situation; because, as the Bill is presently written, there is no limitation on the number of hours in each day that the... the place can have the custody of the children. Now, most schools, in fact all of the ones that I can think of, have custody of children for no more than six hours a day; and, consequently, to make sure that... that we are, in fact, removing the schools out from under the Day Care Code and that we are not improperly removing day care centers, I believe that it's appropriate to put a requirement in here

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

that the exempt facilities have custody of the children for no more than six hours a day. That is what Amendment #1 does, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to point out that the Gentleman has never supported the concept of this Bill, and I suspect that if this Amendment is adopted, even if it is adopted, he will not support the Bill. I suspect, rather, that the Amendment is intended to bother the Bill. This legislation has been very carefully worked out by the Department of Children and Family Services and is now in the form that the Sponsor and the Department wishes to have it passed in, and I oppose this and any other Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Being none, Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Well, I'd just like to point out that the Director of the Department has stated his intent, and I tried to...I tried to say exactly what the Director's intent was in my opening remarks. The Sponsor of the legislation did not say that I had misrepresented the intent of the drafters of the Bill. I believe that I have represented it fairly, and I believe that, if there... those of you who, on the floor of this House, are concerned about children and the health, and welfare and safety of children in day care centers, I'm sure you agree with me that we do not want to be opening a ... a gap in our... in our laws. Now, if the proponents of this legislation are indeed sincere that what they're trying to do is to exempt schools only and not centers, then I think you will want to support Amendment #1, which makes it, I believe, quite clear that we're talking about schools and not day care centers. So, this is exactly the sentiment or the purpose, as represented by the Director of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

the Department of Children and Family Services, and I believe this language clarifies that intent. And I am quite serious about it, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1292 be adopted?'. Pardon? The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. Is he joined by five Members? He is. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1292 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those oppose by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative McAuliffe, Peters 'no'. Representative Macdonald. One minute to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'no' because I couldn't agree more with Representative Pullen than I do. I think that the Amendment that has been offered here is absolutely unacceptable and is certainly an intrusion on the privacy of children and church schools, and I would urge your 'no' votes."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 39 voting 'aye', 104 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Amendment #1 is lost. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #2."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do hope the people on the other side are a little more specific about their opposition..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah. Okay, this particular Amendment, Amendment #2, provides a ... an enforcement mechanism for the health and safety standards which are in the Bill. The Bill, as we all know by now, exempts religious affiliated schools or day care centers from the... the Day Care Licensing Act."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

It does say, however, that there is an obligation and need applicable health and safety standards. The problem, however, is that the Bill provides no mechanism for assuring that those standards are, in fact, met. The... The Department of Children and Family Services will not do the kinds of inspections that are necessary, because they don't have... these schools don't have to be licensed. This would be in the purview of the Fire Marshal. So what I'm proposing here is something really quite simple. All I'm suggesting is that the... the exempt facility file a certified or a notarized statement with the State Fire Marshal at least once in every two-year period so that... that to certify that all appropriate state and local health and fire safety standards are being met. This is something that all they have to do is get a notarized statement. It is very, very simple, and they file it with the State Fire Marshal. This is a once-every-two-year requirement. That is no more burdensome than the present requirement on licensed day care centers, which must be relicensed every year and re-examined every... I'm sorry, every two years. This is the same examination cycle, except we leave it up to the local school to file the notarized statement. I think it's a very simple Amendment. Representative Pullen, the Sponsor of this Bill, has already announced her intention to oppose all subsequent Amendments without addressing the substance of the Amendment, and then we have other Representatives bouncing up on the floor without addressing the substance either. I think, if anyone wants to oppose this Amendment, I'd appreciate knowing what the substantive grounds are."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman's Amendment does not do anything for enforcement,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

rather it does a lot for harassment. This Bill has been carefully crafted by the Department of Children and Family Services to accomplish the purpose intended by the Bill, while protecting the best interests of the children of this state, and I oppose the Amend... the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none... Representative Bowman? The Gentleman asks ..."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you..."

Speaker Peters: "... requests a Roll ..."

Bowman: "Yes, I'd like a Roll Call. Also, in closing, I'd just point out that the Sponsor still refuses to address the substance of the Amendment, and I certainly hope that, by the time the Bill comes up for final passage, the Sponsor is prepared to address the substance of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Is the Gentleman joined by five Members in...? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1292 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Representative McAuliffe, Peters 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 51 voting 'aye', 103 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and Amendment #2 is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Bowman."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Is there more Amendments? Amendment #3, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill, in its present form requires that, to be eligible for an exemption, what they call a school - what I believe is a day care center - must be a component of a... of a school. Now, I don't know what a component of a school is, and I think that the Legislature, before

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

approving a concept like this, ought to be a little more specific about what constitutes a component of a school. It is simply having a common management structure adequate to constitute being a component. In other words, could it...would be possible that this child care facility be located in one... one county and a school operated by exactly the same denomination or church or whatever be located in another county, or another city or down the block. I believe that what we... we intend here is that the... that the child care facility be physically part of a school that normally serves other children, and this Amendment #3 simply requires that they share a common physical plant. It also says that we want this to be a real school, not a phony school. So that we want them to have at least three grade levels above kindergarten in order to qualify as a school. A one-grade-level school, in my opinion, really is not... does not provide adequate safeguard, that the child care facility located or operated in conjunction with it, really have the same kind of... meet the same kind of standards that we all desire; that they're necessary for health, safety and welfare of the children being cared for. So, this particular Amendment makes sure that the child care facility is an integral part of a real school and not just a ...a component of something that is a facade for a school and not a genuine school. So, that is the spirit in which Amendment #3 is offered. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill, as written, is very careful to exempt Christian or other church-oriented... operated, excuse me, pre-school programs. It does not relate to day care centers. The Gentleman's Amendment adds nothing of any value to the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bill, which has been carefully drawn to carry out the intent of the legislation for the benefit of the children of Illinois. I oppose the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Lady, in her oppositions, referred three times to the careful drafting of this legislation by the Department of Children and Family Services. I would just like to review, very briefly, the events that led up to this careful drafting. Senate Bill 524, which was being sought by the Moral Majority last year, passed both chambers, and the Governor vetoed it. And he got himself in a lot of hot water with the Moral Majority, and so now he's trying to back peddle and he's trying to make nice with the Moral Majority. And, so the Department of Children and Family Services was... were the frontmen on this, and they sat down with the Moral Majority and kind of worked a few things out. The Bill is only cosmetically different from Senate Bill 524 from last year. The careful drafting that she refers to is merely an attempt to kind of gloss over the differences between this Bill and 524. It contains the same deficiencies as 524. That is why I've offered Amendment #3 and these other Amendments to overcome the shortcomings of this legislation. I urge adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Representative Bowman. Gentleman asks for a Roll Call vote. Is he joined by five Members? So far I see four. Preston, five. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1292 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. Voting is open. Peters 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 42 voting 'aye', 112 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Amendment #3 is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Daniels in the Chair. Representative Peters back in the Chair. Senate Bill 1299, Representative Birkinbine. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1305, Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing, 1305? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1305, a Bill for an Act relating to drug paraphernalia. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Cullerton."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #1."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is an agreed-to Amendment with the Sponsor of the Bill. This Bill has to deal with drug paraphernalia. And, basically, what the Bill does is to create a definitional category of what is drug paraphernalia and then to say that anyone who sells it ... it's illegal for someone to sell it. It's a business offense, and also creates a nuisance and can be shut down. So, this is basically a clean-up Amendment. What we do, first of all, is to, in the nuisance proceeding, to eliminate the word 'negligence', but leave in 'knowing, intentional or reckless'. With respect to determining whether or not an item is exempt, we delete some redundant material. We also take out language indicating that any newspaper or magazine article can be looked at to determine whether or not an item is exempt, because that's done by a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

third person. With respect to...the judgements, 'drug paraphernalia is subject to forfeiture'. So, with respect to the forfeiture provision, we take out the word...It provides that, 'if there's probable cause to believe that the property is directly or indirectly dangerous to health or safety'. We strike the word, 'or indirectly'. We also make it clear that, if the items are to be seized, that they cannot take the whole inventory, but just that inventory which is objectionable. With respect to the disposition of the property that has been seized, we indicate that in this Amendment, that if the defendant wins his case that he gets the property back within a reasonable period of time. I'd be happy to answer any questions. It's pretty.. basically just a clean-up type Amendment, and it has been agreed to by the Sponsors. And I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr."

