

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived, the House will be in order. The Chaplain for today is the Reverend Wiktkop from the Faith Evangelical Lutheran Church located here in Springfield, Illinois. Reverend Wiktkop."

Reverend Wiktkop: "Let us pray. Gracious Father, Source of all good, the Giver of our daily bread, we thank You for the night of rest and refreshment. We thank You for the new day, for life and health that permits us to come forth to serve. We thank You for our families and friends for the privilege of work and meaningful involvement of our life. As we come to this Fourth of July weekend soon, Lord, we think of the blessed privilege of being a part of this great nation, of being able to chose those who govern us and those who make our laws. We ask that today, as we are about that business, that we may be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, we may be given wisdom and strength to act according, oh God, to Your will. May we seek for righteousness and justice and mercy in all that we do. Grant us joy and satisfaction in serving You and serving our fellow man. This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior. Amen."

Speaker Peters: "We'll be led in the Pledge this morning by Representative Krska."

Krska 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 Peters: "Thank you, Reverend. Thank you, Representative Krska. Roll Call for attendance. For the information of the Membership, we have four or five Bills, appropriation Bills, on the Order of Third Reading, which have to be returned to Second for purposes of Amendment. It would be

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

121st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the intention of the Chair to do that, and then go to the Order of Concurrences. And then conclude, at least at this point, finish off the Bills that we have on Concurrence and on Third Reading appropriation. Fine, Representative. We will...We will start with Concurrences and await your arrival. Representative Darrow, you have an inquiry, Sir?"

Darrow: "Yes, I do. Inasmuch as there's no deadline for Concurrences and there is a deadline for appropriation Bills, why can't we handle the appropriation Bills first so that we can finish up today and go home tomorrow?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative, I think we can do both, and what we are trying to do is to accommodate Representative Matijevich and the Members of your staff who are attempting to work out one or two items on the appropriations."

Darrow: "Well, that's fine and good. But most of us realize that most of these appropriation Bills that have Amendments wind up in Conference Committee anyhow, and we're down here going through the motions, but the real meat of the thing will not occur until Sunday or Monday. So, I would just as soon that we would speed the thing up and take those first, but I understand that we should go along with our Leaders."

Speaker Peters: "Thank you, Representative. We'll...we'll give Representative Matijevich a little bit of time. Representative Keane, would you come to the Chair please? Page four of the Calendar, Concurrences, House Bill 1254, Representative Keane. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1888, Representative...Pardon? There are 173 Members answering the Roll. A quorum is present. Page four of the Calendar, recap, Concurrences, House Bill 1254, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Page five of the Calendar, House Bill 1882, Representative Barkhausen. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1913, Representative Huskey? Page five of the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Calendar, Sir, Concurrences."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1913, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 1925, Representative Hallock, are you ready? Well, if we're going to get out of here tonight, we've got to move these. Otherwise...I mean, if we're just going to wait, we'll wait till... We'll wait. On the Order of Concurrences, page five, House Bill 2285, Representative Piel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2285, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers Occupation Tax Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2285, basically because the Senate Amendment completely gutted the Bill. It deleted everything after the enacting clause and reinstated a complete change around the whole concept of what we were trying to do."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #...Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear. I think there's a little bit too much noise. Would the Gentleman speak a little louder, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Yes, Fred, basically what they did, they deleted everything after the enacting clause in their Amendment, and we agreed to one Amendment. It was a minor corrective Amendment that the LRB and the Department of Revenue wanted, and she put in an Amendment, the Chairman of the

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

1.1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Revenue Committee over there, put in an Amendment completely deleting everything after the enacting clause and reworking the whole Bill. We want to send it back to them and clear it up in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2285. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Chair nonconcur...The House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2285. House Bill 2095, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill originally simply went out to clarify the ...a cancellation problem that the Department of Insurance had. When the Senate got it, Senate Amendment #1 deleted the provision #3 that the House had put on which tried to clarify uninsured motorists and underinsured motorists coverage. Actually, we originally felt that it wasn't necessary, but somehow or other it was passed by the House, and I believe the Senate Amendment is correct. The Department of Insurance concurs. Senate Amendment #2 has to do with insolvency. This was added as an afterthought, but it is most important. It allows the payment of insurance claims and the continuing servicing of policy obligations of insolvent insurance companies during liquidation. This is most important so that a claimant doesn't have to wait months and perhaps years to get paid. Senate #3, (Amendment), is purely a technical one, simply deletes a reference was redundant and I should have caught that originally. Senate #4 (Amendment) is quite important. It requires that beginning on July 1, 1983, underinsured motorists coverage must be written at the same level as uninsured motorists coverage, if the uninsured coverage is purchased above the statutory minimum. This does, in effect, whatever mandatory insurance collision would do in

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

every state in the Union and it's probably the forerunner of any Bills that will be going...I suspect will probably be a uniform code throughout the United States. And finally, 5..Amendment #5 from the Senate is an Amendment that's very close to many of the senior citizens. I should admit a conflict of interest. This specifically provides that the specific senior citizens discount is to be determined by the marketplace, and the discount may be provided in addition to any other citizen discounts which have been previously offered. This clarifies any problem in that regard. And finally, anyone of course convicted of a moving violation is ineligible for the defensive driving discount. I should add that this Bill passed the Senate 58 to nothing. And I trust that the House will concur in all of these Amendments. I seek your approval."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Ston: "Of course."

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "According to our analysis under the Amendment any motor vehicle violation conviction whether or not it is a moving violation would make the person ineligible for the discount for one year. Is that correct?"

Ston: "No. This is anyone who's convicted of a moving violation is ineligible. I...As I read the Amendment it doesn't say anything about a nonmoving violation."

Darrow: "Evidently then, our analysis is wrong. My question would have been then, you know, how are we going to have a record of nonmoving violations?"

Ston: "I concur. I certainly wouldn't be a party. A parking violation would not be held against you."

Darrow: "Right. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Dick Kelly."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Epton, I'd like to ask you, the uninsured...purchase of uninsured of motor vehicle insurance, did you indicate that it should be in the same or has to be in the same dollar amount as your own insurance?"

Epton: "No. No, it has to be there. There was always some doubt in the minds of some that if you had 100 and 300 as your liability coverage that you could not...that you could only get the minimum requirements. It's now mandatory for the insurance company to offer the same to you. You don't..do not have to take it."

Kelly: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Epton to close. Close, Sir?"

Epton: "I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2095?'. Final action. All those in favor 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. The House, having concurred in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2095, House Bill 2095 is declared passed. Representative Telcser, House Bill 2286. Representative Telcser. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2286, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move that the House do not concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3. Number 1 has to do with Judges having to work for longer periods of time before obtaining pension benefits. And

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendment #3, which I'm not quite clear about, has to do with widows' annuities, which are more than \$100.00 and less than \$200.00. I suspect that I'll be working to get Amendment #3 back into the Conference Committee. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I move we nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "Discussions? Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2, I believe it is, deals with 'Anna Goldfeder'. And all it does is it moves the date back. It doesn't cost anything. It allows her to commute her benefit. It's a no cost item."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, that's fine. I'd be glad to concur in #3, but if I go to a Conference for #1...I'll do whatever you want, Bob. I'm all for Amendment #3, the way you explain it. So, let me change my Motion. I move that the House nonconcur with Amendment #1 and then I'll move to concur with #3, but I still...All right. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2286."

Speaker Peters: "On that point, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I'm not quite sure. I'm not concerned about Amendment #3. I am concerned about Amendment 1. Is he going to concur or nonconcur on Amendment 1?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser? The question is, are you concurring or nonconcurring in Amendment 1."

Telcser: "Representative, I'm concurring now, with Senate Amendment #3 which affects the widow of one individual. I will...So now we're concurring on #3 only."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before we go to..."

Telcser: "I will then move to nonconcur with #1..."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Schraeder: "Then, I'd like to be recognized at that time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "All right. Representative Koehler. The question now is on Amendment #3, Ma'am."

Koehler: "Yes. I want to speak on Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Koehler: "Amendment #1, when he gets to that..."

Speaker Peters: "Oh, all right..."

Koehler: "Amendment #3 is the one that has to do with the widow..."

Speaker Peters: "Correct..."

Koehler: "Is that correct? And we are just voting to concur in that one?"

Speaker Peters: "Correct."

Koehler: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2286?'. Final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 131 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 8 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2286. Now, Representative Telcser on Amendment #1."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, before I do Amendment #1, can the Clerk please show that Representative Jane Barnes is absent because of illness? We can get that out of the way. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 is a similar Amendment to one which the House soundly defeated a few days ago. But Amendment #1 provides for, in essence at least, if not in detail, that before...that Judges would have to work for 12 months at a higher compensation level in order that they may receive pension benefits based upon that compensation level. The House defeated that Amendment

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

not too...just a few days ago, and I now rise, Mr. Speaker, move the House to not concur with Senate Amendment #1. I think it's an unfair Amendment. It really will have no effect whatsoever in any way, because Judges' retirement ages has been raised, I believe, to 75 years old. I don't think we'd expect that of state employees. I've never, never heard of a state employee or anyone else having to work for a prescribed period of time at a higher level before they receive benefits and there are probably constitutional problems with this anyway because of it. So I move we nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "On that question, Representative Koehler."

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we would nonconcur in this Amendment, it would mean that a Judge that ...who served only one day into the new pay period could collect an extra \$3,000 more each year in his retirement. And I would rise in opposition to this...to the nonconcurrence...three..an extra 3,000. Well, I've just been corrected. They are saying that it could be 6,000 more he could receive."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I don't know what we will do with this particular Amendment. But the point of it is, this hasn't got anything to do with the retirement age as Representative Telcser said at all. It doesn't change that at all. It allows, if we don't accept this Amendment, Judges to do what they did the last time there was a pay raise, and that is to work a single day and collect, if they have 20 years of service, 85% of the additional compensation as pension and then to receive as much as 30% more of that in the three percent annual adjustment that applies to Judges' salaries...pensions. The case of the Amendment Representative Schraeder had was

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

that it based the Judges' salary on the last salary two years prior to retirement. Currently, you could take that last day's salary and retire. You can work that one day. And that's not a hypothetical because it was done in about a dozen cases the last time there was a salary increase for Judges. Now Judges have gotten that salary increase. It's gone to the Governor. He's taken care of that. It seems to me that we're being unfair to every other pensioner there is to let them take that last day's salary with the pension...with the increase, quit, have an 85% increase of 7,000 or whatever the increased salary is. So, I think we ought to go along with the Senate Amendment. I think we should have gone along with Representative Schraeder's Amendment. It's one thing to argue equity and salary. It's another thing to let a person work one day and increase their compensation for pension purposes by over \$6,000. And that's what the current situation does and that's why the Senate Amendment was put on there. And we should reject nonconcurring. We should file a second Motion. We should accept the Senate Amendment. We ought to stand up and be counted on this thing because that's the only fair way to go."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to belabor this, but I think it is a very important point. Not only would a Judge who takes this pay raise and works one day, retire with three or six thousand dollars more, it doesn't really matter. They would be earning in retirement more than their salary before the last day. Now, there are only a very few Judges that this would affect. Most of them will be in Cook County where there are, of course, the most Judges and the most being apt to retire. None of us downstate should be concerned about

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voting against this nonconcurrency and voting to concur. Probably very few of us have a Judge in our district that would even take advantage of it or even is up for retirement. But we passed the pay raise under the guise that it was going to keep good Judges. Well, if the good Judges are staying, we don't need to worry about the ones that are retiring. We surely don't need to worry about having them retire at more than their annual salary for the last year. I believe this is one thing we can do to help take the heat off of us back home for approving the pay raise. Whether you vote 'yes' or 'no' there'll be heat on that. But if we try and make it fair, or they can't get more in retirement than they got in their last year's salary, I think it'll be a very good point for all of us. And I certainly would have to ask for a nonconcurrency though I have the highest respect for the Sponsor of this, Representative Telcser. I want to concur, but we've got to vote against nonconcurrency. Right. Thank you. Thank you, Representative Telcser."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The comments made by the previous speaker are absolutely correct. And I'm really shocked and astounded that the Leader on the other side of the aisle, whom I respect very greatly, would even consider this type of a Motion to nonconcur. Ladies and Gentlemen, the last time a pay raise was instituted for the Judges' salary - and let me point out, I voted for the pay raise and thought it was justified and I'm willing to take that heat back home - but I don't want to happen what happened a few short years ago on the last pay raise when, in my particular Judicial Circuit, one of the Judges failed to receive a sufficient votes to retain his position as Judge, and immediately after the pay

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

raise when increased, resigned and left his job and received more money than he received or would have received had he been a retained Judge. Consequently, there were about ten or twelve other Judges in the same category who retired immediately after the pay raise when increased and..and as a result of that, retired on more money than they had been receiving as an active Judge. And let me point out, I have a very personal reason for it being...being sincere about this particular Amendment. It is my understanding in my Circuit, we have one Judge who is waiting for the day the pay raise goes into increase and I, specifically, am trying to prevent my Circuit Judge from getting more money as a retired Judge than he's now making. And let me point out, he hasn't even been working these last couple of years. He's been contemplating when his increase was going into effect so he could actually retire officially and not unofficially as he's now doing. Ladies and Gentlemen, this vote is extremely critical and if you want the confidence of your constituency you have to vote 'no'. And, Mr. Speaker, if I'd be in order I would like to have a substitute Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Peters: "...Bell."

Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is rather a difficult subject for me to get up on as my father served 16 years as a Circuit Judge and my uncle would probably give his eye teeth to be able to serve as one. But it isn't fair. It isn't fair to the people at home and I strongly encourage that you do not go along with this and that you vote 'no' on Representative Telcser's Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel. Representative Piel? What...Representative Schraeder, for what purpose, Sir?"

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

1. 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Scaraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I had a substitute Motion that I made and asked for concurrence that that Motion lie on the table and that we concur in Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder? You rise for purposes of making a Motion?"

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Scaraeder: "A substitute Motion that we do concur in Senate Amendment #1 so that these Judges can be treated as our constituency wants them to be treated, the salary based upon equity and not on fairness."

Speaker Peters: "The question...yes. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 286 (sic, 2286)?'. On that question, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, just let me say, I'm sure no one votes around here just to get reelected. But if I were out to beat somebody, I'd take their vote on the Judges' pay raise and this one to give the Judges that are quitting a big boost in their pension and I could beat you in any district in the state. So, I think you'd better listen to Representative Schraeder if you want to come back here."

Speaker Peters: "On this question, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Only a brief comment that now that we are on concurrence, to state what the Amendment does do now, it uses a one year basis for the pension base for the Judge so that he would be getting, with 20 years of service, 85%. In the case of those that are there now, the existing salary, and not a salary for working one day. And Representative Schraeder's absolutely right. We ought to concur now in this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "On that question, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this Amendment, this Amendment does not deprive a Judge of waiting one year and

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

still getting the similar pension. And I think that you also have to understand that the Judge's salary, one of the reasons why they have it based upon the final salary is the fact that the General Assembly determines what their salary will be and therefore it's done by statute as to what their salary would be. They have no control over what their salary is going to be, this year, next year, or ten years from now. And that they are not staying on the bench specifically just for the retirement benefit. If a person's going to retire, he's going to retire based upon what his economic situation and also whatever is best for him, the same as any individual regardless of what system would do. There is also a question about the constitutionality of this Amendment. And at the present time their pension provision states that their pension would be based upon their final salary, and to me, this...there's a question as to whether or not that this Amendment will diminish their benefits, which is unconstitutional in the State of Illinois. So, even if this Bill is amended, I think..or adopted, I think that there will be some question as to whether or not the..the constitutionality that we can diminish a pension benefit for Judges or any..anybody in the state, that we have previously promised to pay."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?'. Representative Schraeder to close."

Schraeder: "To close, yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to correct something. This is something the Judges don't have. We're going to give them this money, \$6,000.00 additional a year. Representative Terzich may want the nonconcurrency, but he's absolutely stated a falsehood. This is an increase in the retirement for Judges who work

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

one day. We're just saying that they ought to get their retirement based upon their last year of service as a Judge. That's pure and simple. I ask for concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Again, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2286?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2286 and the Bill (sic, Amendment) is adopted. Representative Darrow?"

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side on which the concurrence of the last Amendment took place, I hereby move to reconsider the vote by which that Bill was hereby concurred upon."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Move to lie that on the table."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion lies upon the table. Representative Darrow, what purpose, Sir?"

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which Amendment #3 was adopted..was concurred upon, I hereby move to reconsider."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brummer?"

Darrow: "And I'd like a Roll Call vote."

Brummer: "I move that lie on the table."

Speaker Peters: "Repres..No, wait a minute. No. He moved to reconsider. Representative Darrow, restate the Motion."

Darrow: "I move to reconsider the vote by which this House concurred on Amendment #3 to House Bill 2286 and I asked

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

for a Roll Call vote on this and on any subsequent Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people know what Representative Darrow's about. This Amendment...He wants to send this for a Conference Committee. But this Amendment gives a widow an increase in some pension benefits. Now, if he's going to use that vehicle for ...against a poor widow versus the Judges, then I think the poor widow ought to get 100% of the votes. And I think, Darrow, you've made a very bad mistake."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Gentleman's Motion to reconsider the vote by which we concurred with Amendment #3. I think this Bill ought to go to a Conference Committee where we ought to be able to resolve the problems which we talked about in the Amendment in which the House did in fact concur with."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Well, yes. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I move to lay that..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Excuse me. So that we know where we're at, we are on Representative Darrow's Motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #...the House concurred...who did? No, he didn't. Representative Brummer, did...what Motion? You didn't make a Motion."

Brummer: "I moved that that Motion lie on the table."

Speaker Peters: "You asked for a Roll Call vote, Sir. Now, wait. Representative Brummer, I mean, we can handle what you want, but I think we're pretty clear on that one. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I think if you go back and look at the tape, Representative Brummer did move to table. Representative Darrow asked for the Roll Call."

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen. My God, we're getting into adown here. Pardon?"

Pullen: "The Gentlemen are correct. The Gentlemen are correct, Mr. Speaker. But if the Chair wishes to be more clear about it, and my voice doesn't sound like either of theirs, I move to lay Representative Darrow's Motion on the table."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber, on that Motion, Sir?"

Leinenweber: "No. I thought her voice sounded like Representative Brummer's."