Barr: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, it has. You need a copy, Sir?"

Barr: "I'd like to have one. It didn't make it to this row, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel has one behind you. Further discussion? Representative Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "I would just ask for the adoption of the Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #2."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill, in Section 7, the last Section of the Bill, was intended to be preemptive, and the language that was used, drafted in the Senate, is really not well drafted. So, what we've done is we've taken a standard preemption clause, and we wish to amend that onto this Bill. This also have been agreed to by the Sponsor. So, I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2. Be happy to answer any questions, if there are any."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #3."

Cullerton: "I wish to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Conti, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Did I hear right that you just adopted an Amendment that preempted home rule on a voice vote?"

Speaker Daniels: "Nobody asked for a Roll Call. Do you want a Roll Call, Sir? Would you like a Roll Call? Okay. Amendment #3. Is that withdrawn? Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #4."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is a non-severability clause that's added to this Bill. This subject matter of drug paraphernalia has been the subject matter of numerous constitutional challenges, and I would expect that after this Bill is passed that there will also be... it will also be challenged in court. Now, the theory

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

behind this Amendment is to make sure... It would operate somewhat as a sunset provision. What we say with this Amendment is that if this particular... if any provisions in this Act are found to be unconstitutional, that the entire Act is void. The reason for this is because, if it's possible that some Federal Court or some State Court will pick through this Bill and find some things that they find objectionable, and then we'd be left with a loophole; and, through that loophole, these head shop operators would probably be able to still operate. So, this Amendment would have the effect of forcing us to come back and to solve the problems that would be created by the courts. So, I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #4, and I would be happy to answer any questions. It's very clear as to what it does. It says that if this Act is, in any part, is found unconstitutional, that the whole Act is void, and that we have to come back and solve the problem."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this Amendment has stated accurately what this Amendment will do. He only failed, in my opinion, though, to state that this Amendment would tend to bury this Bill, if and when it ever goes to a court for interpretation. Normally, our severability Amendments say that, if any part of an Act is found unconstitutional, the rest of the Act will stand; or, if the Bill has no severability clause, the court decides whether they strike the entire law or not. In this case, the Sponsor of this Amendment would have it just the reverse. They would say that, if any part of the Bill is unconstitutional, the whole Bill is. I personally believe that maybe it's his intention or hope that some small part of the Bill might be found unconstitutional and that would be the death knoll for the drug paraphernalia

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bill. If you want this Bill to pass, vote 'no' on this Amendment. If you don't want the drug paraphernalia Bill, then I say you vote 'yes' on the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative Cullerton, moves the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have... You want a Roll Call? The 'nos' have it. Do you want a Roll Call?"

Cullerton: "Please."

Speaker Daniels: "All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 30 'ayes', 115 'no', none voting 'present', and Amendment #4 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1358, Representative Stuffle. Representative Woodyard, do you want to handle 1358? Out of the record. 1383, Representative Findley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1383, a Bill for an Act to provide for assistance to certain employee-owned enterprises. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #1, by Representative Birkinbine."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Birkinbine on the Motion to table Amendment #1."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 was put on in Committee is now redundant, because a free-standing Bill of its own encompasses what the Amendment did. I would move to remove

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Amendment 1 from the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Satterthwaite, Amendment #2. Lady in the chambers? Representative Findley. Representative Balanoff, do you wish to handle that?"

Balanoff: "Well, now that table... Now that Motion... Amendment #1 has been tabled, any Amendments that I am a Cosponsor of would not be proper. Therefore, I ask that..."

Speaker Daniels: "Lady moves to withdraw Amendment #2. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Saltsman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Saltsman, Amendment #3. ...Your pleasure, Sir? Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #4. Your pleasure, Sir. Representative Bowman. Withdrawn?"

Bowman: "Okay. Just a second. Let me just make sure of one thing, Sir, related to the business at hand. Did we not just table the enterprise zone Bill that was offered as an Amendment to this legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #1 was tabled, Sir."

Bowman: "Okay. Was that not the Enterprise Zone Act? The reason I'm asking is I'll withdraw these Amendments, if it was."

Speaker Daniels: "Do you want to withdraw it?"

Bowman: "I want to know, before I withdraw it, if Amendment #1 was not the Enterprise Zone Act. That's the one?"

Speaker Daniels: "Your Amendment's out of order. It amends Amendment #1. So, do you want to withdraw it or shall I move to table it?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Bowman: "No, if... I have here the Amendment analysis from the staff. Yes, that was the one I was looking for. I'll withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Balanoff."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Please withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Currie."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, #6. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Currie."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Balanoff."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Balanoff."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Findley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Findley, on Amendment #10."

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the assurance of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were opposing the enterprise zone Bill, let me assure you that this Amendment #10 only respects the original Bill, as passed out of the Senate under the sponsorship of Representative... Senator Collins. The Amendment makes a technical change in the Bill only to make specific what was implicit in the original Bill; that being that the employees would have the opportunity, if the owners wished, to purchase the assets of a company that was either closing or relocating its plant. The Amendment #10 just makes specific what was implicit, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Alexander."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Alexander: "I'm inquiring whether Amendments #9 or 10 has been distributed. I don't have them, and those around us don't have them."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #9 has been withdrawn."

Alexander: "I know it, but was it distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "It's not distributed. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1401, Representative Telcser. Out of the record. 1503, Representative Stanley. Representative Stuffle, do you want to handle 1503? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1503, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code and an Act creating the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Katz."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Katz. Your pleasure, Representative Stuffle. Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz, Amendment #2."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was Amendment #1 adopted?"

Speaker Daniels: "No."

Leverenz: "Okay, fine. Amendment #2 then would provide that the State Scholarship Commission could access information in the Department of Labor Bureau of Employment Security Records to establish the current address of any person owing on a defaulted loan with the Scholarship Commission so that we could collect the money. If there are any questions, I'll answer them. We passed the Bill 168 to 0. It got lost in Senate Rules. I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I see nothing wrong with the Amendment, and I would be willing to accept that Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew, Amendment #4. Gentleman in the chambers? Representative McGrew. Representative Stuffle, your pleasure, Sir. Gentleman moves to table Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Representative McGrew is here. Representative McGrew, on Amendment #4."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is a very simple Amendment. All it does is to provide unit districts the ability to have student/parent conferences for the grade schools and to have a workshop for the high schools concurrently. Right now, the law states that, if we try to do it... a parent/teacher conference, that it would have to be district-wide; and, if you are dealing with high schools, you know that it's very, very difficult to try to get parents to come in for a parent/teacher conference for high school students, and it just simply doesn't work. So, this would allow them to have parent/teacher conference K-8, and the high school teachers to have a workshop at the same day. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #4. All those in favor signify

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski, Amendment #5."

Kosinski: "Amendment #5 replaces Amendment #3, which I withdrew.
It extends job opportunity within the realm by the wording,
'or at least two years of full-time experience as an
administrator in the schools described in this Section, or
as an administrator in any education...in an educational
service region officer or as an administrator for the State
Board of Education'."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman
moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor
signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #6."

Bowman: "Leave to withdraw 6."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #7."

Bowman: "Floor Amendment #7 is a very simple. It simply says
that no... no district can lose more than 49 of its state
aid entitlement in any one year. Some districts are ...
really getting wiped out..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Sir. Excuse me. Representative
Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"

Piel: "Question, Mr. Speaker. Has this Amendment been
distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "No. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1401,
Representative Telcser. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1401, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Capital Development Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard, Amendment #1."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday, we attempted to put this Amendment on a Bill which looked like we were really going to upset the Constitution of the State of Illinois; and, since I didn't want to do that, we did decide that this one will not infringe upon the Constitution, and it is the Bill that would name the new Department of Agriculture Building for John W. Lewis. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to make sure that we don't mess up the Constitution, in Representative Woodyard's words, I wonder if I could renew the same request that Representative Getty asked yesterday about whether or not this does violate the single subject matter provisions of the Constitution. I would ask that the Chair inquire of the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Daniels: "Parliamentarian tells me the Amendment is germane and does not violate the single provision. Further discussion? Representative Hoffman. Your light's on, Sir. Representative Kane. Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser, Amendment #2."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might withdraw Amendment #2 and proceed with #3."

Speaker Daniels: "You might. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Telcser."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser, Amendment #3."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3 raises to the introduced level which was in the Governor's budget the provisions of Senate Bill 1401 which were reduced in the Senate. I appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Has this Amendment been distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes."

Kane: "In what areas does this..."

Telcser: "Before you ask the question, Representative, my microphone went off. I didn't quite finish my statement. There's also planning money added for Bowen and the prisons. Now, I'll be glad to take your question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "When he says it's restored to the original level, what projects are put back in?"

Telcser: "Everything that was in it containing new capital as introduced, Representative."

Kane: "Yeah, but could you tell us what that is so we know what... what the difference is that we're voting on today? Well, we're putting in what the Senate took out, and would you tell us what those projects were and what those amounts were?"

Telcser: "You mean the names of the projects and where they're located and the amounts?"

Kane: "Yeah. The Senate must have had some reason for taking them out."

Telcser: "Oh, I think they were just acting like rascals. Well, you've got to give me... the Gentleman wants the details."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Telcser: "Wait. I've got to get the answers to his question."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright."

Telcser: "I know... I know how concerned the Gentleman from Sangamon is about the state's construction projects."

Kane: "I want to know who's getting put back in."

Telcser: "It's for state correctional facilities in the amount of 84,500,000, for state government facilities in the amount of 23 million, for fruit production research at state universities for 800,000."

Kane: "Is 84 million being back in, or is that the total?"

Telcser: "We're putting in about the 85 million dollar level which I just mentioned. That's for Dixon, for Bowen, and our new... our new correctional facility."

Kane: "Of that amount, what did the Senate leave in?"

Telcser: "They left in a dollar, Representative. They're going to have really competitive prices. A dollar. They wanted to build all these facilities for a dollar."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have a copy of this Amendment? I have not received it on my desk, and I have been carefully keeping track of all of them. I really doubt that it's been distributed."

Speaker Daniels: "I can only tell you what the Clerk has told me. It has been distributed. We are sending a copy over to you, special delivery by the Head Page, Larry, to your desk. Further discussion? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

McGrew: "Where's your new facility going?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "It is, as yet, an unnamed location; and, if you're interested in having a site in your neighborhood, I suggest you support my Amendment so that it can be located in an

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

area in which you have an interest."

McGrew: "Well, Sir, your half right. I'm interested in supporting a site in my neighborhood, but I'm not interested in supporting a site in your neighborhood."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, just for the record, we... the Department of Corrections, in fact, some years ago wanted to put one in my neighborhood, and my neighbors didn't want it. So, I don't think they would want this."

McGrew: "Well, my neighbors didn't want it then, either, but I've let them see the light."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion?"

McGrew: "Well, it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I did work long and hard with the Governor. We held the hearings in Galesburg. We have requested additional meetings with him. As a matter of fact, the Governor personally assured me that, before any decision would be made, he would sit down and discuss it with me. It seems that today we're making that decision. We are blindly appropriating dollars for some unknown location, some 14 of which the Governor held hearings. We operated under his time frame. The original decision was to be announced in December. We were going to take all sorts of criteria of which we answered. We have asked for repeated meetings to try to... to get the thing to a head; and, thus far, the only thing we have had is three deadlines that have come and gone, the final one of which he said, 'I will make the announcement so that the Legislature can appropriate the monies'. Well, now we got the money but no announcement. You know, I really don't have a problem with the need for a new penitentiary. I just would like to know where. I'd like to know how you know how much it's going to cost when we don't even know where it's going to be, how much site preparation is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

necessary, or indeed, if the State of Illinois needs to have the land donated or whether we need to have a Governor's fundraiser in Galesburg before that decision is announced."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, as I said, this is planning money. The planning money costs will be the same no matter where it will ultimately be located, and I'm certainly confident that your area will have as good a chance as any other in obtaining the facility, if that is your wish. And I sincerely believe that, if your area is the one which ultimately gains this facility, you will want to have had done all the planning necessary so that it could become a reality as soon as possible without any further delay. I think, by adopting this planning money at this point, we're helping our constituents have the benefit of this facility at a much earlier date."

McGrew: "Then there is no construction money in here for a new facility right now?"

Telcser: "No, it's simply planning money, Representative."

McGrew: "In other words, we'll have one more deadline."

Telcser: "Right."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Without any humor, Art, what prompted the Senate to reduce it to one dollar?"

Telcser: "I have absolutely no idea, Representative."

Kosinski: "We've seen some weird things coming out of the Senates' Appropriations Committee. Art, something is obvious to me; that, if we don't have this seed money, this planning money, we won't have a prison anywhere, much less in one district or another."

Telcser: "That's correct."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Kosinski: "So, I approve of what's going on here."

Telcser: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Roman Kosinski said is not necessarily true. What this Amendment does is put in funds for planning for additional... two additional prisons. What's happened is we've confused the old... whole issue of prisons and where they're going. The Governor has made, I guess, a political issue going all over the state before the election and telling communities we're going to give prisons to the highest bidder, and I guess the highest bidder is the community that can show, in large numbers, which ones want it the most. And I guess that translates to votes for him in November. This 60 million dollars that we have..."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Matijevich: "... in the present CDB Bill and authorization for two new prisons; that translates to about 137 million dollars over the term of the ... the sale of the bonds, and that's getting pretty darn expensive, not to mention that now we're talking about planning to build other prisons even though we don't know for sure where we're going to build them. Also, I might say that this allows for a planning for a conversion of Bowen Developmental Center, Representative Rea. I think you're aware of that - what this Bill is doing to Bowen Center and transferring that to a prison, when we're not all together sure that... that we shouldn't have Bowen be secured yet as we heard in Committee for the developmentally disabled. I heard people come in the Committee when we had the mental health budget yesterday with tears in their eyes saying what's that... what that is going to do to their... to their children."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Sir. Excuse me."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, don't you think that the Gentleman ought to confine his remarks to the legislation, to the authorization Bill for CDB that Representative Telcser is talking about instead of going on a political tyrants about mental health institutions?"