Speaker Peters: "All right. We are on Amendment #3. Representative Darrow moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #3 was concurred in. Representative Pullen moves that that Motion lie on the table. Representative Brummer is joined by five Members asking that that be a Roll Call vote. Okay? Whoever. The question now is, 'Shall Representative Pullen's Motion to lay on the table...'. What? That's right. Right. Okay. Those..Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Take the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay', and Representative Pullen's Motion prevails. All right. House Bill...Representative Ewing, do you have a question, Sir?"

Ewing: "I certainly do. Did you announce that Bill had passed?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Yes. Well, we can do it again if you want."

Ewing: "I wish you would. I didn't hear it."

Speaker Peters: "The House...What number were we on? The House, having concurred in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2286, the Bill is declared passed. Okay? Representative..Oh, yes. I've got Kulas and then Oblinger. House Bill 1938. Representative Kulas. Mr. Clerk? Representative Schraeder, are you seeking attention?"

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

151st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Someone check that light, please? Thank you."

Clark O'Brien: "House Bill 1938, a Bill for an Act to amend the General Not-For-Profit Corporation Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1938, as was voted out of the House, amended the General Not-For-Profit Corporation Act. It provided that no certificate of incorporation would be issued to a social club unless the certificate was accompanied by a notice stating that the sale, possession and consumption of alcoholic liquors within that club must conform with applicable state and local laws. Senate Amendment #1 was put on in the Senate at the request of the Secretary of State's Office. And it just tightens ...tightens up the Act a little bit. It requires that the domestic not-for-profit corporation must also state in their articles of incorporation that they will comply with local and state liquor laws. And I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? There being none, the question is...I'm sorry. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, I have a question. According to the analysis the Republicans have, it says that if the local liquor commissioner notifies the Secretary of State, that the not-for-profit club has violated the local liquor laws, that the Secretary of State shall dissolve that corporation. Is that what the Amendment does?"

Kulas: "Yes, it does."

Leinenweber: "Any violation of the local liquor laws? The corporation would be dissolved? I mean, if they stay open five minutes after hours and get caught doing it, then they get dissolved auto...er...it's mandatory that the Secretary

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

of State dissolve them?"

Kulas: "No, that's..that's not the point, Representative Leinenweber. Not on..Not on any violation. The violations we are concerned with that...in some areas of the state, especially in my area, some of these so-called social clubs are actually just taverns which are running a business without any state or city liquor licenses. So this wouldn't affect if..if...let's say, a VFW Post or something is open a little longer or something like that. That wouldn't give the Secretary of State the right to dissolve them, no."

Leinenweber: "Well, I've been given a copy of the Senate Amendment and it appears that that's precisely what it does. Any kind of violation of the local liquor laws which include, you know, staying open five minutes late, serving an underaged person, there's a whole slew of things, some of which are more serious than others, that the way I read the Amendment..that the Secretary of State shall immediately dissolve the organization. That's worse than what the Liquor Control Commission could even do. If they dissolve the organization they would obviously lose their license to...both state and local. I..this appears to be, in my judgment, certainly more..doing more than what you intend to do. I would suggest that either you take this out of the record so that we can look at it a little more, or move to nonconcur and redraft it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Let's take the Bill out of the record for the time being."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 2126, Representative Oblinger."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2126, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Domestic Violence Act together with Senate

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendment #1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, this is the elderly abuse Bill. The two Amendments that were put on by the Senate are really both technical. The first one restores the definition of abuse by saying harassment and physical abuse. And the second Amendment corrects a mistake that was made last year when we passed the Domestic Violence Act. We had the Circuit Clerk directly sending the money to the state from the marriage licenses and from the divorce proceedings and it must go through the County Treasurer's Office. It was corrected to make it go through the County Treasurer, and I move concurrence for Amendments #1 and 2 of the Senate."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Olson."

Olson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that's a very good Motion by the Representative from Springfield, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2126?'. It's final action. Those in favor 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 155 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2126. The Bill is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1913, Representative Huskey. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1913, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur with 1913. The Senate has..has done their usual job on this Bill. They provided that the logo plates that will be on the door, which there was some objections to it in the House, be removed. But they still left some of the tighter restrictions in the Bill such as Representative Van Duyne's Amendment that he put on. And then added to this, Pearl Harbor Survivor Plates. Now, these are to be paid for at the regular rate, but it was a request of the Veterans Administration. That has been added to the Bill. The retired Legislator plates have the regular cost. The issuance of..of these ceremonial plates...They've been issuing ceremonial plates, but they find there has been no statutory provisions for them to issue those ceremonial plates like the Lincolnfest or the ...some type of a centennial, something that will advertise our State of Illinois and help promote our special events. And they can only limit....It limits these ceremonial plates up to 200 pair and it sets a limit of use of them up to 60 days. And that's all the Bill does. I move for its concurrence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, the way I read the effect of the Senate Amendments is we're creating several new categories, including retired Legislator plates. Is that right?"

Huskey: "I stated that."

Leinenweber: "And Pearl Harbor Survivor plates?"

Huskey: "I stated that."

Leinenweber: "And then Amendment 3 eliminates the...represented the requirement for a logo on a charitable vehicle. Is that correct?"

Huskey: "That's correct."

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Leinenweber: "Are you moving to concur in that one too?"

uskey: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "So, what does the Bill do now besides create retired Legislator plates and Pearl Harbor Survivor plates and ceremonial plates?"

uskey: "Well see, these ceremonial plates..they've been doing this really. We didn't have a statutory provision. So that's about all it does, Representative."

Leinenweber: "You have to retire..."

uskey: "No. No, wait..I mean. Let me go back a bit. It strengthens up the Act of those charitable CB plates. It strengthens up that Act."

Leinenweber: "I have one final question in regard to the retired Legislator plates. If my constituents vote me out of office, am I retired or defeated?"

uskey: "Well, I..I would say you would be retired, which I hope don't happen, Representative. I hope you don't have to use a retired...I hope you never have to use these retired plates."

Leinenweber: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that we all ought to make sure we know that we're creating several new types of license plates, and we may reach the situation where everybody in the state would qualify for his own category which I suppose would be putting things back to where we were before there were any categories at all, other than one. So, as long as everybody knows what they're doing, I guess we should vote on this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "A question...A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he'll yield."

Wikoff: "Herb, does this still require the name to be placed on the side of the CV vehicle?"

uskey: "No, that takes..the name...the logo was removed in the

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Senate, and I checked the possibility of getting that put back on over there and there's no sense of trying because I could see they were pretty adamant against it. So, I...I felt that it's better to pass the Bill with the Secretary of State's requirements and the other things on there. And let it go."

ikoff: "I think it was a good idea."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yourell."

ourell: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Are you saying with Amendment #3, Representative, that we've eliminated what you thought was an excellent idea to place these logos on the side of trucks and cars and vans that belong to charitable vehicles? That's gone now?"

uskey: "Yes."

Yourell: "Doesn't that completely gut the Bill?"

uskey: "No."

ourell: "How are we going to...How are we going to find out who these things belong to? And that was the reason for the original Bill, wasn't it?"

uskey: "Well, Representative Yourell, it provides that the Secretary of State's Office shall require as a prerequisite the registration and documentation of tax exempt status from the IRS from those owners of governmental, religious, and not-for-profit organizations, vehicles who are exempt from federal income taxes who presently pay that \$4.00 fee. So it tightens up with Representative Van Dyne's Amendment, it tightens that up considerable. So they can't just walk in there and get that \$4.00 plate as they have in the past."

Yourell: "Did you say 'yes' or 'no'?"

uskey: "Well, repeat the question then if you want a 'yes' or 'no'."

Yourell: "This eliminates the logo that you thought was so

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

important on the side of cars so that people..."

Huskey: "I answered that question as a 'yes'."

Yorell: "That's 'yes'. Okay. Now, what we have in the Bill is to provide for special license plates for retired Legislators? Is that what we...Is that what we did with this Bill now?"

Huskey: "That's one of the provisions they hung on in the Senate, Representative Yorell."

Yorell: "I see. Thank you very much, Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "And, Representative, let me add that I hope that you will make an application for one very shortly."

Yorell: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Yorell."

Yorell: "Yes, I'd be delighted to make an application for that, Representative. But I would suggest if you look at the figures in the primary and start your application as soon as you can."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Ralph Dunn. Give the Gentleman your attention. This is crucial."

Dunn: "Very, very crucial. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Huskey, I'm afraid you're going to have to...It's a bad Bill. I don't want one of those plates. I don't think you want one. I think you want to give one to Yorell. We could amend the Bill if we'd send it to a Conference Committee and make it only good for Democrat Legislators retired. Then it'd be a good Bill. Otherwise I'm going to have to vote against it and I'd urge we defeat it. We have too many special plates now, and I think it's a bad precedent to start. The main object of the Bill was for logos on the side of charitable vehicles. I think that should be on it. I think we ought to turn down these Amendments and at least insist on that. If you want your retired Legislator plates, why, I don't mind. But, the

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

main object of this Bill was to ..so we can tell who's driving the Cadillacs with the charitable vehicles plates on them, and I think that was the object of the Bill. So I'd urge that we nonconcur or defeat the Motion to concur and then send it back and try to get that back in the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I just want to point out to the Members that in order to qualify for one of these retired Legislator plates, you have to be old enough to get your pension and you, Mr. Speaker, for instance, would be much too young to qualify for such a plate."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Dick Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Representative Huskey, I'd like to ask you. What is a Legislative retirement plate? What does it actually say on it? I mean it's..."

Huskey: "You'd have to ask the Sponsor of the Bill in the Senate. I did not sponsor that. That was sponsored in the Senate and I had no idea it was coming back with that on there. They didn't talk to me about it, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "So, you know, in other words, you're not sure what it says on the plate. In other words, I'd like to know if it's like the one we have now that says, 'Has been' or 'Retired' or something."

Huskey: "It's up to the Secretary of State to..."

Kelly: "Okay, let me ask you something. One more question. What is it...What is the fee going to be for this special license plate?"

Huskey: "Same thing as it..."

Kelly: "The same as it is regularly?"

Huskey: "The regular fee that everybody else pays. We're not asking..."

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

elly: "...Okay."

uskey: "...Certainly I wouldn't sponsor a Bill that asked for a special fee."

elly: "Oh, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative, do you wish to close? Representative Huskey?"

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just move for concurrence.."

Speaker Peters: "Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Topinka's back there. Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Mr. Speaker, no problem. I think enough's been said on this..this pile of Senatorial legislative junk. Carry on."

Speaker Peters: "Carry on, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "I just move for favorable consideration on the concurrence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1913. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. Mr. Clerk? Voting is open. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to explain. There's one plate on here that you should know about, the Pearl Harbor Survivor plate. The survivors of Pearl Harbor is also included in this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish?..."

Huskey: "...And that's the actual."

Speaker Peters: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 32 voting 'aye', 116 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. And the House does not concur in Senate Amendments ..all right. All right. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Now, Representative Huskey? Nonconcur?"

Huskey: "I think..what is it? The next step is they have to recede from the nonconcurrency right? I make a Motion, Mr...I make a Motion that we do not concur..."

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

171st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1913. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. House Bill 2357, Representative Grossi? Representative Grossi, House Bill 21...Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2357, a Bill for an Act that creates the Third Party Prescription Program Act together with Senate Amendments #3 and 4."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2357 is an attempt to correct a problem that exists in the Third Party Prescription Programs. Basically what this Bill was designed to do is to ensure that the persons and plans that would make the medical payments did so, and the State Department of Insurance would see to that. Senate Amendment #3 simply makes some additional changes to the Bill to help..to clarify what was the intent of the Bill. The basic changes in the Bill have been the additions in the Senate Amendment #4. Senate Amendment #4 adds House Bill..or what was House Bill 2394 by Representative Epton. That Bill simply provided that the State Fire Marshal and other authorized law enforcement officials could request any insurance company which is investigated or is investigating their fire loss to provide relevant and factual information that they have with immunity. Also, Senate Amendment #4 provides that the State Department of Insurance was deemed to be a law enforcement agency. This is necessary to allow the State Department of Insurance to investigate and have certain immunities as to the disclosure of libelous or possibly confidential information in the course of criminal investigation. This has become necessary due to the fact

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

101st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

that we have several insurance companies in the State of Illinois that have gone bankrupt and without this, the State Department of Insurance has had problems investigating these bankrupt insurance companies. Senate Amendment #4 also provides ..or adopts the model Act in relationship to multiple employer trusts. Multiple employer trusts would develop under the guise..er..the authority of the Employer Retirement Income Security Act of the Federal Government. Recently we have been hearing a lot of these trusts going bankrupt and the result is that persons who have incurred medical expenses are..have not had those medical expenses paid as a result of the bankrupt of these trusts. Under this model employer trust, the state then would have certain authorities to regulate these employer trusts. I welcome any questions. In absence of questions, I move to adopt...I move to concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Topinka. Will the Gentleman between the Lady and the Chair please move out of the aisle? All right. Shut...Shut the light off. Okay. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur...Shall the House concur...'. Yes, Representative Levin. The procedure is to put your light on and then the Chair will recognize you."

Levin: "I thought it was on. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "Could you give us just a little bit more detail on how these Amendments would solve the problems of the multiple employee (sic, employer) trusts as was documented on, I believe, Channel 2 in Chicago? What kind of authority would it give the Department of Insurance that it doesn't have now?"

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

101st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Crossi: "At the present time there seems to be a question of whether the State Department of Insurance has any jurisdiction whatsoever over these trusts, and this establishes a presumption that they do have jurisdiction."

Levin: "Okay. And they would then have all of the authority...powers that they have over insurance companies over these trusts?"

Crossi: "My understanding is that they have those powers right now, but because this is a...these trusts have started under the Federal Act, that there is a question relating to their jurisdiction and they must go to court to establish their jurisdiction in federal court."

Levin: "All right. Assuming that they then have the jurisdiction under this..this Amendment, what can they do? Can they do everything that they can do in terms of a normal insurance company?"

Crossi: "My understanding is that they will then be able to go in and look over their books and records and other material to determine if they have complied with federal law."

Levin: "'Is there any state law that you could check that would be verifiable here also, or is it just federal law that would be violated?"

Crossi: "It is my understanding that they tend to hide behind the federal law while violating the state law, and this will give the state authority to go in and check that information."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representation Epton."

Epton: "To clarify any misunderstanding that might arise, we, at the present time, do not know what laws that these phony trusts may violate. They presently definitely violate federal laws, but the possibility could exist that there are some state laws that might be invoked. And according,

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

this gives the Department of Insurance the right to utilize either procedure or both."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2357?'. This is final action. Mr. Clerk. 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 160 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2357 and the Bill is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2116, Representative Kosinski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2116, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure together with Senate Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3. House Bill 2116 which passed this House..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr..Excuse me. Representative Getty, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Gentleman take it out of the record. I thought that we had an understanding that we were going to do that."

Speaker Peters: "Kosinski."

Kosinski: "I had information you concurred. If you wish it out of the record..."

Getty: "...I would..I would appreciate that, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. House Bill 2079, Representative Watson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2079, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substance Act together with Senate Amendment #2."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2079. House Bill 2079 is the look alike drug Bill, and this is a technical Amendment. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2079?'. This is final action. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed... 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 164 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2079. And that Bill is hereby declared passed. Representative Sandquist, 2044? Out of the record? Representative Telcser? 2391, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2391, page six of the Calendar, Representative Telcser. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2391, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2391 is the Ethnic Intimidation Act with this..which we passed during the Session. I'm going to move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Senate Amendment #1 put the same restriction on recovery against parents for institutional vandalism committed by a minor that we, in the House, did with Amendment #2 to the other part of the Act. This is the same type of Amendment which we took from Representative Getty. Amendment #2 raises the penalty from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 3 felony. In the drafting of the Bill there were some errors that we

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

had also made and Amendment #2 corrects those errors. Amendment #3 is a technical correction to Amendment #1. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield? With respect to Amendment #2, you said it raises the penalties? As I recall there were two different parts, two different offenses that were created by the Bill, and ..."

McClusker: "Only...only.."

Cullerton: "...One of them was a felony and one of them was a misdemeanor."

McClusker: "We had left out the penalty in the mob action portion of the Bill so the Senate increased it one step in that portion only of the Bill."

Cullerton: "It went from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class 3 felony?"

McClusker: "Mob action itself is a Class 4 felony even without the Bill. So in this Bill it becomes a Class 3.."

Cullerton: "That's a good point, by the way, that all of this is already against the law. This is just kind of a recodification of what is already against the law."

McClusker: "That is a point of view I can appreciate."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

McClusker: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2391."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2391?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? This is final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 161 voting 'aye', none voting

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2391. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Kociolko 'aye', Mr. Clerk. On page five of the Calendar, House Bill 2234, Representative Matijevich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2234, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 4."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are two Senate Amendments, Senate Amendment #1, which I believe was requested by Representative Hallstrom, a technical change with regards to special ed provision where they now have authority of levying taxes for special ed. Purely technical. Senate Amendment #4 was requested by Representative DiPrima and now he's going to ask the Senate Sponsor to recede from that Amendment. So I'm going to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and nonconcur with Amendment #4. Therefore, I now move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2234."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, I would ask the Gentleman, in regarding to Senate Amendment #1, as I understand it, it's a little bit more than technical. It allows a school board to levy a tax for special education building purposes and then, after they've done so, by Resolution, use the revenue which has been raised for the building purposes for other special education purposes other than building. Is that correct?"

Matijevich: "That appears to be my reading of it. I wonder if..I think Dolly Hallstrom may....Dolly, I believe this was your Amendment for the special ed people. Am I correct? Is she back there?"

Leinenweber: "Well, whether she's back there or not, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to..."

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

151st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Matijevich: "Well, I'd like to have her respond to that because they would inform me that it was a technical change so I'd like to ask her to respond to that."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could get your attention.."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, proceed, Sir."