Speaker Daniels: "Your point is well taken. Representative Matijeich, please, to the Amendment, Sir."

Matijeich: "Speaker, I noticed... I notice the Chair, very often when somebody says someone should speak to the Amendment, sometimes the Chair says speak to the Amendment and not really listening to determine whether the person speaking on the issue is speaking to the Amendment or not."

Speaker Daniels: "I was listening. I'd like you to address the Amendment, Sir."

Matijeich: "Well, if you were listening, then you know that this Amendment refers to 300,000 dollars in planning for the conversion of Bowen Developmental Center to a prison. Now, Representative Winchester, whether you like it or not, that relates to the issue of the conversion, and I know you didn't like it because a lot of mem... a lot of people from your area were down in Committee yesterday. And you even said that you are a heavy in your community. I'm a long way from Bowen, but I think I heard those people speak with very strong conviction about the need to keep their children in the Center at Bowen. I think that this Amendment really indicates the confusion of the administration. They don't know where they're going with regards to corrections in the whole State of Illinois. They botched up the whole thing, and let me tell you the cost that this is going to relate to in future years. Only, you know, it's bonding money, and so many think just because it's bond money that it's not GRF. Well, how do we

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

pay off the bonds but with general revenue funds? And you are... you are making it a high-cost matter. You're talking about... about planning, and nobody even has sites in mind. This is the cockeyed mess that we've had in corrections, and I would urge the Members to vote against the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday or the day before in the Appropriations Committee and the Capital Force and the Capital Development Board, we put Amendments on that would provide 30 million dollars for the conversion of Dixon to a correctional facility, and 500,000... or 300,000 for the conversion or planning of the conversion for the A. L. Bowen Center, and there's 500,000 dollars for the planning of a new medium security facility to be built someplace here in the State of Illinois. It's my understanding that the Governor is in the process of contacting, again, those communities that have, for the last several months, had their applications in, and the Director of Corrections has traveled around the state taking testimony. And a decision will soon be made, probably before July 1 or shortly thereafter. A decision will be made very shortly, but we have to have the authorization to spend that money that we put in the Capital, and I don't think that we need to be fooling around playing those political games that we've played on other Bills. We've only got one dollar in this appropriation... in this authorization Bill, and we need to get it approved here so it goes to a Conference Committee so we can get the true picture straightened out and we can go on about our business. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Telcser, to close."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the last speaker was very succinct in his remarks. For us not to adopt Amendment #3, certainly doesn't make sense. I think everyone in this chamber recognizes the critical importance of planning for food for Century III and, additionally, the importance of having adequate facilities... prisoner facilities in Illinois. All of us have long favored an enforcement of the law, a law and order stance in many instances; and, in order to provide adequate protection for Illinois citizens, these prison facilities must be built. I think that's evidenced by the fact that many communities are seeking to have these facilities in their particular area. For us not to have this planning money is simply ludicrous. I... I agree with the prior Gentleman who said this is not a political issue. It's clearly bipartisan in nature. We have support on both sides of the aisle, and I urgently appreciate and hope for your support for my Motion to adopt Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1401."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Third Reading. Senate Bill 1358. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Dick Kelly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kelly, Amendment #1."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Amendment #1, we have gotten together with the Sponsors of this Bill and decided to have another Amendment drafted which is Amendment #3. So, with the leave of the House, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1358."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #1 withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew, Amendment #2."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 changes the formula distribution of the community college funding distribution. What I have done is simply increase the three areas that are most closely coordinated today with training for vocational. I have increased the areas of business occupational, technical occupational and health occupational. The community college budget that you currently have before you, frankly, is fairly disastrous. 1982, we paid, in the average, \$22.43 per category. The 1983 formula, according to the Governor's recommendation, would reduce that to \$20... I'm sorry, from the 22.43 to 18.66 per credit hour per student. Meanwhile, we have had an average 16% increase in enrollment at the community college level. They have been raising tuition rates so fast that, as a matter of fact, in Illinois right now Blackhawk East Community College is in distinct violation of the Act, because they are now raising more than 25% of their total costs from tuition which, as I say, is against the Act. The three areas that I have designated are the three areas that Governor Thompson designated himself. He said that he wanted to make a commitment to the community college people, a commitment to the citizens of the State of Illinois for better and increased vocational education. Therefore, he asked for an 85% increase in each of these categorical areas. However, that 85% increase that the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Governor committed to actually amounted to a reduction, a reduction over the categorical grant of the preceding year. The Bill that you have before you calls for a distribution increase in the formula of about 300,000 dollars. The actual amount of dollars per student, under this Bill, will change the state commitment from 838 dollars last year downward to 743 or a reduction of \$95.06 per student for every community college in the State of Illinois. We have only one alternative; that is, to increase the categorical grants. The Bill before you provides for a 2.4 million dollar switch into the equalization area. Most of you that have followed this argument in the past know that the equalization formula is one of my pet areas; that it's terrible. What we have done is basically left the bottom line the same. We've taken 2.4... 2.5 million, or a 16% increase in that area, out of the categorical grant and put it into equalization grant; yet, only 14 of 38 community colleges receive a dime from that category. In other words, we're robbing from 26 community colleges to pay only 14 in that area, if you pass this budget. Not so ironic, the formula increases that I call, that I propose before you, are a total increase of 2.5... excuse me. Well, it might be off a little bit - 2.5 something million dollars, which is the same thing... Okay, it's 2.476 increase which is the same amount that they have put into equalization. So, the bottom line of this Amendment is that we will provide the same amount of dollars for all 38 community college districts and allow for that equalization increase that's already in the budget. I'll answer questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, very simply and briefly, I rise as a Sponsor in opposition to this Amendment. The problem that we have is the same problem we've had every year for several. We have

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

a lack of money to fund all the credit hour grants. There has to be some formula devised. There are always winners and losers in the process. The process has been worked out with the Community College Board, at this point, as it has each year. Representative McGrew has attempted to change this each year. He has reasons for his arguments, I'm sure, that we're taking from one segment to give to another. That's true. We are in a philosophical difference of opinion as to where the money should go. Each year we're postured in the position, as downstaters sponsoring this Bill, of having to live with an agreement. Now, I've made an agreement with the Community College Board. The Sponsors of this Bill, Democrat and Republican alike, have stood on the floor and stand today in opposition to this concept. This has been agreed to - the formula that's in here now. We've done the best we can to put this together. If this Amendment goes on the Bill, it will destroy the Bill, in terms of the ability to pass it and keep this together. We're dealing with limited funds, and those limited funds have been agreed to to be spent to date in the manner and form in the Bill. For those reasons and the lack of funds and the fact that we can't please everyone all the time, I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment. If it's put on, it will also create a situation where if the Governor takes amendatory veto action on the formula and reduces the amounts in the Bill. There will be even further problems, even more consternation caused over that action. For those reasons and others you're going to hear here, I would urge you to vote 'no' and keep this Bill, in terms of the formula, in the position that it's in now. So, please give us a 'no' vote to keep this in the position agreed to at the appropriations level by the colleges that have submitted

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

the positions to the Board. The Board has a position against the Amendment. Everyone's not happy about where we are, but they've agreed to it at this point. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Amendment. As Representative Stuffle has indicated, the process in developing a community college formula is a very delicate and lengthy process in which members of the Community College Board, the Trustees' Association, the Presidents, Board of Higher Education, Bureau of the Budget, all of those entities are involved in the involvement of that formula. This particular Amendment certainly would destroy that delicate balance and add two and a half million dollars cost to the Bill. For that... For those reasons, I ask your support in defeating this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative McGrew, to close."