Leinenweber: "I'll just go ahead and address the Amendment and then Representative Hallstrom perhaps can address it also. If I recall correctly, this is not the first time we've had this particular issue. What we are seeing here is an effort made to expand the use of a..of a tax which has been levied for one purpose to be used for another purpose. This is no different, in essence, than allowing a school to levy an additional tax without a referendum. Now, if you want to do that, go ahead and vote for this. But I would suggest that if you think this through that's exactly what we're going to be doing. This is the old ploy about giving a school board permission to levy a tax for a worthwhile purpose. When that worthwhile purpose has been served then keep the tax going on the taxpayers and use it for another worthwhile purpose rather than giving the school board either the power to levy that additional tax, or require them to quit levying the tax when the need for that particular tax money has dissipated. Now, I know schools need money and they want to get all they can get and there are a lot of worthwhile purposes for which they can spend money. But this is a real estate tax. If they no longer need the money for building, then they ought to abate the tax and not levy it anymore. Either that or tell the people exactly what they're doing and go to them and ask them by referendum to authorize them to issue a new tax..or..to levy a new tax on their real estate. But, in essence, that's exactly what this is. It's not really a technical Amendment. It's an expansion of a tax so that

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

when the purpose served by the tax is up, they continue to be levied."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And to answer my Representative from the other side, colleague, this is not my Amendment. But also to answer Representative Leinenweber, I understand what he's saying, but I do not agree with him. I believe that this money was raised for special education purposes within the district. Now, whether it's to be used for building or whether it's to be used for a program, the whole idea was to help special education children within that district. I would ask that you support this. We're having enough problem now with the shortage of funds for handicapped children. And this is one place where at least we can let the money that's already raised for one purpose, and when it's not needed for that, to be used for another. I would ask that you support this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Mays: "John, the Motion is to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and not concur in Senate Amendment #4. Is that correct?"

Matijevich: "That's true."

Mays: "Well, as I read Senate Amendment #4, this says that the holder of a veteran's scholarship authorized under this Section shall not be denied admission to the State controlled college or university. Why do you not want to concur in Senate Amendment #4?"

Matijevich: "Well, I understand Representative DiPrima's worked that out through some other legislation. That's no longer required. This language is no longer required, so we don't

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

need that verbiage anymore. That's the purpose for it."

ays: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, back to the special education tax issue. What we find is that some school districts levied a tax for building purposes for special education. Because of the declining enrollment in many of our school districts, however, rather than using that money to build a new facility for special education, it is now more practical for the school district to perhaps renovate a part of an existing building and in many cases that is not as demanding as building a new structure would have been. And so, some of our school districts are finding themselves in a situation where they have already collected the tax. It is sitting there; the only way it can be expended is on building purposes unless we give them some flexibility to use it for programming. Those districts are saying, 'We don't want to be forced into putting this money into bricks and mortar when it is not really needed for that and it can be put to very good use in programming instead'. And so, what they are seeking is simply more flexibility in the ways in which they can expend the money that they have already collected for educational purposes. And I believe it deserves our support."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman. Hoffman. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A number of years ago as we began to put the special education program in place, there was a problem with having the kinds of facilities that were necessary to provide for a proper educational atmosphere for the special education students. So we put in the law a tax of 2% or 2 1/2

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

1. 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

for elementary districts, 2¢ for high school districts and then, of course combined that for the unit districts and provided for a 4¢ levy for building purposes and put an eight year limitation in. So we did two things. We limited the time frame in terms of how many years they could levy the tax, and we limited the purpose for which they could levy it. Now, those school districts that needed buildings levied the tax and those that didn't need it didn't levy it. When the building part of the special ed program had been met, then in a search for additional resources these interest groups came back to the Legislature and said, 'Let's expand that and allow boards, if they don't need the money for building purposes, to use them for other special education purposes - salaries, supplies, materials, whatever..whatever they needed.' Now, this Amendment would provide that even those districts that did not levy a tax could, in fact, levy a tax for the first time and then by Resolution of that board, use it for purposes other than building. Obviously if they never levied it for building, they don't need it for building, but this is a special education tax for special education programs in 17.2.2A of the Code and then they could move on by Resolution and use that money for whatever sources are available. In those districts it is an additional tax without referendum, just as it was in those districts that levied it originally. However, let me make one additional point. And that additional point is that unless this Amendment is adopted we will have another example of some schools who can take advantage of a tax because they've been taxing their people all along for whatever the reason, and other districts who can't get access to this tax because they never used it. I would suggest to you that ..that this Amendment would treat all taxpayers in the same

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

1.1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

way, meaning that all taxpayers in the state would be similarly exposed to a 2% or a 4% levy, depending on what kind of a district they lived in. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Woodyard."

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

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I apologize. I was informed, Representative Huff, and that..this was your Amendment. Evidently it came from the special ed people who felt that the original Bill, as introduced, that this language was part of the intent of the original Bill as their people informed me. I would agree with the assessment, first of all, Representative Hallstrom, that I'd like to see the person come here and tell me what taxes are ever going to be abated. So this is a vehicle wherein those taxes that are levied can be used for the purposes of special ed. I think those of you on the Elementary and Secondary Committee, those of us in the Appropriations Committee are aware of the real shortfall that special education is facing. So, I think, Representative Hallstrom's closing statement indicated to me that this would treat everybody alike and for that reason, ought to be adopted. So, I would urge the Members to adopt it. I don't look at it as an original tax at all. So, I again move and urge your support for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2234?'. Final action. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Smith to explain his vote, Harry Smith."

Smith: "I am voting 'no' on this, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not because I am against the laudable aims that have been spoken of here this morning, but because I believe that by accepting this Amendment we are acting contrary to the concept and the spirit of truth of taxation Bill that was passed by this Assembly some time back."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Bower to explain his vote."

Bower: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the basic concept of the original Bill was to charge tuition to military dependents residing on a military base. This Bill, unfortunately, slipped through the House with virtually no discussion. I think you have to realize exactly what that is doing. Every military installation in the State of Illinois, with the exception of Scott Air Force Base, has at one time or another been slated for closure by the Department of Defense. There are serious constitutional questions about the legality of tuition charges to military dependents. The Department of Defense is very interested in this and has filed law suits in at least three states on this matter. I would urge an 'aye' vote...er...a 'no' vote with the hopes that the whole Bill could be defeated."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2234. Further Motions? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The House Sponsor of Senate Amendment #4 has indicated to the

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Senate Sponsor of the Bill that he wishes no longer to have Senate Amendment #4 on the Bill, and she will recede. So, therefore I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2234."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2234?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2234. House Bill 2175, Representative Mays? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2175,..."

Speaker Peters: "Oh, excuse me, Representative Mays. Representative Winchester, for what purpose, Sir?"

Winchester: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to suspend Rule 22 so that the House Elections Committee could meet at 3:00 p.m. in the conference room in the Speaker's Office. The Motion has been cleared with the Leadership on the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, the Gentleman's Motion is adopted. Representative Mays."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2175, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to public water districts together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Yes, I move we concur in Senate Amendment #1. What this does is...you recall the underlying Bill which passed out of the House on May 3rd by 136 to 8 margin allowed water districts to charge a differential rate under four different categories. When it went thru the Senate there were some questions raised about different funds being set up and so what we've done is narrow down the scope of

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the...scope of the Bill so that you could still charge differential rates under two..two categories instead of four. So I move that we concur."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? There being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2175?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. 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 161 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2175. The Bill is hereby declared passed. Representative Bradley, are you ready, Sir? House Bill 2276. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2276, a Bill for an Act relating to the maximum rate of interest of bonds and warrants together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2276. We're having some problems fitting it together and it's not in the form that we want it, in the form that went over. So I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2276. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2276. Representative Hallock, is he here? Representative Barkhausen on 1822? House Bill 1822. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 18..."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "1882. Out of the record. ...Reilly? Representative McAuliffe? On page six of the Calendar, Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 624, Representative Alstat? Out of the record. Senate Bill 623, Representative Grossi? Out of the record. Page two of the Calendar, Senate Bills, Third Reading. Top of the page, Senate Bill 1359, Representative Kustra. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1363, Representative Wolf? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1363, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1363 makes the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses for seven Commissions. All these Commissions have appropriations included in House Bill 2370, the continuing Commissions Bill. The total appropriation is \$796,300 for FY '83. It takes in the Judicial Advisory Council, the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, Ethnic Heritage Pension Laws Commission, Pension Laws Recodification, Criminal Sentencing and the Commission to Visit and Examine State Institutions. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 136...Who? Ropp. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Wolf, J. J.: "I'm in error on this Bill. I grabbed the wrong the file here. There has been some changes by Amendment #1 which removed everything after the enacting clause and all that is left in this particular Bill now is from the State Scholarship Commission, Student Loan Fund, \$433,000 and

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

from GRF \$217,00 for the..for the move of the State Scholarship Commission will be from Chicago to Springfield office. That's what left in the Bill now."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you. That answers my question."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1363 pass?'. Those in favor 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 142 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1386. Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record temporarily. House Bill 13...Senate Bill 1397. Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1397, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1397 appropriates 67 million 463 thousand 700 dollars for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Department of Aging for Fiscal Year '83. That is the amount as now in the Bill with the Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1397 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

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 148
voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present'. This
Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1398, Representative
Winchester? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1398, a Bill for an Act to provide
for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department
of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. This is the ordinary and contingent
appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. The total
appropriation now with a total of seven Amendments is 39
million, 820 thousand 600 dollars. And I would ask for a
favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Winchester: "Yes."

Darrow: "Would you explain page eleven, lines eighteen through
twenty that pertain to the 4-H clubs? How is that money
distributed? Page eleven, lines eighteen, it says, '...for
premiums, an agricultural extension for 4-H clubs to be
distributed at a uniform rate of \$10.50 per member...', for
a total of \$850,000."

Winchester: "It's to encourage 4-H participation to get the young
people of this state involved in agriculture. I don't
understand what your...we've had this type of a program
for years and years. What would be your concern?"

Darrow: "Well, my concern is, does that mean that \$10.50 goes to
each member of the 4-H, or how is it distributed?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp?"

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, if I might answer that question. The \$10.50 goes to each club enrolled member as of June 30th, correction, June the 1st, and those monies are used for giving out awards at the county fair in the form of premiums. They may be medals. They may be ribbons, or they may even be cash. And, this is given to each county based on a per member amount. And that's the \$10.50 that goes to each member."

Darrow: "For a total of \$850,000?"

Ropp: "I don't have the portion before me to identify the total amount. But that explains what the \$10.50 went to."

Darrow: "Yes. Coming from my area of the state, I won't say anymore."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "This money was set up in the budget about four years ago. A 4-H member takes a specific group of projects. They work on these projects. It keeps them busy and when you consider \$10.50 for projects and compare that with the cost of keeping a person in jail one time, this is the cheapest and the best money that is spent in the State Government anytime and any place. If you don't believe it, some of you that have eaten the banana nut bread that my daughter bakes and brings up here, this came from one of these projects. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich. Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could I please ask the Sponsor a question of Amendment #7?"

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

Frederick: "Would you please tell me what the restoration of \$241,600.00 in retirement funds..for what group are those retirement funds, please?"

Winchester: "Well, Representative Frederick, I would prefer that

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Representative Terzich or Representative Matijevich explain to you exactly what that did, because I wasn't in support of it and I'd hate to stand here and try to defend something that I didn't...I didn't support."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, that Amendment simply brought the funding of the pension system up to the 70% of pay outs rather than 62.5."

Frederick: "But which pension fund?"

Terzich: "State employees retirement system."

Speaker Peters: "State employees, Representative. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Bob, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that courtesy. I read just recently that the Director, Director Werries, and his wife are going to go to Taiwan in July and to the People's Republic of China in August. And I want to know if.."

Unknown: "Ah-so.."

Schneider: "...If that money is in there, and then I want to know why the Director would have to go. In Committee it was pretty well established that we have an office in Hong Kong and now I have, I think, Belfast. No, not Belfast. That's too revolutionary. But one..Brussels. Thank you. Little kids, brussel sprouts. So he's going to Taiwan and China. We already have an office for that purpose. What's the reason for that? And where's the money for that?"

Winchester: "Representative Schneider, I'm being told by our staff that there is...there is money in the appropriation Bill for the Director to go to Taiwan or Hong Kong, wherever it was that you said. There is no money in the Bill for his wife. Now..go ahead. Go ahead, if you just..."

Schneider: "Bob, I missed that. Is there..There is money for himself but not for his spouse."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Winchester: "For his wife. You said that he and his wife were be going...were going to go to Hong Kong or Taiwan, I forgot which one it was you said."

Schneider: "They're going to both places. But I guess I missed your answer. That's all. Did you say there was money for the Director?"

Winchester: "My answer is that there is money in the travel line item so that the Director, his travel expenses could be paid in this budget. But no, as to the state paying the travel allowances or the travel expenses for the wife of the Director of the Department of Agriculture."

Schneider: "I think that's reasonable. Can you tell me the amount? Ask one of the staff there about...just what it costs to the run the Director to Taiwan and also to China?"

Winchester: "Well, we don't have that with us, Glen. Can..Can we get that information for you and come to you, personally, with that information? If you've got a problem with it, then maybe we can do something about it in the Senate. We don't have what the specific cost is going to be for his trip to China and Taiwan and Hong Kong at our disposal."

Schneider: "The successor question to that is, why does the Director have to go to those places when there's a marketing division in Hong Kong?"

Winchester: "Well, I would assume that the Director is in charge of those offices and from time to time I would assume again, that it's his responsibility to go to those offices to see and discuss the...the economic trade situation with our employees there, to meet with distinguished leaders of those foreign countries to try to work out arrangements for them to buy more and more Illinois grain - corn, soybean, wheat, whatever - which at this point is probably the...where Illinois is the third largest exporting state in the nation, and I...I would like to keep that...that

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

rating. And to do it from time to time it's necessary for the Director of Agriculture to go and meet with the leaders of those countries to continue to convince them to buy Illinois grain."

Schneider: "Would he settle for a one-way ticket, half the price."

Winchester: "No, Sir. No, Sir."

Schneider: "How about sending the..."

Winchester: "Our Director..."

Schneider: "...leader of Ag Industry there? Maybe he ..."

Winchester: "Well, our Dir...Well, we might send Tom Crawford, if that will satisfy you. But our Director, Director Werries is one of the finest, one of the most conscientious directors that the Governor has in his cabinet. He is doing an excellent job. He, you know, I'd like to see...Illinois farmers want to see him go over there, and we want him to come back. But I'll tell you what, if you can arrange it, I'll go with him and I'll take that one-way ticket."

Schneider: "Well, God knows, we need a conscientious director. I can't wait to see him. Thank you very much."

Winchester: "You're welcome."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, to the Gentleman of DuPage, I understand they're going over there to study the gypsy moth problem, which is highly prevalent in Eastern Asia and come back with some new ideas."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "That...is probably hooked onto a trailer which had been quarantined in Springfield, and they'll start over there gnawing away at the trees."

Speaker Peters: "Ever it was so. Representative McClain."

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

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

of the House. Once again, speak on behalf of the Spokesperson for the appropriation process. We would solicit a 'present' vote on the Department of Aging's budget, being that it comes in at a higher...on Agriculture, being that it comes in a little higher than the amount introduced, in that it takes more GRF funds than we had anticipated. So, on behalf of us, we say that the budget is imbalanced; and, until the budget is balanced, we would urge a 'present' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative...Any further discussion? Being none, Representative Winchester to close."

Winchester: "Well, I...I don't know...yeah...I, I, I, I. I don't know what Representative McClain is talking about. He did not mention how much money that we're over in...in the Department of Agriculture's budget as introduced by the Governor. It's...It's not very much. As a matter of fact, my staff says that we're under. But anyway, this is the ordinary and contingent appropriation. We do have to fund the Department of Agriculture, and I don't know what kind of game plan that we're just about ready to get into. Perhaps we want to hold some Bills in hostage so that when we go into Conference Committees, certain people have Bills that they can use to negotiate with to get special projects for their area of the state. Most likely in the City of Chicago and Cook County, that's always the way it's been before. I don't think that we should...we should stand...stand here and let this happen to the Department of Agriculture's Bill or any other Bill. I suggest that we vote 'aye', and we get this Bill out of here so we can go home as soon as possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1398 pass?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'nay', 32 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1399, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1399 appropriates 4,751,600 dollars in the Banks and Trust Fund for the FY '83 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts. Included in this final figure is the restoration of 100,400 dollars, which the Senate had reduced by their pay plan and productivity proposal. That was restored by the House, and the..."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion?"

Wolf, J. J.: "There's also 5,000 dollars added for legal services. So, the...the total is now 4,857,000 dollars, and it is all out of Banks and Trusts Fund, which I mentioned earlier."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We concur with this piece of legislation and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1399 pass?'. Those in favor 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 146 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 6

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back up one. Senate Bill 1386, Representative Matijevich. Are you ready, Sir? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1386 is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Comptroller. The total amounts appropriated are 24,623,300 dollars in GRF, 340,900 in other funds, a total of 24,964,200 dollars. I urge your support of Senate Bill 1386."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1386 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 147 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1359, top of the page. Representative Kustra. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kustra."

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1359 is the appropriation Bill for the operating and contingent expenses of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. There were three Amendments adopted on Second Reading in the House. Amendment #1 added

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

20,000 dollars for either retirement lines, increasing retirement from 62.5 to 70 percent. Amendment #4 added 8.4 million for monetary awards, and Amendment #5 added 1.5 for additional general state aid. That brings the total appropriation Bill to 144,787,460 dollars, and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Question of the Sponsor. Representative Kustra, how much...how does this differ from last year's appropriation? Up, down, in between or what?"

Kustra: "Just one second. As amended, I don't know whether I have that information. The Pierce Amendment added eight million. The McClain Amendment added 1.5. The appropriation's up ten million from the way it came over to us from the Senate."

Mulcahey: "But, how's that compare to last year? I mean, is it up or down?"

Kustra: "The percent change over FY '82 is 21.6 percent over."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "I have some concerns about the contractual services for the collection of the Scholarship Funds. Would you explain how that operates?"

Kustra: "Would you repeat the question again?"

Darrow: "Yes, it's my understanding that in the collection of loans, under this legislation, we are hiring private contractors, and there is an appropriation of, I believe, it's 645,774 dollars. Is that correct?"

Kustra: "No, not that I'm aware of."

Darrow: "Well, check...under your contractual services, according

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

to our analysis, th...you have contractual services to collect loans that have not been paid back."

Kustra: "We don't have that information with us. It's possible that it's in the...in the line items."

Darrow: "Well, let me...then I will address the Bill based on our staff analysis. According to what our staff has discovered, the Illinois State Scholarship Commission has engaged the services of some collection agencies. The appropriation that they anticipate next year will be 645,000 dollars. The way it operates, they anticipate they will be able to collect six million dollars from loans that have not been paid back. Of that amount, 30 percent will be retained by the State of Illinois. Of that, a third of it must go to the private collections agencies. I've had experience with other states collecting loans, and the other states - particularly Louisiana - they use the services of the Attorney General's Office. There appears to be no reason why our Attorney General cannot collect these sums, why we have to hire outside help, why we have to contract and give these folks the customary one-third. The 645,000 dollars could remain in the State Treasury. We could do it much cheaper if the Attorney General would care to do so, and I think that this is another example where we're hiring outside consultants where the Attorney General ought to pursue this himself. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, because of the very difficult fiscal problems caused to many university and college students due to loss of federal assistance and federal grants, I feel that this Bill, as amendment...amended, is in good shape. They are...There are many, many student of...of normal income family, middle...higher...even upper middle income that are finding very difficult problems trying to send

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

their children to college. I, therefore, stand in support of this Bill as amended."