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The remarks of the first Gentleman that spoke in opposition are somewhat misleading, in that this is not a totally agreed Bill. As a matter of fact, the Illinois Senate put an Amendment in it that put a 4% increase in each of the areas and was an adjustment throughout. The bottom line amount thus far is an agreement. Again, I am asking that we put this 2.4 million dollars back into the categorical grants. In lieu of some of the things that I have tried in the past and lost to be quite honest, I did not adjust the equalization. I simply put the same amount of dollars back into the categorical grants that they are putting into the equalization. I further have... these very same categories that the Governor of the State of Illinois said is the most

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

important thing that community colleges could do. I attended their meeting last Friday, and who, once again, appeared before them and reiterated how great a job they're doing in business, technical and health occupational. And I ask that you vote 'yes' to put this Amendment on."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. 'Nos' have it. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like a Roll Call on that."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 19 'aye', 122 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1358 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Dick Kelly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kelly, Amendment #3."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I, first of all, want to thank the Membership for supporting ... for the support you gave yesterday when a Motion was made to table this same Amendment, Amendment #1. Amendment #3 is an Amendment which is very beneficial to 11 community colleges throughout the State of Illinois who have a declining enrollment and that are being adversely affected by this legislation. There is an amount of 1,757,273 dollars which is included and will be offered in the form of an appropriation Amendment which will come further down. We had discussed this issue with the Sponsors of the legislation, and we did come to an agreement that, if in fact these funds were not finally approved, then the hold harmless Amendment, which is what Amendment #3 is, it's a hold harmless Amendment which guarantees that these school districts' community colleges will not receive less than

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

what they receive during the last fiscal year, the current fiscal year. Ladies and Gentlemen, this affects 11 community colleges and helps them greatly, which would otherwise be suffering from this declining enrollment, and it's... it would affect many Legislators throughout the State of Illinois. I would ask that you would support, and I would like to point out that we do have bipartisan support on this legislation with the hyphenated sponsorship of myself, Representative Piel, Representative Giglio, Representative Collins, Representative Steczo, Representative Winchester, Representative Jack Dunn and Representative Yourell. With that, ..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Kelly: "I would ask for your favorable approval in adopting this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the key point, as far as this Bill is concerned, was mentioned in the concluding comments of the Sponsor of the Amendment, and that is that this is, in effect, a hold harmless Bill to protect 11 school districts at the expense of the rest of the junior college districts in the state; because, certainly if this is going to cost 1,750,000 dollars, that 1,750,000 dollars could go to those districts and be distributed on the basis of enrollment. Now, hold harmless, as a principle, is disequalizing. You are taking from those who are growing or in need and giving to those who are not. Now, if the last Amendment was defeated by the overwhelming majority that it was, there isn't really any difference, in terms of the impact of this, ultimately, than in the previous Amendment. Hold harmless provisions are not in the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois, and they certainly aren't

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

in the best interests of those Legislators who represent the districts other than these 11; because, if those dollars are available in any set of circumstances, they could be equally or equitably be distributed to the other school districts as well. This is intended to be a set-aside for these districts. This is not in the best interests of the people or the best interest of the students in this state. If those resources are available, they should be used in an equitable fashion; and, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, half of what Representative Hoffman says is accurate. The part that's accurate, and I don't rise in support or opposition, but I wanted to give Representative Kelly a shot at this after yesterday. The half that's right is the fact that, if you agree philosophically that you distribute money on the basis of need and with equalization and so forth in the formula, that you'd spread any additional money out over that formula. The half that's not exactly accurate is the fact that this will not take money from the formula or from anyone; because, as Representative Kelly agreed to put the Amendment in, unlike yesterday's Amendment which would have done damage to the formula and would have been unfair, this Amendment requires that the money be separately appropriated in a line item and would require him or the other Sponsors to also amend the budget Bill, 1357, to put in it approximately 1.5 million dollars or a little more than that to effect the purposes of this Amendment. It's the type of thing we did three years ago, or four years ago, with the school aid appropriation and formula for the elementary and secondary public schools. So, it's not

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

taking from anyone. That should be clarified. It's an additional amount that has to come separately in a line item under 1357 and could have no effect without that money, in fact, could stay in the Bill. The Governor wouldn't even have to knock the language out, and he could knock out the money. So, it's the position of policy as to whether or not, if the money's there, you add it in this fashion or some other; but, clearly, it doesn't take from anyone."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, obviously that, if there is money available for appropriations to the community colleges, it ought to be appropriated based upon the need, as Representative Hoffman pointed out, not on the basis of a gift to some community colleges because of the fact that they haven't been keeping up with the rest of them in enrollment. Now, it has been said that, I think, maybe 55 or 60 of you will benefit by this Amendment. I can only say to that, that if that's the case, then there's at least 120 or so that will be hurt by this Amendment. So, I would suggest that you take a walk; because, if you have any question in your mind whether your school's going to be hurt or not, walk over and Representative Kelly will be happy to show you how devastating it will be to your own district. So, I would suggest that everybody check that out - how it will affect their own district, before they're... they vote on this, and don't vote for it if you're not on his list."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1358. To explain my... my support, it seems simple to say that we should take the monies that are... that would be generated by the adoption of an extra appropriation and divide them equally

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

amongst the formula. However, the way the Amendment would read is that those community college districts that currently gain under the formula would gain. Those districts, those 11 districts that would lose would be, in essence, held harmless or would receive the same amount of funding that they received last year. We talk about formulas. We talk about people losing. Nevertheless, we can't escape the fact that enrollments have risen by 14%; yet, an increase of funds over 1.06% has been included in the appropriations over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1982. The amount of money we're speaking of here, as Representative Kelly pointed out, is 1.7 million dollars, approximately, and I should also like to point out, too, that the average statewide total grants per full-time enrolled student, in Fiscal Year 1982, was 838 dollars. For Fiscal Year '83, it's proposed at 743 dollars. So there's been a reduction of 95 dollars, generally, per full-time enrolled, as per the... the enrollment increases. I would also like to point out one question about holding harmless, and all of a sudden people seem to think that holding harmless is some kind of a... some kind of a dirty word. I can recall Sessions in the past where we have done that and have approved legislation that has held harmless elementary and secondary districts. Seemingly, everybody supported those. I think, in the essence of fairness, the way this Amendment is drafted; it is fair. Where, if the Governor reduces that separate line item or vetoes that separate line item, that those districts, who would be held harmless, would also lose the advantage... the advantages we're giving them now. I think it's an extremely fair concept, and I believe this Amendment should be... be supported in the interest of fairness. And I would urge you to support Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1358."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to make a couple of points that go far beyond just this Amendment itself. In 1980, the Presidents of the... all of the community colleges in the state did agree upon the formula that is presently in this Bill. A year ago there were several community colleges that were hurt under this formula, actually lost money. They are Illinois Eastern, Danville, Thornton, Highland, 'Rand Lake', Morton and Shawnee to the tune of nearly 1,300,000 dollars. Those people didn't try an end run around the formula at all. They stayed with it and bit the bullet. My fear, if this Amendment passes, is that we will destroy those feelings of compromise and agreements between the community colleges all over the State of Illinois, and that they may never again be the viable force that they are today in reaching those agreements, if we adopt this kind of Amendment. I... I sincerely ask for your 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frankly, this Amendment points out the luditi... ludicrous budget of the community college system. We all say that we're trying to pass a bare-bones budget. This is not a bare-bones budget. Hell, this is a starvation budget. Carl Sandburg Community College would not be affected by this Amendment because we do receive an increase, but we had a 22% increase in enrollment last year. You're telling us that we can now have a 2% increase in money, but someone else, who had a 1% increase in enrollment, is not going to lose a dime. It certainly would make a bad situation worse. If you want to really address the problem, the only way to address it is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