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

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although I can't address myself to the specifics of the collection procedures utilized by the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, there is no question that in the last few years, the States of Texas, Minnesota and other states have utilized private collection agents rather than utilize in-house agencies; because, they get from those private collection agencies the expertise that has been acquired over the years in dealing with the private sector. And now, that expertise is being used in the public sector. I suspect that that's exactly the reason for the Scholarship Commissions using those facilities this time. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1359 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 154 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representatives Wolf and Matijevich, with leave of the House and your understanding, we'd like to skip out of order and pick up one or two other Bills, and then go to some Bills and move them back to Second for the purpose of Amendments that have been filed. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. On page three of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1425, Representative Vinson or Wolf. 1425. Representative Wolf. Senate Bill 1425, Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1425, this provides the FY '83 ordinary and contingent expenses request of the Department of Registration/Education. As passed by the Senate, the budget request is 7,804,800, both in...containing 6,665,600 in GRF and 888,500 in Medical Disciplinary Funds, also 250,700 in Dental Disciplinary Funds. This represents a 100,900 or 1.3 increase over the FY '82 spending level. The Senate reduced the Department's original request by 137,000 dollars, and I would ask for favorable vote of the House."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill. In Committee, and if any have read recent newspapers, there have been indications of a potential scandal with regards to the Medical Disciplinary Board; that it's really not a functioning agency, that no matter how many complaints, the doctors really don't discipline where there are cases that there ought to be disciplined. And, when that happens, you are really toying with the health and lives of many people. I therefore intend to vote 'present' on this agency Bill, and I would urge Members on this side of the aisle to give their 'present' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1425 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

question, there are 104 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 46 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1427, Representative Wolf. It's Veterans Affairs. Wolf or Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Originally, this Bill provided 23,512,800 for the OCE for the Department of Veteran Affairs. By Amendment, we added 4.1 million dollars, I believe, for the veteran scholarships and also there was a 5,000 Amendment for the perpetual care, which was offered by Mr. DiPrima, and I would ask for an affirmative vote of the Members of the House."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I intend, at this time, even though I feel the Bill has been approved by Amendments - and I don't want my vote to indicate that I don't support the veterans' affairs, but I do at this time intend to vote 'present' on this agency."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1427 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 148 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 17 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page two of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1405, State Emergency Services. Senate Bill

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

1405, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1405, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is... provides the 12,804,200 dollars for the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency for their Fiscal year 1983 OCE's. There's a net change... Yes...And this includes a reappropriation for the Marion disaster... is included in this particular Bill, and I would ask for the affirmative votes of the House."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that generated some discussion on Second Reading. In Committee I stated to Director Erie Jones that if for no other reason I would vote against this Bill because of the inclusion of the radiolo... radiological defense officer. Somebody said 'Well it's federal funds and that ought to make it alright'. yet on the floor of this House I've heard many people say, you know, 'Just because some... something is federal funds that doesn't mean it's free money'. And the job description of that officer is not one who is going to work because there may be some nuclear emergency. The job description, under the federal ac... guidelines is that that person is one who does a job where there is a nuclear attack. The words 'nuclear attack' are used in the job description. I don't think that in this day and age and I ought to tell this Body, I just read in the newspaper yesterday where the Congress in the House is taking an overwhelming vote with regards to nuclear freeze. More and more people are becoming aware that nobody, I mean nobody, is going to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

win... can win a nuclear war. This language that we have in that job description means that we are in preparation for a nuclear attack. Now, I got to tell you that this guy is going to do nothing. So, we're going to pay him for doing nothing. That's what it amounts to. If you want to throw money away, that's what you're doing; and if you're just going to vote because you think that we... you know, you're going to take that conservative hawkish type of thing, go ahead, but let me tell you also, you know, be as hawkish as you want. Your kids and your grandchildren are going to be the ones who are going to be eradicated by your hawkish type of presentation on this type of Bill. I've got a kid that's going to be twelve years old in the month of October. I'm near the point of becoming aging... aged. All I can do, by my action on the floor of this House, is do something for future generations. To hell with me. I'm not going to be here long. I don't want anything that I do... No, I don't know. God and the voters willing I may be back, but in spite of that, I'd rather do something for the future of kids. And I would hope that more and more of us take the stance that a nuclear war is going to put us all to... blow us all to smithereens. I find that the conservatives who were the other way are waking up to the issue. You know who's waking them up? The kids. The kids are the ones that... You know, the kids are the ones that woke us up to the Viet Nam, you know how ridiculous that was. The kids are waking us up to the fact that nuclear war is unwinnable, and all I say is by the inclusion of that Amendment I can'... I'm not only going to vote... not vote 'present', I'm going to vote 'no'. Ted Leverenz gave some presentation in the Appropriation hearing with regards to the Director's travel policies. That's enough to vote 'present' on the Bill; but, because of that... what I

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

thought was a ridiculous Amendment, I am going to vote 'no', and I urge the Members to vote either 'no' or 'present' on this Agency."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I for the life of me cannot understand the hysteria that seems to be being engendered relevant to the possibility of a nuclear war or a nuclear holocaust. Now, I don't stand up here today advocating any such way of settling the differences of mankind. But I'll tell you if anybody believes that it's going to help us or it's going to protect our future generations, if anybody is of the opinion or believes that the way to do that is to sit back and to make no preparations or no study or to leave ourselves utterly defenseless in the event of a nuclear attack, if they believe that's the way to protect their grandchildren, then I suppose that's their privilege. I don't happen to see it that way, and I would advocate if any of you want to look into this a little bit, just pick up a copy of today's State Journal Register, 'How U. S. lost its lead in nuclear weapons to the Soviets' and read it. Inform yourselves just a little bit on this issue, but here we have across this country today a movement which, in effect, says, 'Do nothing'. Let the Soviets go ahead, continue to build up and leave ourselves in a position of utter unpreparedness. I just don't understand it, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let me read just a little bit from this article, just a tiny bit here. 'On the strategic defensive side, which gets far less attention in the U. S. press, the Soviets have an unchallenged lead. They have a civil defense program U. S. officials say could limit deaths to 15 to 20 million in an all out nuclear war; whereas, America's puny program in this area could mean 150 million

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

fatalities.' Now, this is ghastly to even think about, but I will tell you that the Soviets are not sitting back doing some of the foolish things that we're doing. They are considering these factors, and they are considering what their losses might be vis-a-vis ours. And it would seem to me to be a better sense of good judgement to at least think about it and not feel that we can put our necks in the sand like an ostrich, and this whole thing will go away. It will not go away; but to use this argument as a means or a reason for defeating the appropriation to ESDA, to me is totally utterly incomprehensible. I just don't understand it. We need our ESDA. We need the work they do; but to use this hysterical fear as a reason to defeat the appropriation for ESDA, to me is the height of folly. And I would urge you think about this my colleagues, and vote for this particular appropriation regardless of that Amendment that may be attached to it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, maybe I could help shed a little light on some of this. Here we are with a 12 million dollar budget, and we're haggling over a 40,000 dollar federally funded position that is not just merely what the Gentleman who spoke against it says. Let me tell you some of the other duties that this person will be. He's a technician. He will be the... heading the maintenance and calibration unit. Now, what that is, is they calibrate the Geiger counters which are distributed to local communities, in the event of a nuclear accident or problems, if there's a spill from a railroad car with some possible radioactive material. These Geiger counters are distributed to local... to local people, communities, and they calibrate those Geiger counters to make sure there's accident, and that's in the interest of public health. They also head

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the Illinois Plan for Radiological Accidents and coordinate the statewide plan and work with local agencies, and that's the other things they do. Certainly we're not engaged in nuclear war. He would be available for that, if in the event it came, which I hope it never does, but that's not all this position does. It is a vital service in the area of safety with nuclear accidents or problems to local communities, and I think it's... it's just hysterical to get engaged in a nuclear war type of a discussion here in this Illinois House of Representatives and defeat an agency over that one issue. And I would hope that we'd have good sense to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Just for a question."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "I wasn't going to ask you too much more than questions. Could you tell us now the level of the travel line item?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Leverenz: "And also last year's travel line item amount so we can make that comparison."

Wolf: "In central office there's 15,000 in federal and 15 from GRF. That's this year, and I'll hand you last year's figure if you don't already have it. Last year was 10,800 in GRF and 10,500 in federal."

Leverenz: "Well, we have now then, effectively is - am I correct - we have gone from 10,000 to 15,000 in GRF, a 50% increase; and, out of federal, from 10 to 15,000, another 50% increase?"

Wolf: "10,500 to 15 - not quite. Relatively close."

Leverenz: "Well, I guess I shoot golf the same way. Could

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

you..."

Wolf: "... is in the neighborhood."

Leverenz: "Could you explain why that we have a 45% or more increase in the travel line item? The gentleman, if you'll recall in Committee, said that he agreed that about on an average of twice a month he goes out of state, and he attends retirement parties in Indianapolis. He took a state car over to St. Louis and proceeded to take a flight to, I believe, Arizona or California for his personal vacation after attending a conference, and we're paying and allowing this individual to use a state car for his personal use. As a matter of fact, he took his wife with him. So, if we are increasing it by 45 or almost 50%, is that because it's an election year or what?"

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Leverenz, you know, you asked the same questions in Committee, and you brought up the fact that the... that the Director did go on a vacation from another point. There was nothing illegal in that. Speaker Redmond's secretarial staff did the same thing from San Francisco a few years ago. It was at no cost to the state. There's nothing irregular or illegal about it, and I don't know why you continue to bring up that subject."

Leverenz: "The only reason I bring it up, and perhaps you will remember that the Director personally came over and said, 'I will sit down and explain this to you', and he did not return to do anything like that. And I said also in Committee that he could take a direct nuclear hit and survive. Now, it's unfortunate that the Marion disaster money - is that in this Bill?"

Wolf: "Yes. It's in the appropriation."

Leverenz: "Didn't we pass another one, and it's on the Governor's desk already?"

Wolf: "This is the reappropriation, because they won't be able to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

spend the money if we don't reappropriate it."

Leverenz: "That was a tremendous way to make sure this one passed. The problems however in that office - the gentleman has his office here in Springfield and his home in Marion, and I can appreciate the fact that he likes to travel from Marion to Springfield and orders up state planes, I'm sure helicopters and everything else, to do it. I don't understand however why we'd have a 50% increase in his travel, and you can't explain it. So, I would ask everyone to vote 'present', and I'd ask for a 'no' vote if the disaster money wasn't in there. And that's the truth."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to the remarks by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee who says that the purpose for having a Radiological Defense Officer is merely to help units of local government with a possible civil nuclear accident such as railway spills or nuclear reactor accidents, I would simply point out to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee that there are presently on board in the Agency, personnel in the maintenance and calibration section, personnel in the planning and analysis section whose job it is to do precisely what he is suggesting. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would call your attention to the fact that this particular position is funded 100% with federal money, and there are federal strings attached to it. It is the Federal Disaster Agency, the counterpart of our own state Agency if you will, that determines the job description for that person. I mean, they are paying the money for the... the individual, and they get to determine what the individual does. It is their determination, not ours, that says that this person shall advise citizens about what to do in the case of

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

nuclear attack. It is their job description that calls for this person to construct and implement a statewide plan for a nuclear attack so that we do not have a choice in this matter, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, and what I would recommend now, because it's not the money. It is the principle of the thing. After all, it is only 40,000 dollars, but this is a subject which simply is too important to be ignored. It supports... It is a silly appropriation and supports the naive view held by the Reagan administration that nuclear war is a feasible strategy; that a nuclear war is winnable and so; therefore, I think it is important for us to go on record right here and now to tell the Reagan administration to stop this foolishness, to stop trying to hoodwink the American public on an issue that is as important as nuclear war. So, what I recommend, Ladies and Gentlemen, is to vote 'no' on the Bill, put it on Postponed Consideration and then take the Amendment off. It is an Amendment to the Bill. We can very easily table the Amendment. We should have tabled it the other night and then vote the Bill out. So, I am certainly in favor of providing funding to this Agency. I think it's a fine Agency. I think there is... there's money in there for very good purposes, but let's kill the Bill, put it... right now, put it on Postponed Consideration then take that money out, and then we can vote the Bill out of here clean. That's the way we should do it. So, I urge a 'no' vote.'

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom."

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

Speaker Peters: "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."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, turn my microphone off."

Speaker Peters: "Representative... I forgot. Whose Bill was this? Representative Wolf, to close. Close. Gentleman closed. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1405 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Vinson, to explain his vote. One minute. Representative Vinson. No? Representative Winchester, to explain his vote."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Wolf explained in great detail as to the need for Committee Amendment #2 for the Radiological Defense Officer, but I'd like to remind the Members of the House that Amendment #3 reappropriates 1,850,000 dollars for the disaster relief for the Marion tornado that we had a couple of weeks ago. That's... That's a very, very important appropriation, but I'd also like to... to say to the House that Representative... the Gentleman from Chicago, for every year for the last four years, has blasted the Director of the Department of Emergency Services for the location in where he lives. He does live in Marion, Illinois, and that happens to be in my district. And I thank God that he happened to be there when we had the... the tornado, because he was... he was there. He spent 18 hours a day for two weeks coordinating the... the disaster that we had there. He's all over the State of Illinois when disasters occur. He is one of the finest Directors that the Governor has in his Cabinet, and I just don't understand why year, after year, after year the great Legislator from Chicago continues to harass and harangue this Director. His wife... when he took that trip to Florida, his wife was not... her expenses were not paid for by the state, and he knows that. And he knows that it's important for him to attend these seminars throughout

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the state. I would ask him... Well, he's here now. I would ask for a green vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. My 'no' vote on this measure is not against the appropriation of this Agency, but is simply the way to register my views on the Amendment which tries to solve the problems of nuclear war with the addition of 40,000 dollars. I hope that... that we could take some of those green lights off, put the Bill on Postponed Consideration, take it back to Second Reading and amend out the 40,000 dollars that is there to help us win, presumably, a nuclear war..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Chapman, excuse me, Ma'am. Representative Kulas, what purpose?"

Kulas: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are not discussing the nuclear freeze Resolution. There is a Motion on the Speaker's Table. If we get to that Motion, we can discuss that problem. Let the Lady..."

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

Kulas: "Let the Lady address the Bill now and not waste the time of the House."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Chapman, continue."

Chapman: "Heavens, I wouldn't want to waste the time of this House, but I did hear someone say that to fail to vote for this was to have one's head in the sand like an ostrich. And I wanted to say that those people who think they can win a nuclear war, are the ones who have their heads in the sand, just like so many ostriches (sic). It is impossible to win a nuclear war. The difficulties are insurmountable. A bilateral, verifiable freeze is the way to approach this problem."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair reminds our friends in the press, quote, 'friends', unquote, that filming during explanation

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

of votes is prohibited by the rules. And, outside of that, you're right Representative Slape it's not allowed. You're correct. To explain his vote, Representative Findley. One minute."

Findley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There has been some mention of transportation and place of residence of the Director of ESDA, and I can just address a little bit of the transportation question with respect to his appearances within thirty miles of my home. In 1977, Virginia was facing a drought. Erie Jones and ESDA were there to help. The next year Beardstown had a flood. A levy broke. Erie Jones and ESDA were there to help. Last year, Littleton was devastated by a tornado. Erie Jones, again, and ESDA were there to help, and just this week in Beardstown, which faces a school emergency, Erie Jones and ESDA were there to help. Frankly, I don't care where the man lives. He does his job."

Speaker Peters: "To explain his vote, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make certain that perhaps Representative... the Sponsor of the Bill could explain his vote and answer this. Is the 100,000 dollars to fund the Illinois House Foreign Relations Commission in this Bill? Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'nay', 24 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1413, Representative Wolf, Department of Labor. I'm sorry, I missed the Natural Resources. Mr. Clerk, take that one out for now. It's Senate Bill 1406, Energy and Natural Resources. Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act making

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "...this is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. As amended, the Bill is 50,066,700 dollars. Unfortunately, it includes the million and a half dollars for the operation of museums which was added yesterday, which is not in the Governor's budget. I would move the adoption...or the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is... Representative Matijevich, your light is not on, Sir. I did not intentionally miss you."

Matijevich: "No, not really. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I want to correct what the Gentleman said. Fortunately, this...this does include 1,500,000 dollars for the public museums. It also includes 50 million to the Department for the capital development of coal resources at the Abbot Power Plant. I think you've had many who ask you to support that too. We've looked over the Bill very carefully and feel that it is in real good shape, and I would urge the Members to support it."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1406 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'...Conti, 'aye. On this question there are 146 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1413, Representative Winchester, Department of Labor. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1413, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of Labor. The appropriation is 157,763,000 dollars. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Leverenz. The time is up."

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

Speaker Peters: "Indicates..."

Winchester: "He will."

Speaker Peters: "...he will."

Leverenz: "What makes you believe I live in Chicago? No. My district is totally suburban, and my questions in the Appropriations Committee are still unanswered. First do you know now as the Sponsor of the Bill how much is owed to the state by employers because of our enormous amount of money that we owe the Federal Government and the trust fund problems? Do we have an accurate amount of money owed to the state by employers?"

Winchester: "Well first of all Representative Leverenz, I apologize for accusing you from being from the City of Chicago. That was a gross mistake and error on my part, because I should have recognized that with your independence, that you are not...and that you are not controlled by the Chicago Machine, and I...I do feel bad

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

and I feel that you have properly cascaded me or...whatever that...castrated me, cascaded...whatever the word is, and I promise you Sir that I will never do it. But as a Gentleman from the South..."

Leverenz: "Representative..."

Winchester: "No, Mrs. Chapman, I'm talking to this guy. Anybody that lives within 50 miles of the Loop has got to be from Chicago. We have the answer to your question. Unfortunately, it...my staff person says it's down in his office. We are...I've sent him down to get it. It's probably going to take a couple of minutes. Will you settle for letting us come over to your desk and give you that answer after the Bill is passed out?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz, proceed."