the...the Amendment that I proposed that was resoundly defeated, and; that is, to put hol.. more money in the overall category. The number of students in community colleges changed drastically from year to year. It's not like taking a K through 12 system and putting in a hold harmless formula. You can have a 22% increase one year. You can have a 15% decrease the following year in community colleges. This is only two years. So, this Amendment, in essence, makes the whole thing worse. If you want to put some money in the formula, let's do it. Let's do it equitably. Let's do it according to the number of kids that they have in class, but let's don't just say, 'You got so much last year'. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Kelly, to close."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to point out that the opposition to this Amendment in every instance were speaking to the provisions that may have existed in Amendment #1. Since the Amendment #1 was offered, we discussed this issue with the Sponsor, with other concerned community college persons and we decided that, rather than having a hold harmless take effect without providing the funding, that there was a potential for effecting a great many community colleges in the State of Illinois that were not having declining enrollments. So, rather than that, we came in with what I consider a compromise and what we... we all know was an agreement that there would be... the hold harmless Amendment would only take effect if, in fact, the funding, the 1,757,000 dollars, only if that funding is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

approved. If it is not approved, then the hold harmless provision will not occur, and the schools - and I'm telling you. There's a great many Legislators in this Assembly who will be adversely affected if this Amendment does not go through. If it goes through, you're not going to be hurt one bit until the appropriation Bill would occur, and I feel that even the reductions that are listed are very minimal, comparing them to those districts which are having the declining enrollment. I would ask for the Membership to... to give serious consideration to adopting this hold harmless Amendment. I request bipartisan support, because it's affecting us, not matter whether we're a Democrat or a Republican. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for your support for Amendment #3, and I would like a ... I want a formal Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Zito."

Zito: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my 'yes' vote. Let's remember what a community college does, Ladies and Gentlemen. Many Representatives speaking for or against this Amendment has indicated that Legislators, 50 or 60 Legislators are going to be directly affected by this. Let's remember what a community college does. A community college continues education for skilled and unskilled people, young, old, middle-aged. It's an attempt... Community colleges attempt to put a labor force back in many communities. It's not a four-year university. It's... You can't get a degree, except an Associate Degree, from a community college. Let's support these institutions. These institutions, above all others, are there for the purpose of helping the communities in putting this economy in the State of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Illinois that we've all talked about back on the right track. Let's support these schools. Let's support these community colleges, these community programs, and let's give them the money to continue these programs. I appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, in explaining my 'no' vote, I would like to point out that it has been said here several times that there are 50 or 60 Legislators whose areas would benefit and 120 who would suffer or have no benefit from this. I looked on the list, and I saw Illinois Eastern Community College, which is in my area, as one of the beneficiaries. After looking at the list, I called to the school and talked to Chancellor Spencer there, and he said that's right. We would benefit, but this is not part of the agreement. This is not part of the deal, and this Amendment, despite the fact that we would benefit on it, should be defeated. So, those of you who found that your name is on the list, you ought to go a step further and contact the community college and see if they are really in support of this. Our district is not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber, I would encourage a positive vote, mainly because, as much as Representative Zito said, our community colleges are not only a bulwark for just on the job training, for helping business and industry in the state of Illinois in helping to train industrial leaders of the future as well as people who have to have jobs now. It is a solid system, and it is something I think we should support, and I would encourage more green votes."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

are 57 'aye', 83 'no', 5 voting 'present', and Amendment #3 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1251, Representative Peters. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1251, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to establish an unpaid Commission on intergovernmental cooperation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any further Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Matijevich - et al, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #2."

Matijevich: "Speaker..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Representative Peters and I've just talked to the Minority Leader, and we've got a scheduled meeting Monday at 2 p.m. with the Democratic Task Force and John 'Latimer' with the Intergovernmental Commission. I wonder if you'd take it out of the record, and then we promise you, if we can't agree Monday, go ahead. But, we think we can come to some agreement. Could you do that? Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1289, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. 1299, Representative Birkinbine. Out of the record. 1383, Representative Findley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1383 has been read a second time previously. Next Amendment is Amendment #10, Findley, amends Senate Bill 1383 on page..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Findley on Amendment #10."

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment 10 adds language that one of the Members of the Labor and Commerce Committee felt was essential in stipulating clearly that in the case of an employee association wishing to buy the assets of a company that was closing or relocating, that they may do so only with the consent of the owners of that facility. This is, in my opinion, a technical Amendment, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 adopt...10. Amendment #10 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, it's on the Board wrong. Alright, Amendment #10 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1503, Representative Stanley. Representative Stuffle, 1503. Out of the record. 1519, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. 1532, Representative Hastert. Out of the record. 1549, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Kociolko, amends Senate Bill 1549 on page one..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kociolko, Amendment #1."

Kociolko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1549 is identical to the language which was contained in House Bill 617 passed by this chamber last year. It gives municipalities which

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

have racetracks located entirely within their corporate boundaries the option of levying an admission tax of up to 25%. There are approximately six tracks in the State of Illinois that are affected by this. Currently there is a 10% limit on such an admission tax, which has been in effect since 1975. Communities that have racetracks located within their boundaries endure a great deal of difficulty and inconvenience for their residents as well as a great deal of additional costs to the municipal government in terms of police protection, traffic control and other municipal services. So, I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this Amendment to Senate Bill 1549."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Kociolko: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Slape: "Your indication is that you're raising the municipalities' ability to levy a tax from 10% to 25%. Is that the only change you're making in the Act?"

Kociolko: "Yes, that is the only change. There is a 10% limit now. This is an admissions tax, and it would go to a maximum of 25%. It would not be mandatory, of course."

Slape: "It doesn't...right. Doesn't the Act state now that that money collected has to be used in the promotion of tourism?"

Kociolko: "For..would you repeat that? I could not hear you."

Slape: "Does the Act state at this time that the money raised from that tax has to be used in the promotion of tourism?"

Kociolko: "No, it does not."

Slape: "It does not. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am the House Sponsor of this Bill, and I am opposed to this Amendment

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

and the Gentleman's following Amendment. What he is attempting to do with this Bill, which is simply designed to put the off-track racing parlors...betting parlors out of business, and that simply is what it is designed to do. The Gentleman was able to get his Bill out of Rules Committee and is attempting to use this for a vehicle. And what he will do, in effect, would be to destroy this particular Bill. I am opposed to it. Senator Savickas, the Senator Sponsor, is also opposed to this. Would appreciate the 'no' votes... 'no' votes of the Members of this Committee, because what he will do is put the Bill's passage in jeopardy. We saw a similar instance where a Member of this House had put an Amendment on another Member's Bill and almost killed his Bill. That is what's going to happen to this one. I would strongly resist this, and ask for a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion and also on the next Amendment, because the next Amendment will attempt to take the downstate tracks out. So what will be left in his...taking care of the tax situation for Cicero. I am opposed to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to oppose this Amendment. Down in my area we've got two racetracks now, and one is already out of business, because we've overloaded it with taxes. I also agree with the Sponsor of the Bill that if...if a proponent...someone who proposes an Amendment thinks it is such a good idea, why don't he put in a Bill? This will kill the Bill, and I think we ought to kill the Amendment and leave the Bill stand."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, I think all of us...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've all heard the House Sponsor say that he's in opposition to the Amendment itself. It is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

a good Bill prohibiting off-track betting, and we are putting a good Bill in jeopardy by proposing this Amendment which would really allow Cicero to get some additional revenue at the expense of the poor guy that puts down his buck at the racetrack. The only reason we passed the Bill in the past, and only in the House, I think, was because we all like Mayor Klosak. But, I don't think we've got any obligation to the City of Cicero, and I don't think we ought to jeopardize a good Bill, and I would urge the Members to vote against the...both Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kociolko to close."