Winchester: "I didn't hear that, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady please repeat that?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "I think you were right the first time. Well, let...no, no, no. We don't want to... You know, you asked if someone could bring that information over to me, and someone about ten minutes ago tried to come over and ask if my questions were answered. And, by a letter from the Dir...the Administrator, she really hedges around the answers. The next question to you is how much has been spent or paid out in overpayments to claimants? Because the letter came back saying overpayments that are collectible. We didn't ask that in the Appropriations Committee. We asked for the total amount of overpayments including fraud, and the lady could not answer the question to the closest ten million dollars - give or take ten million. But, the letter indicates that the collectible overpayments are 17 million. Now, three years ago, the employers owed to the state an estimated 23 million

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

dollars. Currently, I understand that figure can be as high as 100 million dollars. The lady only knew of 20 percent, wasn't even close to the nearest...give or take 75 million dollars. In the area of claimants that have been overpaid, whether that includes fraud or not, she was off by over 30 million dollars. The information that I'm telling you now comes from the Task Force, especially put together by the Governor. That's an amount of 150 million dollars, and if we didn't owe so much to the trust fund, we would be able to fully fund State Government by the amount owed to this agency by itself. Do you know the answers to those two questions, or would you rather take it out of the record?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "I think I'd like to take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker, if you don't mind. Representative Leverenz has some very good questions. He addressed them in the...in the Committee. They weren't properly answered. He is a good Legislator. He deserves to have the answer, and I would ask that this be take out of the record for ten minutes."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "1413, out of the record. Representative Barr, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege since we are between Bills at this moment."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Barr: "Last week, Mr. Speaker, I had the, what I considered at the time to be a privilege, to participate with a small number of men and women in a meeting in Chicago, which was widely publicized as a summit meeting to discuss strategy for a last-minute, all-out effort, a bipartisan effort to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

secure the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Participating in that meeting, Mr. Speaker, along with me were the Governor of Illinois, the distinguished Majority Leader of the Illinois House, the Minority Leader of the Illinois House and others and the Chairman, Mr. Speaker, of the Democratic Party of the State of Illinois, the President of the Illinois Senate, who sat with us as we attempted to devise a strategy which would result in the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, and he pledged his support, Mr. Speaker, with the rest of us in that room, unanimously to do everything morally and ethically possible to secure the ratification of that Amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the trust which we shared in that room was violated. When this Amendment was called for a vote in the Illinois Senate and it secured the bipartisan support of Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, and it got 29 votes, Mr. Speaker, and it needed 30 votes. And the Chairman of the Democratic Party of the State of Illinois, the President of the Illinois Senate, a man whose Party just a week previously had unanimously endorsed this Amendment, joining the position which the Republican Party has consistently supported in its national platforms since the early 1940's; and yesterday that Amendment failed in the Illinois Senate, Mr. Speaker, because the President of the Senate, the Chairman of the Democratic Party refused to vote. He sat in the seat of power, Mr. Speaker, and he refused to vote for it. And the Equal Rights Amendment has failed in ratification, Mr. Speaker, because the Chairman of the Democratic Party violated the trust which the Members of his Party placed in him and which the people of Illinois had in him. And I am personally offended, and that's why I rise to this point of personal privilege."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock, what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege also."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have less than five good days remaining to take care of the business of the citizens of the State of Illinois. So, I'm chagrined and somewhat annoyed that the Chairman of the Republican Party of Cook County would rise on the floor of this House and engage in what is obviously political gamesmanship, and attempt to castigate the Leadership of the Senate. Now, the last time I checked the Roll Call in the Senate, I did notice that there were several statesmen who happened, unfortunately, to be Republicans that voted for the Resolution. But the thing that brings me to my feet on this particular issue, is that I know and Members of this Body know that the Senate, probably at this very moment, is going to take one additional vote on the ERA and many other votes prior to June 30th, and rightfully so; because it should pass. But, I'm tired of listening to the whining of the Republican Leadership that has done nothing but violence to women of this state, violence to feminists of this state, and to think that they would disrupt the orderly proceedings of this House with such innocuous accusations that are nothing more than smoke screen. That's all they're interested in is smoke screen and diversion. We have the most violent, the most underhanded tactics God ever created used in this House two nights ago in the Rules Committee when, not once but twice but three time, the Members of his side of the aisle sit silent and engaged in complicity as once again they denied...denied to make permanent rules for this House. We don't need this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

type of shenanigan. We don't need this type of fiasco to take place; but, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that each time you allow a Member from that side of the aisle to rise and to disrupt the proceeding, to cast aspersions on someone who doesn't even serve in this Body, doesn't even serve in this Body; it's unfortunate, and I certainly hope Mr. Speaker, that you will continue to give us a chance to rebut those vicious lies that are being spewed by the Chairman...by the Chairman of Cook County, who sat in a state convention the week before the Democratic Convention and took out of the Republican platform any reference to the Equal Rights Amendment or its passage, and who was the biggest cheerleader for the most anti-feminist in the history of the world, Ronald Reagan; who took out of the national platform any reference to human dignity and human rights. We don't need sinners. We don't need backsliders to preach the Gospel to us. We know for whom the drums toll. We know for whom the drums beat. We listen to the beat of the drum, and the drum tells us that he'd better tell the Speaker to bring permanent rules and give us order and give us an opportunity to change to a simple majority. We don't need that hypocrisy. We don't need that smoke screen, particularly from the biggest sinners in this chamber, the Republican Leadership."

Speaker Peters: "Lad...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have approximately 2, 4, 6, 7 or 8 people seeking recognition. Just a second. No. No, now wait a minute. The...The Chair will attempt to call all those whose lights are on now, and if they wish to speak, I think...now... Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise very, very briefly simply to say that I feel betrayed by what happened yesterday. I have worked long and hard for

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

ten years for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. I am very sorry that it is probably not going to pass in this Session of the Legislature. But, the reasons for that are very clear. The reasons are that lies were told by the opposition about what the Equal Rights Amendment actually said and what it would do. It is not true that ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment will destroy the family. When I first got into politics, I used to believe that reasonable people could sit down and work out solutions and come to ways for solving the problems of the State of Illinois. I'm not so certain that I still believe that. The other day in debate, on the floor of this House, Members on the opposite side got up and said, 'Why do we have to talk about this now?', when we were debating the idea of splitting the school aid payment at the end of June. They said, 'There's no emergency. There's no crisis'. That's just one of the most ridiculous arguments that I have ever heard on this floor. What we need to do here is look toward the future; to think of our children, as John mentioned earlier in debate today, to think about the long term effects of what we do here in the State of Illinois, and to recognize that we do have differences. But, those people among us who are to be admired are those people who are straight with us, who do not say one thing and then, when they have the opportunity to push that button, which the Governor does not have and which only those of us who sit here in the House or over in the Senate have; to sit right there and not push that button is betrayal. And that's why I was saddened yesterday."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't come from Johnson County, where they grow orators there like corn; but, I come from a

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

right pretty part of the state that has a wonderful newspaper, the Evanston Review. And many of you have not had the joy and the pleasure of reading the Evanston Review as I have. And just the other day, I would like to share with you a letter that was in the Evanston Review signed by...well, I forget his name. But he is...he serves in this chamber. He is also the Chairman of the Republican Party of Cook County, and he said, 'ERA is not a partisan issue'. Oh no ERA is not a partisan issue. Those were fine words from the Chairman of the Republican Party of Cook County. And I wanted to share them with you because they were printed in the...one of the finest newspapers in this state, the Evanston Review. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Peters: "The...The Chair now must leave this to the discretion of the Members as to how far we are going on this. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't understand why Representative Barr was in that meeting, and I understand it was a matter of conscience for him. But more than that I can certainly understand why President Rock, after going through that kind of a meeting, decided that he was against the Equal Rights Amendment. It would be easy to understand that, after going through that kind of a meeting. The...The thing that I hope and pray is that, unlike Representative Bullock, I hope and pray that Governor Stevenson, who is coming to Springfield today as I understand it is not going to try to bludgeon...is not going to try to bludgeon the President of the Senate into following his line on the Equal Rights Amendment. I...I sincerely hope that he will recognize that this is an issue of merit and an issue of conscience, and that he will not attempt to compel support

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

for the Equal Rights Amendment from the President of the Senate; that he will let the President of the Senate vote his conscience and vote what the wishes are of the members of the caucus in the Democratic Party as he has so far."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just respectfully suggest that, while this is all very interesting, it would be more appropriate that we got on with the business of the House; and we could set this for a special Order of business, and I would so move for 4:30 on June 26th."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman's point is w...we... This is the position the Chair is in. There are about 19 lights flashing here. Now, let...All right. Hopefully, if we can get away with calling two more people, then cut it off and if we get that settled that way... Senate Bills Third Reading, page two of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1413. That was in and out of the record. Senate Bill 1414, Department of Law Enforcement. Who...Is that Wolf or Vinson? Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1414, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As amended, Senate Bill 1414 is 105,531,600 dollars for the Department of Law Enforcement's ordinary and contingent expenses for FY '83. Included in this is the...the eight percent salary increase for state troopers, which was increased by this House by amendment provision for time and a half for overtime for the state police, and has restored 90 truck weight inspectors. It also stays with the...with the formula of 60 percent GRF and 40 percent Road Fund to provide the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

salaries for the state police, and I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 1414."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the appropriation for this agency is a classic example of how the Governor has done a flip-flop on so many issues. For example, when he introduced his appropriation Bills and gave his budget message, the governor included no funds for the Metropolitan Enforcement Groups. The enforcement of drugs that we've heard so much about from one of his aides, Tyrone Fahner, and now the Attorney General. The matter of...of the fact that he did not include, for the purchase of the 'vitulo' evidence collection kits for the prosecution of rape or sexual assault cases. Until Representative Jaffe made a case about that, the funds were not included for that. This appropriation also introduced...violated the Governor's own task co...Cost Control Task Force...Force with regard to truck weight inspectors. And, probably the most classic of classic examples, is what the...we did with the Bureau of the Budget Amendment with regards to road diversion. Here is a Governor who has told us to pass a law with regards to anti-diversion, yet has come in by Amendment and really gone around the wording of his own recommendation by that statute. Those reasons alone, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the Members to vote a 'present' vote on Senate Bill 1414."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor one question. You mentioned there's an eight percent pay increase, plus appropriations for time and a half. Can you tell me what the salaries are of the state police right now that we're giving them an eight percent salary adjustment?"

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf. Representative Wolf.

Repeat the question, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Could you tell me approximately what the salary is of the state police that we're providing an eight percent salary adjustment, say with five years' service?"

Wolf, J. J.: "All right. Approximately 18,000 dollars for a..."

Terzich: "About 18,000 dollars and we're giving them an eight percent salary..."

Wolf, J. J.: "That's"

Terzich: "And we're giving them an eight percent salary adjustment. What are we also providing for the other state employees as far as salary adjustment, eight percent also?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes."

Terzich: "But they don't make 18,000 dollars on an average. I would assume they're about 10,000, right?"

Wolf, J. J.: "I'm not sure what the average is."

Terzich: "Thank you."

Wolf, J. J.: "Almost as much as the firemen, I think."

Terzich: "Oh, excuse me. Did...Is the starting salary 18,000 or is the average about 22 or 23,000 dollars for a state...state police?"

Wolf, J. J.: "I said it was about 18,000 for a rookie trooper."

Terzich: "That's starting salary, isn't that correct?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, that's provided by this General Assembly. That seems to be the will of the General Assembly in this and past Sessions."

Terzich: "And approximately, if they have five years service, it would be about 22 or 23,000 dollars when we're giving them an eight percent salary adjustment."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yeah, there's a step increase along the way, so you're probably pretty much on the money."

Terzich: "Oh, well, they do just about as well as the Judges, I would assume."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this legislation has indicated that, I believe it was, 80 or 90 truck weight inspectors have been put back on; however, these truck weight inspectors are similar to the revenue agents we heard so much about earlier. They generate more revenue than goes to their salaries. Everyone who is employed in that area generates revenue for the State of Illinois. It makes no sense to lay these folks off. Secondly, Representative Matijevich has mentioned the Road Fund. Here, we're allowing the Road Fund to be drained first. We're going to take all the money that's needed for this project out of the Road Fund until that percentage is used up. Thirdly, I'd like to point out to this Body that we have a nice cushy relationship between our current Attorney General and the former Director here. We have a nice contract for Dan Webb as special Assistant Attorney General for his law firm; so that he can work for law enforcement, get a little money for his overhead, and we take care of the buddies. Tyrone Fahner's taking care of his buddy Dan Webb in this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins and then Katz. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I have a question or two of the Sponsor."

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

Robbins: "I was wondering if the...has there been an addition to the title of this Department of Law Enforcement to include the Department of Harassment?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Not at this time."

Robbins: "Are you aware that a public hearing was held in Southern Illinois. The Department was given notification and the results of the hearing of harassment of officers?"

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Wolf, J. J.: "No, I was not aware of that. I thank you for the enlightenment."

Robbins: "Well, let me explain a little of the harassment then since you're not aware of it. One thing for sure, in Southern Illinois, when you pull into the grocery store, you don't take your keys out of the ignition. You go into a grocery store, you buy a loaf of bread or whatever you buy, and you come back out, not expecting to find a ticket on your windshield for leaving the keys in your ignition. Does that happen in your part of the state?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes."

Robbins: "You...You know...You know of them writing tickets like that then, in your..."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, the City of Chicago's police give tickets for that."

Robbins: "That's good. I'm glad to know that they take care of things like that up there, too. Yesterday was the first day that it was really fit to cut wheat in Southern Illinois. They were combining wheat in the town of McLeansboro, the officer was doing a real good job. He was intercepting the trucks at the elevator, moving them 30 miles to the station and weighing them. If they wasn't overweight, why, he would check very closely to see if he could find a light out, see if the license was dirty and make them clean the license off on these trucks. Now when you need to work in the field you need to work in the field and you don't need to be harassed. The...The county sheriff called me this morning and asked me if there was anything that I could do because of the problems being caused by this. They are...The Department of Law Enforcement has been of great help. They have moved a port...a set of portable scales to the elevator so they can weigh every truck as it comes to the elevator, and then

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

they can go on the scales. That's nice. I contacted the State's Attorney to find out what was really going on, and he said...he asked if...if the state police didn't have anything to do but to harass the people. There were 16 burglaries in the county the last month. Why couldn't they help patrol the roads except for speedies...speeders and for the trucks? The opinion of the people of the state police and the Department of the Law Enforcement in our area is so low right now, that it makes me feel bad because of the good officers that we have. There needs to be some money put into this to...a budget. Yes, but it needs to be put in for law enforcement. It needs to be put in to try to help protect the people, and not ride them to death. The State's Attorney made the comment that he could not - now listen to this - that he could not use a couple of the state police officers in the county, because the feeling was so bad that it would destroy his case. He couldn't even call them in court, even though they are the ones that wrote the ticket, and the Judge is routinely dismissing them. Now, this is...this is very serious. We need something to straighten this out. I have voted for every appropriation Bill, I believe, that has come up. I will continue to try to vote for appropriation Bills on the Department of Law Enforcement. But if something can't be done on this I would ask that this Bill be held today until we can get some kind of results from this area. Because in our area right now there are three sets of portable scales running around the elevators to see if they can't pick up more money for the state, find a farmer that's wheat is weighing 65 pounds to the bushel instead of 56 pounds to the bushel. And you find that variance and you can't tell by looking at a truck how that wheat is going to test in its test weight. So I ask for a 'present' or 'no' vote on

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

this appropriation."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz. No. Representative Katz.
Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman from Rock Island, one of his main concerns in speaking against this Bill was that the state would lose a lot of revenue if we cut 90 truck weigh inspectors out of this Bill. Well, the fact is Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to be very shortly probably within the next six months, the United States Congress and the President of the United States has already indicated his support that it will be a state...or a United States...nationwide 80,000 pound truck limit. The only reason we need the truck weigh inspectors is because, now in Illinois, we have a 72,300 pound truck limit and there are those that were driving up to 80,000. We were able to catch those, and we were able to fine them. It's not necessary now, because we are going to 80,000 pounds. That is the maximum limit that our trucks can drive. So, his arguments really...really don't hold water, and I would ask that we support this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, during this debate now, the distinguished Minority Spokesman on the Appropriations Committee has asked for a 'present' vote. The Gentleman from Rock Island has questioned improprieties. Mr. Terzich, apparently, thinks the state troopers are paid entirely too much salary, and we hear from my other colleague about the harassment of the state police who are enforcing law. I'm thinking maybe this is a bad Bill. Maybe we shouldn't have a state police. Would you take it out of the record, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. That's the second one that

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

we've talked about for half an hour and have taken out of the record. It does appear that we are getting closer to staying here tomorrow. Senate Bill 1415, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and various state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As...In its final form, this appropriates 13,709,000 dollars for the ordinary and contingent expenses of law enforcement...Illinois Law Enforcement Commission for FY '83. There is 1,005,600 dollars in GRF, 400,000 in us...user fees and 11,394,700 dollars in federal funds."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I guess I should respond to some of the comments the Chairman said in the last Bill. I haven't really been doing much different than I have much of this Session, because we are sort of negotiating as we wind down, and sooner or later I'm sure we'll come close to what a balanced budget may be. And I'm not sure of that, but it may be only a perception of a balanced budget. On this Bi...And I think I've been cooperating along the road. But, on this Bill, Jake, you don't...not only you don't have to take it out of the record, I support it. We support it."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1415 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 160

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1417, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act making appropriations..."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on a second, now. Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Could you hold that a while? There's a Democrat Amendment coming from one of the Senators, if you can."

Speaker Peters: "All right. All right, we will...we will, so that we can get them all together, we will pass... Representative Bower, are your Amendments all ready on that Bill? Is everything all set? Representative Matijevec, on 1418 are we ready with that? All right. Senate Bill 1418, Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of amending."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman asks leave...Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rule so...to take Senate Bill 1418 back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, J. J. Wolf, amends Senate Bill 1418 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, Amendment #6. Representative Wolf, Amendment #6. Who is it, now? Bower? Representative Bower on Amendment #6."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6, which is agreed to, merely

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

corrects...corrects a drafting error made by the Senate,
and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question
is...put it up on the board. 'Shall Amendment #6 be
adopted?' Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye',
opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
have it, and Amendment 6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, J. J. Wolf, amends House Bill...House
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1418."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower, Amendment #7."

Bower: "I move to table this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #7. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, J. J. Wolf, amends House Amendment #3
to Senate Bill 1418."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower, Amendment #8."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Amendment #8 corrects a drafting error. It makes
no change in amounts, and it is also agreed to. I would
ask..."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #8.
Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed
'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.
Amendment #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, J. J. Wolf, amends House Amendment #1
to Senate Bill 1418."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower, Amendment #9."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. This Amendment corrects a technical error in House
Amendment #1. This replaces Amendment #7, which we just
withdrew because it had an error in it also, and this is
also agreed to."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

is, 'Shall Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1418 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is adopted. Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 35(c), by using the Attendance Roll Call so that Senate Bill 1418 can be considered immediately."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there...wait a minute. Further Amendments? There's an Amendment 10 here."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Winchester, amends Senate Bill 1418 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. Representative Winchester on Amendment 10. Representative Bower. Winchester or Bower. Representative Bower on 10."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Illinois has been selected as the host state for the 1983 annual meeting of the Mine Inspectors Institute. This would appropriate 15,000 for the cost of that meeting, which is being matched by other states."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 to House Bill 1418 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 10 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative...Representative Bower."

Bower: "I now move to suspend rule 35(c) so that we can immediately consider this on Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'... The Gentleman have leave? Is there objection? There being none, Third

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Reading. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mine and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Mines and Minerals. I would ask for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "My 'present' vote explanation is only because of some questions regarding the whole budgetary process, and therefore, I would urge Members to support this 'present' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Oblinger."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Oblinger: "Under Amendment #1, Representative Bower, I notice it eliminates three mine inspectors in the general office. Are these the three 'at large' inspectors? And if so, why are they being eliminated?"

Bower: "It restores them."

Oblinger: "It said it eliminates three mine inspectors in the general office in the paper that we have here."

Bower: "They were added back in a subsequent Amendment, in Amendment #2."

Oblinger: "Specifically, it doesn't mention that, and I want to be sure that they are."

Bower: "Yes, they were added back, Amendment #2."

Oblinger: "All right."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1418 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

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 131 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 26 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1419, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to take this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendments. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Matijevich, amends Senate Bill 1419 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #7."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #7 appropriates 100,000 dollars to reimburse local units of government who participate in programs authorized by the Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. What has happened under federal law, at nuclear plants like my Zion Commonwealth Edison Plant, they have to go through emergency preparedness drills. However, the local governments are expending goodly amounts of money, and they don't have those funds available. Representative (sic - Senator) Joyce passed a Bill in the Senate, and I believe it's passed here too, which would provide reimbursement to local units of government for this purpose. All this does

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

is incorporate that through the appropriations process. It is supported, I understand, by the agency. I would move for it's adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1419 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, J. J. Wolf - Vinson, amends Senate Bill 1419..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson, Amendment #8. 8."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question, initially. I believe Representative Matijevich intended to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, I understand you were going to do something with that, Sam."

Vinson: "Okay. I would move to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves to table...Gentleman moves to table Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1419. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 6 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Vinson: "Now on...Now, on Amendment #8, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #8, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I would move to adopt Amendment #8 which substitutes a new Section, 1(a) in the Bill. The previous Section 1(a) had 241,000 dollars. This would raise the level for equipment to 317, for contractual services to 151, and in 1(a)1, for contractual services to 442, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1419 be adopted?'. "

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

Amendment 8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, J. J. Wolf - Vinson, amends Senate Bill 1419..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf. Representative Vinson, Amendment #9."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of Amendment #9 which facilitates in the appropriation...in the appropriation Bill the recognition of the fact that the Legislature's passed House Bill 2496, the Nuclear Safety Emergency Preparedness Fund, and the amount would be 2.2 million dollars."

Speaker Peters: "The question is... Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1419 be adopted?'. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #9 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that we suspend Rule 35(c) with the Attendance Roll Call for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1419."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

1419."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, this agency has been very cooperative with me and my staff since they've been created...our staff, I keep saying that. Cullerton wants me to keep saying our staff. And I stand corrected. However, because of the whole budgetary question still unresolved, I'm going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate... Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1419 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 135 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 21 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1420, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1420, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the House to return Senate Bill 1420 to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, J. J...."

Speaker Peters: "Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "...J. J. Wolf, amends Senate Bill 1420 as amended."

Wolf, J. J.: "Withdraw Amendment 7, Mr. Speaker."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Withdraw."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #7. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Watson, amends Senate Bill 1420 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Watson, Amendment #8."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 simply changes the language from 'agencies' to 'agencies for printing and distribution of wall certificates'. As you may recall, we passed legislation here that is now on the Governor's desk to allow for the agency to issue wall certificates. The Governor's office and the Comptroller approved the language of this Amendment, and have asked for this Amendment to be adopted. Both staffs have worked on this. There's no problem. There's no cost involved, and I move for the adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1420 be adopted?'. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Davis, amends Senate Bill 1420 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis, Amendment #9."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 adds back into the...to the Bill 579,000 dollars, 240...579,240 dollars in GRF for the expenses of operation of the 2121 Taylor Building in Chicago; that is, the University of Illinois' Circle Campus Medical School laboratory that was inadvertently left out of all the budgets this year."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1420 be adopted?'. "

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now move to suspend the provisions of Rule 35(c) in order that this Bill be heard on immediate consideration."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1420, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The new total of the Bill, which is now the...the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Central Management Services Fund is 297,836,909 dollars, which represents, with the Amendments, a combination of the old Department of Administrative Services and the Department of Personnel. And I feel at this point I should apologize to the Democratic Spokesman and to his fine staff over there for an inadvertent error, that a request was brought to me and added in some money that we inadvertently - and I take full responsibility - forgot to tell them about. But, notwithstanding that, this is a new shakedown agency that was covered under the Executive Order. This is the budget, and I heartily enlist your...your support for this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, a couple of things. One, neither in Committee nor on the floor yet, have we been made aware of the fact...usually it happens in Committee, and ordinarily it

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

happens from some Springfield Representative who gets into a discussion about the group insurance costs. I think the Body ought to know that the group insurance has been increased by 26 percent this year. That's a significant increase. I'd also like to discuss, very briefly, our staff worked for some hours because a person came to my office and sa...he represented a computer company, and he said, 'You know, we really can't compete against IBM, because IBM's really got a lock on the business, and we make a comparable product'. And so, what I was concerned about was the fact that he thought the taxpayers were getting cheated in the process, and I said, well, that's something then that we ought to discuss in the Committee. And our staff and Steve Stalcup from the staff spent hours with this Gentleman, and at the...the day, the very day of the hearing when this Gentleman was going to testify in Committee, low and behold, another person who represented that company who I know, a former Legislator, said, 'Well, we want to thank you for what you've been doing with regards to the unfair treatment of our company, and we're negotiating and things are working out'. The day of the hearing, the Gentleman that was going to testify, the former Legislator who was an attorney for the company said, 'Well, he shouldn't testify. It shouldn't be appropriation matter'. And so...so he didn't testify. I talked to the Director about this matter, and I said, 'You know, I didn't want to present that in Committee only to help that company...to help that company get business now or in the future. I wanted to see what the procedures were; if there were competitive bidding at all on comparable products. I just want to make sure that the public isn't getting ripped off'. The Director had a meeting in my office, and Mr. Giordano, Fred Uhlig and the staff. I sensed that the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Director now, at least, is more open with the Legislature about the operations of that agency. I didn't feel that same openness, for example, last Session when I dir...directed similar questions to former Director Toolen on this same issue. The reason I bring this up is because I have been concerned for years about the purchase and lease of computer products in the state of Illinois. We really don't have the oversight on it that we ought to. I believe that in the future, they're going to handle it a little differently, and I think that's good. That's some good that comes out of the appropriations process, and I want to compliment the Director on this openness. I am going to vote 'present' because of what's happened in the...in the past and the uncertainty of some budgetary problems. But, I thought this was such a serious issue that the Body ought to know about it."

Speaker Epton: "Any further discussion? Representative Davis to close. Gentleman moves the adoption..."

Davis: "Well, I'm terribly sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'd simply ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Epton: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment...Amendment #3...The question is, 'Shall 1420 pass?'. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Peters in the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'nay', 38 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Took my pen. Representative Matijevec, 1524's got Amendments? Is that to go back to Second? All right. Senate Bill 1524, Representative Matijevec. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as many of you know, sometimes during the appropriations process, everything doesn't work out, and you sometimes need a Bill to put everything together. This is one of those so-called vehicle Bills, and all this Amendment does, I guess, is create a flat tire so that it can be repaired down the road in a Conference Committee. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1524."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeich... Representative... Representative Matijeich, you'll need a Motion to take it back to Second."

Matijeich: "Oh, I'm sorry. Would we have leave to bring Senate Bill 1524 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of our flat tire Amendment?"

Speaker Peters: "You...You have...You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Matijeich, amends Senate Bill 14...1524 on page one, line five..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeich, Amendment #1. The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1524."

Matijeich: "It's a reduction of 17 dollars, by the way."

Speaker Peters: "...to Senate Bill 1524. Is there discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, we're always delighted to save money, and we certainly support this Amendment."

Matijeich: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is...The question is, 'Shall

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1524 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Now, could we have leave to hear Senate Bill 1524, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "The Order of Third Reading."

Matijeovich: "On the order of Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Representative...Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have honestly put forth that Senate Bill 1524 is a vehicle Bill, which may not be needed at all, but it ought to be placed in the pro...procedure where it could be in Conference Committee, if needed. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1524."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1524 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye' 20 voting 'nay', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reilly, are we ready? Senate Bill 1417, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this Bill brought back to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #22, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 1417 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "What is it, Mr. Clerk? Amendment #22, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would withdraw Amendment 22."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment 22 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #23, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 1417 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson, Amendment #23."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to show that Representative Stuffle, Leverenz and Bower are Cosponsors of Amendment #23."

Speaker Peters: "Leave."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #23 reflects the compromise arrived at in regard to community mental health funding. It will provide a million dollars for mental health, alcoholism and developmental disability grants to community agencies. It will delete the reductions that were previously contemplated in regional staffs and in the central office, and it will add 200,000 dollars for patient care positions at the Lincoln Developmental Center. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

is, 'Shall Amendment #23 to Senate Bill 1417 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #23 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #24, Schneider, amends Senate Bill 1417 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider, Amendment #24."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

This comes to me as a surprise, but I do discover that it is a good...good idea. There is a..a problem in Illinois that relates to behaviorally disordered children in which we find ourselves unequipped or ill-equipped to provide education and mental health care services to those children. As a consequence, we send those children out of state, and we have a concern that, when the billing comes due in regard to this matter, that those students...or rather those families, are unable to pay that. We wind up being limited by the Purchase Care Review Board as to what constitutes therapy versus education and, as a result, I think we went into a...we have been in an extended period of time over the last two or three years when the local school district and the State of Illinois have been involved in a variety of court cases; one being the Gary B. case, the other being the Claudia K. In each of those cases, the contest really focused on the question of therapy and educational services. But the real problem beyond that I think is that the State of Illinois has no facilities to deal with those joint services; that is, education and psychological services. So, what we are proposing here, that the Henry Horner Center be allocated 100,000 dollars for the purposes of providing those kinds of services...services that include both education and psychological services. It would be a worthy project, if

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

we could begin to say to the people of the State of Illinois and the parents who bear that extraordinary burden of cost that we have that local facility in the State of Illinois, and we do not have to send the children to 'Elon' in Maine or in California or to 'Brown' in Texas; but rather, that we, the State of Illinois, who have been for a long time a leader in special ed could now also provide combined services of education and psychological services. And on that brief comment, Mr. Speaker and Members, I would urge the...the Body to support this 100,000 dollar additional money for the...to Senate Bill 1417. It is a well-programmed idea as well as a good program, and I hope we can endorse it. It's a good step in the right direction."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't tell you how enthusiastic I am about the program that Representative Schneider is talking about. I've been around about 25 years working in the area of special education. One of the real problems that we've had is that the Department of Mental Health and, now with our State Board of Education, they don't work together. We've got a program now where there are the both components. The Senate is going to take care of the 100...100,000 dollars for the State Board of Education, and we in the House are asked to come up with the 100,000 dollars for the Department of Mental Health. If you ever saw these youngsters who have to be sent out of state, at the cost sometimes of 100,000 dollars for each youngster, you would understand the importance of putting this program together. It's not going to help just a few children. There are many behaviorally disordered youngsters in this state, and we pay for them and we pay a lot of money for them by sending

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

them out of state. This is absolutely one of the best programs, one of the best Bills I think we've had. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the Amendment I was holding it up for as a courtesy to one of the Senators who is a good friend of mine, and he sent this over. Unfortunately, I find myself in the position of having to oppose the Amendment, because it is unbudgeted money. It is general revenue funds, and it is new money, never before budgeted. And I find myself in the position of having to oppose it for that reason."

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

Schneider: "Well, I guess it's always tough on the budget question, and I know you're all trying to line up your priorities. Just let me tell you this; that it is critical for the State of Illinois that you...we begin to put in place, as we get more and more of the local and state responsibility for these kinds of programs. I would also note that we have lost, as the State of Illinois, both of those cases. Both Gary B. and Claudia K. have cost the State of Illinois approximately 60,000 dollars. That money should have been in the Purchase Care Review Board budget. It was not budgeted. I think we're doing some really silly things these days, obviously, and I'm sure I contribute my share of silliness. But let me just say this, that why should we accumulate legal fees to the tune of 60 grand, and then deny the State of Illinois and the people that we purportedly serve the opportunity for a pilot program. Again, it's...you know, divide up your priorities and try to make that decision on that basis. I think it's really one of the more enlightened steps that we can take this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

year. I would urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #24 to Senate Bill 1417 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Amendment is lost. Representative Schneider. The Gentleman has a remedy. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "With four of my other colleagues - we'll all raise our hands, right - and we want a Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. I see. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #24 to Senate Bill 1417 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'...or voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 120 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present', and Amendment #24 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Smith, what purpose...Irv Smith, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Smith, Irv: "Thank you, Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing side of Amendment 17, I move to reconsider."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #17 was adopted. Those in favor... It failed? The Gentleman... Well, I assume that it's okay on your side of the aisle, now, you know. I just get little notes up here. Please restate your Motion, Representative Smith."

Smith, Irv: "Thank you. Having voted on the prevailing side of Amendment #17 which failed last night, I move to reconsider."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn, on that question."

Flinn: "I move that Motion lie on the table."

Speaker Peters: "Representative... Well, we've got another

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Motion now, Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I was busy talking to somebody from your side of the aisle, and I...on the Representative's reconsideration of McPike's Amendment, my understanding that that was almost agreed to."

Speaker Peters: "Well, I assume so."

Matijevich: "And what happened to it?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn now moves that that Motion lie on the table."

Matijevich: "Would you take that out for a moment while we talk to Flinn?"

Speaker Peters: "Well, I don't know that I can. It's his Motion. That's the last piece before us."

Matijevich: "That's what we want to talk to him about."

Speaker Peters: "Well, the Chair will adjust his shoelace while you do that. ...Ebbesen, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the microphone turned on over there over that conversation, so we could all listen in."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich and Flinn, I'm reminded of the Open Meetings Act. You ought to keep your mike open there, so we all know what you're talking about. Representative Flinn, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, our language wasn't fit for an open microphone."

Speaker Peters: "Oh. Have you reconsidered, Sir?"

Flinn: "I...I've been...They've been trying to convince me that I should reconsider. I'd like to talk about the Amendment itself. If they're right in what they say, I would reconsider. I know it's out of order not to...we can't

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

discuss the Motion to table, but I have information that this would do great harm to the mentally disabled from that area down there. My standpoints are taken away from the contractual service, put in the line item personal service, and I...it's pretty obvious to me that the Governor will line item veto it out. And the disabled...mentally disabled will wind end up a quarter of a million dollars short of what they were going to get otherwise. That's my only objection."

Speaker Peters: "What's your pleasure, Representative Flinn? Representative Reilly, a way out. God bless you."

Reilly: "I think it is, anyway. If we could simply...If he would withdraw his Motion to table the Motion to reconsider passes (sic - passage); at that point, Representative McPike then moves adoption of the Amendment, and we debate the Amendment and vote it up or down."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "All right. I realize that last night there was no discussion. We seemed like we were in an awfully big hurry, and sometimes we get too fast for our own good. For the reasons that Representative Reilly has given, I will withdraw my Motion to table."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman withdraws his Motion. Now, Representative Irv Smith moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1417 lost. Okay? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 104 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Amendment #17. Representative McPike, Amendment #17."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There was very little discussion of this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendment last night, so I would like to try to explain it again. It does not add or detract money from the mental health budget, but it does rearrange a 200 and some odd thousand dollars. The FY'83 budget for the Alton Mental Health Center proposes to eliminate 18 positions that are currently filled. Now, these are 18 AFSCME employees that provide services to the mentally ill. They are going to eliminate these 18 bud...18 positions, and this money, 266 thou...266,000 dollars has, instead, been budgeted for an outside provider to come onto the grounds, that is, onto the mental health grounds themselves, and to provide the same services to the same mentally ill that were previously supplied by AFSCME employees. Now, I...I maintain that this is a step in the wrong direction. These are qualified, trained state employees. We are eliminating their jobs. We are taking the money that was previously paid to them. We are giving it to an outside provider. We are giving it to an outside provider to come onto the grounds to use a building owned by the Mental Health Center, and to provide the same services in the same facility that were previously supplied. Now, as I said before, some of us has...have objected in the past to deinstitutionalization; that is, dumping people on the community. I think this is a step more in that direction. This is really removing the care of the mentally ill from the state altogether and farming these programs out, although keeping the patients on the ground. I think it's a comple...completely wrong way to go. I think the money should be kept in the mental health budget so that the trained employees who have been providing the service can continue to provide the service, and I see no reason why we should take this money and give it to someone in the community to hire new people to come on and replace state

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

workers. I think it's a bad idea, and I ask for your...your approval of this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. Now, I realize that this is in Representative McPike's district, but let me explain to you; his main argument is that we should not contract out. Well, this is not a bargaining table here on the floor of this House. It's the most qualified people for helping the mentally disabled or...or in the business of contracting with the state. That's where we ought to do it. In the first place, I said a few moments ago and I still believe it; that if we take this out of the budget as a contractual matter and put it in the line item for personal services for the Alton Mental Hospital, that will show them a quarter of a million dollars higher than it was intended in the Governor's budget, and he will simply line item veto it. It...Sure, it will give the Governor an opportunity to save a quarter of a million dollars, but it will be at the expense of the mentally disabled. I think we should give due consideration to this thing; that there's some people going to suffer if we do what Representative McPike's Amendment suggests. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Cissy Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's my understanding that, if this Amendment passes, the services to the mentally ill are going to be delayed and the program, perhaps, is going to be...have to be completely revamped. The contract, it's my understanding, has been made with a community-care organization. The professional help is in place. They are ready to go on July 1st, and I

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

even believe the contract has been signed by the state so that if this Amendment passes it's going to delay any type of assistance to these mentally retarded until they have...they renegotiate this contract and until they put a new program in place. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm not as well acquainted with the program as some of the people in that area; but, as I understand from my questioning of certain Members, as I understand it, this program is being well-run by the Association of Retarded Children in that area. I think the Gentleman that's proposing the Amendment wants to move the whole program to Alton for some particular reason which is not evident to me, and doesn't appear to be a good move. I would ask to join others in defeating the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Rep...Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Amendment. I...First place, as a matter of principle, I agree with Representative McPike on the contracting out issue, but I'm not sure we even have to decide that right now. Representative Vinson, with his Amendment, has added a million dollars to the community grant line. What this does, really, is put the money back in personal services if, in fact, the Madison County Area Association of Retarded Citizens is going to be shorted on its grant. The Governor has the option of making them whole. So I, at least, support the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in support of this Amendment. What Representative McPike is really attempting to do is to see that these

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

people in this institute in Alton are given high-quality care. Under the present system, the people in Alton Mental Health are given the on...on-line care right there in the Alton Health Center. Now, what the...what the Governor is proposing to do is to eliminate these positions and, in effect, to farm out this care to those peoples in the community; but, actually those people who are lesser trained. I think if we want to provide good, quality care, we want to see that these...these people who are in Alton Mental Health Institute are taken care of properly, we should vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "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 McPike to close."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Lady from Belleville suggested that the services would be delayed if this Amendment were adopted. I don't think she understood that the services are being provided today, last week, last month and last year, and they will be provided for the rest of this month by the employees that are currently on board at the mental health facility in Alton. They currently perform these services. Representative...The Representative from Peoria suggested that I wanted to move this program to Alton. The program is at the Alton facility now. The Mental Health Department does not even propose to move it out of Alton. They simply said that they are going to terminate the state employees and have someone from the community bring their own employees onto the mental health ground, into the mental health buildings and provide the same services that were

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

provided by the employees that they have terminated. This, to me, makes no sense. It's a step in the wrong direction, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "The question...Representative Vinson, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "On a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "State your point."