Kociolko: "Several things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would point out to the Gentleman who just spoke that Mayor Klosak still supports the Bill, so that if you wish to be kind to him, he would certainly deeply appreciate your continued support for this legislation. I would agree that it certainly does bring additional revenue to my community as to a number of communities that endure the difficulties of having a track located within their corporate boundaries. And it is certainly not my intention to cause any harm to the purpose of the original Bill. My Amendment does not, in any way, detract from that or gut the Bill. The language which Representative Wolf had is still there, and I would assume would still be there when this Bill achieves final passage. So I would encourage an 'aye' vote and ask for your support on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Kociolko."

Kociolko: "Request a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Pullen, would you record me as 'aye' please?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 47 'aye', 99 'no', 6 voting 'present', and Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Kociolko, amends Senate Bill 1549..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kociolko, Amendment #2."

Kociolko: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is virtually identical to the first Amendment. What it does is it exempts some of the smaller tracks which have indicated that they have the greatest difficulty with the concept of this Bill. It would ex...it would limit those tracks which have a daily betting handle less than \$850,000 per day to the current 10% limit. It was designed to alleviate the problems experienced by the smaller tracks, particularly downstate."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the same reason I expressed on the first Amendment, I am also opposed to this Amendment, as is the Senate Sponsor of the Bill. I would just be happy with the same vote we got on the last one."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I wouldn't be out of order, I'd ask leave for the same Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kociolko to close."

Kociolko: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this vote, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Pullen. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schneider, do you want to vote? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 46 'aye', 92 'no', 6 voting 'present', and Amendment #2

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Leinenweber, amends Senate Bill
1549..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber, Amendment #3."

Leinenweber: "Withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1558, Representative McAuliffe.
Representative Sam Wolf, do you wish to move that Bill,
Sir? Out of the record. 1566, Representative Hastert.
Out of the record. 1614, Representative Bower. Read the
Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1614, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Stearney, amends Senate Bill
1614..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney, Amendment #1.
Representative Bower, your pleasure, Sir. The Gentleman
moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by
saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment
#1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Sandquist, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Sandquist, Amendment #2."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, Amendment #2 is a result of the hearing we had in
the Subcommittee on Registration - Regulation concerning
the manner in which the Department of Registration and
Education has been considering the problem of doctors who
have abused their profession. And what this does on
Amendment #2, which is the result of testimony we heard
earlier this week, it establishes mandatory reporting

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

requirements for health care institutions, professional association such as medical societies, insurance companies, clerks of court and state agencies to report any physician. This is something that came out very clearly. And then from there on, then the...it has to be reported within 60 days after the action and then to the Disciplinary Board under the Department of Registration - Education. I believe everyone agrees to this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, O'Connell, amends Senate Bill 1614..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell, Amendment #3."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move to table Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Sandquist - Domico - Barnes..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Sandquist, Amendment #4."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this, again, comes out of the hearings we had; and what it does, it adds two public members to the Disciplinary Board. I think one of the things we think is very important is that we have a public...public members there to make sure that the doctors who are on the Board...that the process moves ahead so the public's protected."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, O'Connell, amends Senate Bill 16..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell, Amendment #5."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment #5 also emanates from the hearing that we had last week. What it does is it provides for an increase in the length of the statute of limitations under which the Medical Disciplinary Board can begin an investigation on a doctor who is alleged to have been negligent or alleged to have been in violation of the Medical Practices Act and subject to discipline by the Medical Disciplinary Board. Now, it increases it from one year beyond the date of the final settlement or adjudication in a civil action. I would move for its favorable adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #5 adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill 1614 as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Conti: "I'm sorry, I thought you were going to have a pause for a moment there. Someone lost a brass button. It's on my desk. If it matches their suit, come and pick it up."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #6."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton, Amendment #6."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is also, I understand, an agreed Amendment by the Sponsors of the Bill. I am...I am one of the Sponsors. This Amendment is put in in behalf of the Trial Lawyers' Association. It says that no such rule shall be admissible into evidence in any civil action. What we're trying to do with this Amendment is to make it clear that the standards that are used in disciplining any

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

doctors is not the same standard that would be used in a malpractice case. So, I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1654, out of the record. 1656. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to criminal identification and investigation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Yourell, amends Senate Bill 165..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you rise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I spoke with Representative Cullerton, and we agree that if we could read this Bill a second time today and leave it on Second due to the late hour, we'd pick it up again next week."

Speaker Daniels: "The Bill has been read a second time, and we will take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1665, Representative McBroom. Senate Bill 1670, Representative Bullock. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act regarding payments or rates of payments for medical assistance to public aid recipients. Second Reading of the Bill. No

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Levin - Oblinger."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin, Amendment #1."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On May 21st, this House overwhelmingly passed House Bill 1119 by a 99 to 52 vote to moderate the effects of the spend-down policy. Unfortunately, that Bill did not get out of Senate Rules. Amendment #1 embodies House Bill 1119 as it passed the House. It would help the senior citizens and the handicapped who have been affected by this policy. You know, we had extensive debate on that Bill before in terms of what its effects were. We talked about the fact that this Bill...this Amendment would, we believe, actually save money. It would certainly encourage benefits for the senior citizens and the handicapped, and we'd like to put the Amendment on the Bill so that we have another shot at it. ...Any questions I'll be happy to answer them."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Will the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Telcser: "Representative, could you please tell me what if...what impact, if any, this would have on the state's General Revenue Fund and/or if it has an affect on the Governor's budget?"

Levin: "Representative, we...before House Bill 1119 came up for Third Reading, we asked for a fiscal note from the Department of Public Aid. With respect to the basic part of the Bill, they indicated that they could not formulate a fiscal note in terms of estimating what the costs were. The current status of the law is that there was a court decision, and that court decision required a one month spend-down for Aid to...for AABD persons. It is the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

feeling of the Department of Public Aid that a straight one month spend-down will cost them a substantial amount of money because of the possibility of summer eligible persons, persons who are unemployed during the summer months only, to qualify. What this Bill...this Amendment provides is for a six month eligibility standard with a one month spend-down. So, this would save the Department money over the current court decision with respect to AABD."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, there seems to be some confusion on our side. Our staff has informed us that this could impact the state's General Revenue Fund in the amount of some 29 or 30 million dollars. So, I don't know who's right or who's wrong, frankly."

Levin: "Representative, we did...we asked for a fiscal note. We got the fiscal note. This proposal comes out of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. They have worked closely with the Department. There were extensive hearings on this proposal also in Committee, and you know, I think that it's the feeling that this will not cost money. This will save money. This will ameliorate a situation that virtually every Legislator has received inquiries from their constituents about, and we think it is a good cost-effective Amendment."

Telcser: "Well, I am at a loss to find out why the Department of Public Aid did not help you with the fiscal note. They told us that it would indeed cost, in their estimate, 29.8 million dollars to implement the provisions of Amendment #1. So that seems to make..."

Levin: "Representative, I have a copy of the fiscal note to House Bill 1119..."

Telcser: "I'm sure you're...I believe you, and I say, I'm at a loss to find out why the Department has told us of the impact to be of such great magnitude and yet did not comply

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

with your request for a fiscal note. And I'm sure you're telling the truth, certainly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. It has nothing to do with the merits of the Amendment, Representative Levin. But Senate Bill 1670, as it came to us from the Senate, is in a form in which the administration and the nursing home providers of our state have negotiated it; and I think that if, for some unfortunate reason, this Amendment were to go onto the Bill, it would undo long hours of negotiations and long hours of discussion which have brought about 1670 as it presently stands. We know that many of the nursing homes in our state need the provisions of 1670; and unfortunately, if your Amendment were to be attached, it could seriously jeopardize the passage of the Bill. So I think reality dictates, at this point, that we defeat Amendment #1 in order that the nursing homes in our state can receive the long overdue relief which relates directly to timely payments for service. And so many of these institutions that have attempted to comply with the directives of this Body and the Nursing Home Bill of Rights do, in fact, need quick and prompt direct payment for goods and services. And that is what this Bill is intended to do, and the administration supports it, and this is one of the times in which I have to stand in opposition to an honorable, conscientious colleague, but I must say that the administration's negotiations should remain in tact, and we should not amend this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, because Representative Bullock said it very well. There are two

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

reasons to be against this Amendment; number one, the best information we have is that this costs somewhere between, I would guess at the low end, 18,000,000 if you just based it on the current caseload that is affected by the spend-down policy. If that goes up, as we would expect if this Bill became law, to something like 20,000 cases from 13, then you come up to the 28 or 29 million dollar figure. We just don't have the money. But number two is the reason Representative Bullock gave and gave very well. The underlying Bill is needed. The underlying Bill represents a valid, genuine agreement between the administration and the nursing home group care people. To mess around with that at this point is simply wrong. That part of this Legislative Session can be put to rest. As we drive towards adjournment, that is one thing we can get out of the way. It is a valid agreement to change that to endanger that...to terminate this Bill, I think, if this Amendment went on, is just wrong. So, we should oppose this Amendment, both because we don't have the money, and because we need to save the underlying Bill. This Amendment should be defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, when we discussed this before, I stood before you to tell you that a lot of people are now not getting services because of the six month spend-down. If you have to spend-down the six months before you can get services, a lot of people are never going to get the service. They have to have the eligibility of six months, but they spend-down one month so that they then qualify. This is what the court case has already held. I don't know how we can say to the people, 'You've got to spend more money than you even have before we will give you any assistance'. We allow it for ADFA,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

why don't we allow it for Medicaid and MANG people? I cannot understand our two different standards for two different groups of people."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like to rebut one statement that was made today and was also made when House Bill 1119 was on Third Reading. We were told this is going to cost some huge amount of money. And yet, when we've attempted to pin down the Department as terms of a fiscal note, they've come back and they've said, 'We don't think it would.', or, 'We don't know what it is going to cost.' In actual fact, the spend-down policy, like the day care cuts, is something that was not cost effective. It is something that is going to cost us and is costing us at the present time more money than if we change it it would cost. We heard testimony in Committee about persons who could benefit from out-patient chemotherapy, or dialysis or similar kinds of treatment who are now not able to get it because of the spend-down policy, and as a result, are having to go into the hospital on an in-patient basis, and this is costing substantially more. This Amendment, as House Bill 1119 did, would ameliorate that situation, would be cost effective, would change the court decision and would save us money as well as being humane. I urge the adoption of this Amendment, and I ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by voting

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 40 'ayes', 81 'nos', none voting 'present'. Amendment #1 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Getty, amends Senate Bill 1670 as amended."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave I'd ask to handle the Bill...the Amendment for Representative Getty."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did he request leave to handle the Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton did."

Bullock: "Well, I'd like to be recognized after he makes his proper Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "You have no..."

Bullock: "After he explains the Amendment, I'd like to be recognized for the purpose of..."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, you have no objections to him handling it?"

Bullock: "Well, I want to table the Amendment. We might as well let him explain it and then move to table it."

Speaker Daniels: "You are objecting to his handling the Amendment then, Sir?"

Bullock: "Well, I'll object if that will expedite things. If it will expedite matters, I'll object."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman raises objections, Representative Cullerton. There are objections. The Gentleman, Representative Bullock, moves to table Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

126th Legislative Day

June 18, 1982

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1685,
Representative Pullen. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill...Senate Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act in
relationship to postage stamp vending machines. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Telcser, for
what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I now move the
House stand adjourned until Monday the 22nd of June, to
hour of...21st of June, Monday the 21st of June, the hour
of 2 p.m."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Telcser, moves to
adopt Adjournment Resolution...Senate Joint Resolution
102."

Telcser: "And, Hr. Speaker, if the Clerk needs some perfunctory
time, allowing him the necessary time."

Speaker Daniels: "With necessary time for perfunct, all those in
favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'
have it. The House stands adjourned until 2 o'clock
Monday."

Clerk Leone: "Committee Report. Representative J. J. Wolf,
Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations to which the
following Bills were referred, action taken June 17, 1982
and reported the same back with the following
recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bill 1524; 'do pass as
amended' Senate Bill 1410, 1417 and 1422. No further
business, the House will now stand adjourned till Monday,
June 21st at the hour of 2 o'clock."

09/09/82
08:20

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 18, 1982

SB-0734	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
SB-1212	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-1251	SECOND READING	PAGE	151
SB-1256	SECOND READING	PAGE	103
SB-1267	THIRD READING	PAGE	8
SB-1288	THIRD READING	PAGE	9
SB-1292	SECOND READING	PAGE	112
SB-1296	THIRD READING	PAGE	10
SB-1305	SECOND READING	PAGE	119
SB-1324	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
SB-1358	SECOND READING	PAGE	137
SB-1360	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
SB-1369	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
SB-1371	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
SB-1375	THIRD READING	PAGE	31
SB-1383	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
SB-1383	SECOND READING	PAGE	151
SB-1387	SECOND READING	PAGE	31
SB-1389	THIRD READING	PAGE	35
SB-1401	SECOND READING	PAGE	128
SB-1429	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
SB-1436	THIRD READING	PAGE	39
SB-1447	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
SB-1452	SECOND READING	PAGE	104
SB-1470	THIRD READING	PAGE	42
SB-1471	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
SB-1487	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
SB-1496	THIRD READING	PAGE	58
SB-1500	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
SB-1503	SECOND READING	PAGE	126
SB-1510	THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1518	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1520	THIRD READING	PAGE	64
SB-1539	THIRD READING	PAGE	65
SB-1540	THIRD READING	PAGE	71
SB-1549	SECOND READING	PAGE	152
SB-1579	SECOND READING	PAGE	105
SB-1581	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-1590	THIRD READING	PAGE	74
SB-1592	THIRD READING	PAGE	75
SB-1594	THIRD READING	PAGE	76
SB-1606	THIRD READING	PAGE	77
SB-1614	SECOND READING	PAGE	157
SB-1621	THIRD READING	PAGE	79
SB-1630	THIRD READING	PAGE	81
SB-1653	THIRD READING	PAGE	82
SB-1656	SECOND READING	PAGE	160
SB-1657	RECALLED	PAGE	86
SB-1657	THIRD READING	PAGE	88
SB-1658	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
SB-1663	THIRD READING	PAGE	89
SB-1670	SECOND READING	PAGE	160
SB-1685	SECOND READING	PAGE	167
SB-1837	SECOND READING	PAGE	31

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND ANTHONY TZORTZIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	50
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	77

09/09/82
08:20

STATE OF ILLINOIS
82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

JUNE 18, 1982

SUBJECT MATTER

REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	120
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	167
EPTON IN CHAIR	PAGE	45
PETBBS IN CHAIR	PAGE	46