Vinson: "Now, Amendment #23 has been added to the Bill previously by action of the House. I have just been advised that Amendment #23 and Amendment #17 are inconsistent. Now, we have the problem that Amendment #17 comes after Amendment #23, because of the peculiar way in which we've gotten to this. I would query of the Chair whether this a problem, if Amendment #17 would be added, which can be resolved through Enrolling and Engrossing; or if in fact Amendment #17 were to be added, if that would invalidate the one million dollars that have been added by Amendment #23 to community mental health grants for developmental disabilities, alcoholism and mental health or whether in the alternative to that, Amendment #17 given the way it's inconsistent, is now out of order."

Speaker Peters: "...Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker on that point, Amendment 17, even though we are considering it now, is Amendment #17. It comes before Amendment #22 or whatever that number you said; 23 I guess Sam. It's just before us now because of the Motion to reconsider, but it still is Amendment #17. Turn off the mike. Jim and I are talking now. We violate the Open Meetings Act."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McPike, on this point."

McPike: "Yes, if this Motion prevails, Amendment 17 is obviously numerically before Amendment 23; but 23 has already been adopted. So, there wo...there will not be a question as to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

whether 23 is technically right or not. It's already been adopted, and the Bill would be moved to Third Reading."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber, on this point."

Leinenweber: "I suggest it's premature until after we vote on it."

Speaker Peters: "Decision from Solomon. Representative Reilly, the Chair requests you take this out of the record. Out of the record. We will suggest that this be redone with another number, and making sure it's not inconsistent solves everybody's problems, including Enrolling and Engrossing and the Supreme Court, eventually. Out of the record. Where are we at now? 1422? Oh, excuse me. For the purposes of an introduction, the Honorable Lawrence DiPrima, Representative from the County of Cook."

DiPrima: "Ladies and Gentleman, we have Senator Bob Mitchler here, who is now employed by the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and while he was in the Senate, was my right arm over there. He's got a few kids here from the American Legion Police School that he wishes to introduce. Take it away, Bob."

Bob Mitchler: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Once again, it's a pleasure to bring to you and present you to them, the 1982 Officers of the 12th Annual Illinois Legion Youth Police Program. This is a program that is sponsored by the American Legion in which we have 62 high school juniors, boys and girls, it's a coeducational program, and they spend one week - from last Saturday until tomorrow - out at the Illinois State Police Academy here in Springfield. Now, it's not a recruitment program for law enforcement, but basically it was designed so that the junior high school students that were selected could have a rapport with people of the law enforcement. And this was accomplished by having rap sessions and getting an

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

understanding of what police work is all about, problems that the police officers have, the state troopers and also what the problems are on the minds of our junior high school students. And it's a very worthwhile program, and this is the 12th year that the American Legion has sponsored it. At this time, I would like to introduce to you the three officers that were elected, and I might say, out of the 62 attending, 23 were girls and 39 are...39 are boys. So, a ratio of 23 girls to 39 boys, but the girls won out. Now, how about that? They took all three top offices. So, Susan Catania...Representative Catania, you see, you're winning your cause. The Secretary, coming from Blandinsville, Illinois, I know that was Senator Ken McMillan's district, Crystal 'Poulter'. Crystal. And the Vice-President, coming from Springfield, Illinois, right, a home town girl, Amber 'Vertinen'. And the President of the 12th Annual American Legion Youth Police Program is from Byron, Illinois, Marie 'Lindgren'. Marie. Marie's going to say a few words, very few."

Marie Lindgren: "I'd like to thank the American Legion for making this opportunity possible. Thank you."

Bob Mitchler: "Thank you very much."

DiPrima: "Bob has got 4th of July speeches. For any of you that would like a copy, come and see me."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeich, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijeich: "Well, as long as we're on the Order of National Defense, I just heard the report that Alexander Haig resigned."

Speaker Peters: "I was going to make that announcement."

Matijeich: "Maybe the hawks want to get up again."

Speaker Peters: "The...For..For the information of the Membership, Secretary of State, Alexander Haig has resigned

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

and has been replaced by George Schultz. Evidently all happened because of that radio expert and their nuclear safety thing. Where are we at? Where are we at, Mr. Clerk? All right. 1422? 1445, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State and Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1445 reappropriates...reappropriates 403,315,000 to the Capital Development Board for various permanent improvement capital projects as part of the CDB's FY '83 budget request. I would ask for a favorable vote. I mi...I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill was originally introduced at 451 million. It's been reduced down to 403 million."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1445 pass?'. Those in favor 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 136 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 27 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1400. We will now continue back in order there. Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

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

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the House. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Capital Development Board...Oh, I'm sorry. This is the appropriation for the new capital for the Capital Development Board. The appropriation is 135,976,000 dollars, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill, because I...I think there's still some question regarding the monies in...in this Bill for funding of planning and conversion of Bowen Mental Health Center. I think there's still some question in my mind and the court has not resolved it with regard to the conversion of the state institutions at Dixon into a...the conversion of a correctional facility. I think that, by our 'present' vote, we can show that these questions haven't been answered. The fact that we're talking about planning for a new correctional site in addition to those that we've already agreed to, that nobody knows where it's going to be. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge the Members to vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I...I, too, stand and recommend a 'present' vote on Senate Bill 1400. I think that two specific problems are inherent in what has been presented. Number one is that the reappropriation that we've just addressed a few minutes ago has no guarantee from the administration that those programs that were authorized and priorities set by last year's General Assembly will be completed and authorized before the new authorization, which you are now looking at in 1400. This was brought out in discussion on Second Reading. And number two, I think we're taking the wrong step as it pertains to mental health and developmental disabilities, specifically the Dixon Developmental Center;

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

when in fact, and if in fact, Judge Staniec order is retained and those clients will be still members of that facility living there in Dixon, Illinois. I believe, also, that there should be assurances to Members of this General Assembly on the new site locations for the correctional facilities. It was the Governor's position, and, I believe his promise, to many Members of this General Assembly that a site selection for the new correctional facilities would be maintained and made public within the budgetary process, and that's what we're looking at. The site selection and change provision for the Dixon Developmental Center, I do believe, was in Amendment #2, if I'm not mistaken, and that 30 million dollars was for conversion. It is my feeling that, since the Governor's statement was that we should close the mental health facilities to save six million dollars, so far this Session, we have spent approximately 50 million dollars, which is certainly no cost savings, when you include the cost of conversion, the duplication of the same provisions for certification at other facilities and then add the additional cost for corrections. I guess it's time that this General Assembly takes a good, long, hard look at a priority and a provision, and that is, do we eliminate the funding for the human services and put all of our money into correctional facilities and take good care of those individuals in society that do have a determination and a chance. But, they gave that chance up by stepping on the other side of the line as it pertains to criminal behavior in this state. I happen to believe that we should direct our interest to human services, and not continually put those funds that are needed in other areas into correctional facilities. And I respectfully request a 'present' vote on 1400."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bowman: "Couple questions of the Sponsor."

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

Bowman: "What, with all these Amendments on it, what is the total dollar amount that we are voting on, at this point?"

Winchester: "135.9 million."

Bowman: "135.9 million. Okay. Now, that is all bond money?"

Winchester: "No, there's 924,000 GRF."

Bowman: "Okay, so something on the order of 135 million in...in..."

Winchester: "In bond money."

Bowman: "...in bond money. Okay."

Winchester: "Less than a million in GRF."

Bowman: "Now, does that include the...the debt service, the...the interest payments that will have to be made over the years, or is that just the...the initial outlay?"

Winchester: "That's just the House Committee and the House floor additions. No, that does not include those."

Bowman: "Okay. I see that there is a state debt impact note filed. I know that those debt impact notes have information on debt service. Could you tell me how much it's going to cost to...to pay off these bonds?"

Winchester: "Yeah, if you'll just give me a minute. I'm sorry, Representative, I don't have the information with me."

Bowman: "Okay. Okay, well, I'll...I'll help. Acco...According to my estimate, and if I'm incorrect, please do let me know, but I've been looking at these state debt impact notes, and I've been amazed at the effect of the rising interest rates on the amount of money that we have to pay back. You know, time was, if you borrowed a dollar, you had to pay back \$1.60. That was when interest rates for municipal bonds were low, around five, six percent. But, now that the rates are up around 11 and 12 percent, the...the ratio between what you borrow and what you have

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

to pay back is two and a half to one. So, for every dollar you borrow, you have to pay back two and a half dollars. So, this...this Bill that we're voting on here is 337 million dollars in state resources that will have to be...that we'll have to come up with, and in order to...to meet the obligations imposed on us by this Bill. So, I think everybody should know before they vote that what we're talking about here is 337 million dollars. That is an awful lot of money, and I'm...I'm not sure that all of it is wisely spent; so that...I believe that the prudent vote in this case is, indeed, a 'present' vote."

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

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Believe it or not, this year's request for capital funding is...is much, much less than what it was last year and the year before and the year before that. The Committee Amendments that we have put in this Bill are important to both sides of the aisle throughout the State of Illinois. I notice that there's an Amendment for 40,000 for the conversion of a mental health facility to a nursing home at Anna. There is 30,000 dollars for the conversion of the Dixon State Hospital, and there's 6,439,000 for food for Century 3 projects at the University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University and Western Illinois University. There's important projects for all areas of the states in this appropriation Bill, and I...I've heard the request that we vote 'present' on this Bill. That's nothing more than simply a political game to delay this appropriation to be used at a...at a later time, probably this week, for negotiations in a Conference Committee, and I don't think we have the time to waste in this House to play those kind of games. And I would ask that we simply

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

vote this Bill out and get it going."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1400 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 97 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', 57 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1402, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1402 appropriates 4,223,000 dollars for the FY '83 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. The Bill was introduced at 4,312,000, and we're passing it out of the House in this legislation at 4,312,000. To me, that's quite an accomplishment, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Chairman (sic - Speaker), Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, reduction for reduction's sake sometimes is foolish. I think all of us are aware that this agency had a fairly substantial staff reduction. Some of us even know some of the people that were reduced from staff. That's all right if, in the process, we still have a...an effective agency doing what we, the Legislature, feel that it ought to be doing. What has happened though, in the matter of capital improvement projects, we are left now by the elimination of many staff without a responsible three

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

or five year plan, so that we are knowing where we are going with regards to capital projects in the State of Illinois. I think that is a failure in this particular appropriation Bill and what's happening in CDB. Also, CDB is very valuable in its assistance to local governments in making recommendations to those local governments with regards to capital projects. We, by reductions in this agency, now find that that assistance and cooperation with the local governments is no more. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am also going to vote 'present' on this Bill, Senate Bill 1402."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'm sorry. The distinguished Gentleman from, I believe, Hardin answer a question?"

Winchester: "Yes."

Leverenz: "In the contractual line item, is the former paid director that was on personal services now being paid contractually?"

Winchester: "No, it's my understanding that he was only on for one month. He is not being paid any money out of correctional or any monies Capital Development Board at all."

Leverenz: "Is it contemplated that he will return?"

Winchester: "No, definitely not, I'm being told. He's got a big job in New York."

Leverenz: "When does my job in New York come through? Thank you."

Winchester: "Next year."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1402 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 48 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1404, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and certain other agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Just a second, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1404 is the FY '83 ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. The Bill was introduced at 186 million. It's coming out of the House at 189 million, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Peter Fox has replaced Mr. Castle as the Director of this agency. This agency has come under a lot of heat since it was created, and mainly the heat has come from the state Chamber of Commerce who actually was looking for the creation of an agency like this. They felt that it wasn't doing the job that we thought it ought to in stimulating business and the economy in the State of Illinois. Mr. Fox has met with me in my office, and I think that, as compared to what the agency was doing and what it's doing now and the direction and leadership that he is providing as compared to what Mr. Castle was, I think is a vast improvement. I did discuss with the new Director and I believe it was mentioned in Committee, that one of the problems is that, with regards to the...the training program, the agency isn't targeting those training programs

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

in the areas of high unemployment. And the response by the agency was that that wasn't the business of the agency, to target in high unemployment areas; that it only could do that if there was a statutory change. I'm not sure if that's true. But, if that is true, then I would have thought that that would...would have been the responsibility of the Department to come forward with that recommended legislation and move it along in this General Assembly. Because, I think it is important for the economy of the State of Illinois that we do something about our very, very high unemployment. And this is the agency that ought to be looking toward that. I get the feeling sometime that all this agency has done in the past has been one to be a public relations type of agency. It ought to do much, much more than that. I think that's the problem that it had in the past with the state Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and similar organizations like that. In spite of the fact that I feel that the agency has improved based on the fact that it isn't doing much more in the area of high unemployment, I again will vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1404 pass?'. Those in favor 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 116 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 40 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winchester, are we now ready on 1413? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1413, a Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, we just...just two minutes ago got the answers for Representative Leverenz, and it's being delivered to him, so he's going to need probably 5 or 10 minutes. Can we go one more Bill, then come back?"

Speaker Peters: "All right. Senate Bill 1414, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1414, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "This...This Bill was discussed previously, and was just taken out momentarily. So, Representative Wolf to formally present the Bill."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have debated this thoroughly. The phone has been ringing constantly. The state police would like to get paid, and they'd like this Bill passed."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support the state police, and surely supported the eight percent increase for them. I've supported the time and a half overtime for the state police. However, I did discuss certain areas of concern, which I believe that this time, justify a 'present' vote. We know the Bill's going to move out, and I'm going to fight for the state police all the way along the line, in the Conference Committees, if we have to. But, at this time, I vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1414 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Representative Robbins to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

would again ask a 'present' or a 'no' vote on this Bill. I asked the Director to try to iron out some things on this about three or four months ago. No action has been taken, and if you...I feel like that until you change this...title of this Bill to the Department of Law Enforcement and Harassment, that you should not vote money to give the state police... Now, I'm...I'm very serious. I am proud of our state police, and I don't think that they should be forced by their commanding officers to take these ticket quotas, destroy the prosecutors' cases in court, and if...if we don't do something as individuals, we will destroy the respect of the public for our state police. And when we destroy the respect of the public for law, you do not have anything. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Katz to explain his vote."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did want to comment that I think it is fine that we think so much of our state police, but I do believe that we ought to also recognize that other public employees are just as good and just as devoted and just as loyal as the state police, and I vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take...Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 29 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1413, Representative Winchester, was also discussed previously. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1413, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Where we left off was, Representative Leverenz

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

was asking some questions which I...I certainly hope you will recognize him to continue with his questioning. He di...He did have some questions that I think were very valid questions, very important questions, questions that were not answered properly in Committee, answers that were not given to him properly through his telephone requests and through his staff requests. And I agree with him that he has a right to feel the way he does towards this agency and other things that he has that are problems with the agency. But we have, I think, in the last 45 minutes, answered those quest... obtained those answers to his questions, and I would now defer to him to see where he wants to proceed from that point."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. I...To the Gentleman from Hardin, certainly has more clout than I've ever seen anyone, in a long time, display in a matter of minutes. We find...and to the Bill, Speaker, we find that the Bureau of Employment Security, an agency that is almost in shambles, the overpayments to employees, which are called claimants to the system, now amounts to 57.9 million dollars in overpayments, fraud and non-fraud. The employers owe to the system not 74 million dollars, as the letter indicated apparently, or that is part of it; but, the total amount owed to the Bureau of Employment Security by employers is 111.7 million dollars, about 160, then, total - maybe 170. The Administrator for the Bureau of Employment Security time after time, year after year has come and asked for appropriations to solve data processing problems. The consultant contracts which, for the most part are non-bid, single source contracts, for FY '81 amounted to 4.3 million; in FY '82, 3.5 million; and now asking for the high priority to solve the problem of a 6.5 million dollar

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

amount of money for data processing contracts. And for the most part, again, they are single source, non-bid. For the Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security to allow an unemployment office to close is unbelievable. For almost a year, the district that I serve has been without an office. The lady said that they have looked at 40 locations. Nothing could be further from the truth. The best is that they looked at one place almost 40 times. The problem of looking and locating an unemployment office and leasing for the state is with the Department of Administrative Services. Yet, the Bureau of Employment Security retains ten employees to do nothing but look for offices and settle real estate problems. The Bureau of Employment Security, the Administrator, in Committee finally said that they are negotiating for an unemployment office. The Department of Administrative Services did not know that the negotiations were even taking place. It's unfortunate that Representative Winchester and his legislative abilities have had to be overtaxed to get this budget out. It staggers the imagination that the lady is even left in this responsible position, and maybe the whole thing should be given to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to properly administer. I appreciate Representative Winchester's ability and time in getting the answers, but now we know. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery, at the northeast corner of the chamber, I would introduce Willard and Mildred Webb, very good friends and neighbors of mine and the mother and father of the Parliamentarian of this House, Ed Webb."

Speaker Peters: "Welcome to the House. Representative Matijevich."

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Patijevich: "You know, I always like to compliment somebody when it means something to that person, and I think all of you know I've known something about the rules during my time in this Legislature. But, I want to here and now, when his parents are present, compliment Ed Webb, not only in the job he does as a Parliamentarian with the rules that he makes, but in the manner and demeanor that he does it. I don't know of a more decent person I've met than Ed Webb down here."

Speaker Peters: "Thank you, Representative. It's tough keeping him in line. Further discussion? There being none, the question is, ... Representative Winchester, to close."

Winchester: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do want to say that I think that Representative Leverenz had every right in the questions that he asked. I'm not happy with the way that he was getting his...his answers from the agency. He was not being shown the proper respect that is due to every Member in this House. I think we have corrected that now. I appreciate the comments that he has said. I have agreed that I will work with him on...on certain issues. I intend to keep that promise. We have a good piece of legislation here, in that we are talking about less money than what we were last year, and I would ask for a favorable vote for the Department of Labor."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1413 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 107 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'nay', 32 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representatives Reilly and McPike, are we ready? I believe

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

1.1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

so. Senate Bill 1417 is still on the Order of Second Reading. Representative McPike moves to table Amendment #17. Can he just withdraw? All right. Amendment #17 is before us. Representative McPike withdraws Amendment #17. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #25, McPike - Hannig..."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #25, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not to take any more time of the House, the debate had been closed on this, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. This is the...the Amendment that we debated 15 minutes ago that AFSCME has asked everyone to vote for. AFSCME is upset that the State of Illinois is eliminating 18 professional trained employees from the current mental health budget, and replacing these employees with a...with employees from a private organization, will be brought onto the mental health grounds to provide identical services in state buildings that were previously provided by AFSCME workers. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Sponsor of this Amendment is trying to make a speech and cut off the debate all at the same time. I doubt if he has that right. I don't belabor the with a point, he is right that the subject has been discussed, but there's been some misinformation. For example, the Cosponsor of this Amendment left the impression a while ago when we were discussing the other one, that part of the mental hospital in Alton would be shut down, and people would be kicked out of work; and he implied that patients wouldn't be getting served. It has nothing to do with those patients whatsoever. It is an outside service. There is a group of people who have already contracted with the Department,

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

121st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

starting July 1st, to furnish this service. They are well-qualified, and as I stated before on the other Amendment, the same thing applied here of course, because it's identical; is that, if you are successful in passing this Amendment, it will transfer the money from contractual to personal services, and the Governor, most likely, will promptly line item veto out the quarter million dollars, and the people who need this service will not get it. Those union people who are crying so loud about losing their job won't have this money either. So, I would ask that we vote this Amendment down."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Reilly. Excuse me. Representative Hallstrom before you."

Hallstrom: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't agree more than I do with Representative Flinn. Now, I just talked with the Sponsor of the Amendment, and my understanding was that someone was going to come over and explain this better to me. Now, this Amendment failed last night. We've had it a second time already today. It's now up for the third time, and I tell you that the important thing is what's going to happen to the patients there. And I agree with Mr. Flinn... Representative Flinn, and I'm afraid that the Governor will line item this out and we will not have the money for these patients. And I urge, please, that you vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Just briefly in support of the Amendment, as I indicated before. It seems to me just a matter of philosophy, I guess, I agree with Representative McPike on this particular point, though we don't always agree. But, it also seems to me that with the money that we've added in Representative Vinson's Amendment, if in fact this private agency is shorted on grant money, we can, or at least the

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Governor can, deal with that. So, I will be supporting the Amendment."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are obviously two different stories on this. I can only...I can only tell people that what I know, I...and have been informed of. The current employees at Alton Mental Health Center are providing services to the mental patients at that center. Some of them will be terminated, 18, so that the identical services can be provided in the future by a private agency on the Alton Mental Health grounds. I think that's wrong. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #25 to Senate Bill 1417 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all... 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 93 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. On this question there are 93...On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'nay'. Vinson, 'aye'. Speaker, 'aye'. Grossi 'no'. 95 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'nay'. Amendment #25 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to...to suspend...use the Attendance Roll Call to suspend the provisions of 35(c) for immediate consideration of..."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Rep...Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act making

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "...as it stands now, is a total of 582,118,100 dollars for the operations for the Department of Mental Health. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to sincerely say that I have had some problems. I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill, but I have had some problems in recent years with the philosophy of the Department of Mental Health. I think we all believe that we want to go away from the old theory of warehousing of the mentally ill that we've had in the past. In going away from that philosophy, what we've done is, we've said, 'Oh, we want to deinstitutionalize'. But no matter how we do it, it's right just because we're deinstitutionalizing. I don't think that's necessarily right; because what I've seen is there have been cases where we have taken the mentally ill out of inst...state institutions, and dumped them into some nursing homes that aren't worthy, that really don't take care of those mentally ill patients. That's bothered me. What's bothered me in recent years is that we...we haven't followed what we intended that Department to do; to proceed with plans that we, as a Legislature, then know what the direction of the Department is. I've talked in the Committee about the whole matter of the compliance plan and, in fact, told the Director if...if in private enterprise they had...anybody had done what the Department had done, they've have put...been put in prison for criminal fraud. Because, what we were doing was using the matter of Medicaid reimbursement and really, it was all a

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

falsification. It was all a fraud. We were using it to get federal funds, and we were saying that we were...we were renovating Dixon for example, and in the process getting these funds where we were putting patients temp...temporarily in certified beds. It was all a facade just to get federal funds, and I think this is very unfortunate; because all along evidently, the Department must have had plans that we were going to close that facility or ren...or transfer it and convert it into a prison. That to me is very close to being a fraudulent act, and now it may be that we owe the Federal Government many millions of dollars because of that, quote, fraud. I mentioned to the Department Director that I get the distinct feeling, and I've mentioned it not just this year in Appropriations Committee, but in the past too; that the Director and his staff really isn't the...they really aren't the ones that are promoting the policies within the Department. The Department is one department that has really caved in to the Bureau of the Budget, and in my mind that hurts the Development...Developmentally Disabled in Illinois. It hurts the mentally ill. The decisions...The decisions that really make the difference in what we're doing to the treatment of the mentally ill and the developmentally disabled are being made by the Dir...Director of the Department of...Bureau of the Budget. And I've said right before his face that he doesn't know anything about human services. No Director of any Bureau of the Budget has their minds on...on the development and the administration of...of services, human services. All they're worried about is balancing budgets, let the chips fall where they may; whether their acts are heartless or not, whether they do anything to treat the hum...the mentally ill or the developmentally disabled. Those are

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

very serious problems. I would hope in the future that some of these problems are directed. I...I really feel, and this isn't anything political about this, this agency has been a problem with us under both administrations - Democrat and Republican. I don't see any improvement; when there was a near scandal under Democratic administrations than there is now. I think we've got a long way to go, and I really think that there ought to be some middle ground where institutionalization is good in some...some cases. I don't think it's good just for the sake of...of getting people out of institutions, that we immediately dump them somewhere else just to get them out of...of certain institutions. I don't think we do a good job of monitoring our wards. I think we do a horrible job. In other words, what I'm saying, we...when we transfer the developmentally disabled, we really think we're getting them out of our hands, and many times there are deaths. There are deaths in nursing homes that are covered up, and I think that's serious; that the kids now may not only be treated poorly, but they are actually mistreated, maltreated and actually die because of that mistreatment. These are things I think we ought to address. I don't say that be...just because I want to justify a 'present' vote. I am going to vote 'present', but I say this because I think that both administrations have done a poor job, and I hope in the future that the mentally ill and the me...developmentally disabled can be treated much better."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1417 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 114

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

11st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 44 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1422, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates 3,036,451,300 dollars for the operations of the Department of Public Aid. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "You know, that was the quickest explanation. I've always said, when you spend a lot, you say the least, and I don't even think I have to justify a 'present' vote after that. And in fact, it's so much money, I think there's going to be a lot of 'present' votes anyway. I am going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1422 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 89 voting 'aye'... Representative Hannig, we know why you want to vote 'aye'. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "I'll be glad to talk as long as Representative Matijevich would like. Let's poll the absentees."

Speaker Peters: "Poll of the Absentees. Before that, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, we'll be starting with 83. Representative Karpiel, from 'present' to 'aye'. ...Just hold on. Just an announcement. The Elections Committee will meet at 3:30 instead of 3:00 o'clock. 3:30 instead of 3:00."

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

121st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Representative Catania."

Catania: "Please change me from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon? Representative Catania from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative... Representative Wolf, from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Macdonald, 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Reilly. Representative Alexander from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Kornowicz, from 'aye' to 'present', and Representative Balanoff, 'aye' to 'present'. Is that it? Representative Bartulis. Representative Bartulis, from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Jack Dunn, from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "'Aye' to 'present', please."

Speaker Peters: "From 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Kelly, from 'aye' to 'present'. Well, shall we take another one or... Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I guess we've had enough fun and games. How about dumping the Roll Call and take another Roll?"

Speaker Peters: "Is there objection? Dump the Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 14...please, only those who are here, flip your switches...Senate Bill 1422. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1422 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reilly to explain his vote."

Reilly: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members, I understand the problems. Everybody would like to vote 'no' on this Bill. The fact is you can vote for it now or you can vote for it later. If you vote for it later, it will cost more money and it will keep us here an extra week. So, I mean, the only honest thing to do is to vote 'yes'."

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

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Turner. Representative Turner. Representative Katz to explain his vote. Turner. Katz? No? Representative Friedrich, Dwight."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that those who think the Judges ought to get a 30 percent pay raise won't vote for money for the poor."

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

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure I know what's happening. There's been a lot of time put into this particular Bill. I know it's a sizeable amount. We all know what it's for, and the people really who are voting 'present'...I mean, frankly from my district I could vote 'no' on this thing, and they'd probably give me a medal for it. We all know that these people have to receive their assistance. The...The ones who are voting 'present', in many cases, are from districts which are very vital and very important that this thing pass. Now, I guess we can play games and I guess we can let it go down and fool around. It will come back later on another Bill. Staff's going to go to work. They're going to have to draft it up and put it on another Bill. We can play all the games we want. I think it's time for us to put...put our votes on the board, and let's get the job done."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I guess, just reiterating what the last speaker said. I could vote 'no' on this Bill. I should be voting 'no' on this Bill. The people on the other side who have their lights on yellow, it's their constituents more than mine that are going to be needing this Bill. I don't care if we stay here another week. In fact, I could vote 'no', go home and never care if we came back to take care of this. I hope that everybody will take a good look at that board, and

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

those people who this is important to will get on there and get this thing taken care of."

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there may be a game being played.

I..I've always felt very strongly, and I've said that in the House before, when you have an administration that the party of that administration ought to back up that administration. There's some on this side of the aisle feel very strongly about the level of assistance, for example. But...And we're not at that level under this Bill. But I don't know why for example, that your party can't sup...we'll give you enough votes to bring it over. But, if you look at that board, your party ought to almost pass the Bill by yourself, because it is your administration. You talk about playing games. What are you ashamed of? You know, we want the Bill to get passed, but we don't feel it's our obligation as a Minority Party to pass the Governor's Bill for his Department. And I'll tell you, when there was a Democratic Governor, I had votes on for virtually..."

Speaker Peters: "Conclude your remarks, Sir. Okay? Representative Leinenweber to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Well, the last Gentleman's comments are extraordinary, to say the least; that he's indicating as I understand his remarks that we Republicans have an obligation to vote for the Bill, regardless of what's in it, because the Governor happens to be a Republican. And the Democrats, regardless of the merits of the Bill, do not have an obligation to vote for it. I was always told that we should vote for legislation based upon the merits and the merits alone. And, obviously, the previous speaker doesn't ascribe to that, and apparently a lot of his people that are blindly following his lead don't either."

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

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

Robbins: "I...I think that the points that Representative Matijevich made was very good. We do have people in the nursing homes that rob the decency of the elderly to be...to have these people in there...in these homes with them. They are not receiving the care that they received in the state institutions. There is no, and I repeat, there is no ti...these people they put in these nursing homes, some of them could be educated to a degree. But, there is no educational program in these nursing homes, such as has been in some of the state facilities. I do not necessarily say I am in favor of taking...putting people in the state facilities, but I am in favor of putting them there..."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe we're playing a, not only a dangerous game, you're playing Russian roulette, and really the people who are going to be hurt are the people that unfortunately are at the downtrodden point of the economic system. And between the Federal Government and now the State of Illinois, we're saying that, 'Yes, we understand your plight and conditions, now we're not going to pass your three billion dollar appropriation, because we want to have every Member of one Party or another supporting that issue; make it a political issue. And the total conservative vote of your appropriation process is a tragic mistake'. And for any...for the people from Chicago and the people...whatever portion, let's say, you're from, if you have a high degree of unemployment and people that have gone off the unemployment rolls and the unemployment compensation system, the only other alternative is public aid. I'm not a firm believer in public aid, but it's an area that I have totally supported. Because, unless you've

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

been there, you don't realize how important it is. And unfortunately, more and more people are being placed in that position. And for any other Bill to be held in hostage two times in the same Legislative Session, it's a tragic mistake, and this Bill should be supported. We should get the business done with. We should get the appropriate necessary votes to get this Bill out of here. It deserves an 'aye' vote at this time."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 92 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'nay', 53 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1498, Representative Rigney. Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1678, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Peters: "That, I believe, excuse me, is the last appropriation on Third Reading to this point."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1678, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Originally, this was a Legislative Information System OCE. Everything after the enacting clause was deleted, and now it appropriates 30,000 dollars for the Governor's Council on Health and Physical Fitness for the Prairie State Games. It...It appropriates 25,000 dollars to the House Rape Study Committee, appropriates 75,000 to the bipartisan House Committee on Medical Assistance Program, 800,000 dollars to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant to the City of Aurora for completion of a drainage

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

project, and 3,000 to the Governor's Office of operation for a Hispanic toll free telephone number. I don't know how you put a telephone number in Spanish, but it's in there. Total Bill is now 933,000 dollars."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijeich. Discussion? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Speaker, I am the Cosponsor of this. Every year we have a Bill some call a Christmas tree. This year the Christmas tree has less ornaments than ever in the past. I would urge your support."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1678 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? Last time, have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 121 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Telcser, you ready? Senate Bills Third Reading, Substantive Bills, page three of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1656, Representative Telcser. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1656 is really the product of the legislative process, something with... something which each and every one of us becomes more intimately involved in as each Session goes by. And, as I have said before in discussing this Bill, I have paraphrased the remarks of the Minority Leader which are so true, and that is that the genius of the process is to

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

compromise and to get what you can and then perhaps someday continue to work and fight for what you believe the proper action should be. Senate Bill 1656 is a statewide grand jury Bill which deals only in the area of narcotics, narcotic trafficking and drug abuse. This statewide grand jury Bill would help us to vote the resources of our great state in what has become and is becoming a more and more complex crime, the crime of narcotic trafficking. Senate Bill 1656 has a number of major provisions. First of all, it allows the Attorney General to convene a statewide grand jury when there are multi-county offenses, and in doing so the Attorney General would first have to receive permission from the state's Chief Justice, and again receive permission from each individual state's attorney in whose county the Attorney General would like to cover in the grand jury investigation. The Bill, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, takes effect in January of next year so that there should be absolutely no political overtones in reference to Senate Bill 1656. No one knows who the Attorney General will be next year after the November election. And so, therefore, I emphasize that this Bill has absolutely no political partisan overtones to it, as was alleged in its earlier versions. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members, I'm sure, I'm sure that there are some among you who oppose this Bill for a variety of reasons, and I imagine that as we had on Second Reading, we will hear from some people that this is a nothing Bill, it's watered down, it doesn't mean anything and; therefore, we shouldn't pass it. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, for those who are going to rise on that point, it seems to me that if it is such a nothing watered-down Bill, then you ought not oppose it so vigorously, and you ought not be so worried about it. I simply say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members, that this

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

statewide grand jury Bill is going to help us, in Illinois, help us in some measure, whether it's large or small, but will help us address ourselves to one of the most insidious, devastating facets of our society, a facet which, unfortunately, is growing by leaps and bounds. Is there one among you who does not agree that trafficking in narcotics is one of the worst possible crimes conceivable, because it eats away at our youngsters, particularly? I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Senate Bill 1656 is a measure which will help us stem that horrible tide; and, although I agree with Members on this floor that I had hoped this Bill could be stronger, I do believe that this Bill gives us something. It gives our law enforcement agencies something when dealing with the problems of narcotic trafficking in Illinois, and I would like to remind the Members that a variety of law enforcement agencies support this legislation. And that last year an organization comprised of state's attorneys - I don't recall its make-up or how it's organized - but last year they supported the legislation with the provision that they would have to give their permission before the Attorney General could come into their county. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, I emphasize to you that Members on both sides ought to support Senate Bill 1656 in its present form. It could be one more step forward in trying to fight this horrible, horrible disease of narcotic trafficking in our great state. Mr. Speaker and Members, I would sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration in connection with Senate Bill 1656."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

that, if this Bill receives the neces... 89 votes or more, I would ask for a verification. Let's just review, for a few minutes, what this Bill is and how it got to where it is right now. Originally, this Bill was introduced at the request of the Attorney General for the purposes of setting up a statewide grand jury to indict people; the polluters, the drug dealers and the con artists. And the way the Bill was set up, the Attorney General would ask the Supreme Court Justice's to convene a grand jury and pick the county. They would set up a grand jury. They would pick jurors from that county and from other surrounding counties, and their purposes would be to indict. And then their job would be done. That's what the Bill did. Now, the reasons why the Bill was never needed are clear, and I think just about everybody here knows it; but again I will review them for you. The state's attorneys can already indict people. They already have 102 county grand juries, and those grand juries have the power to send subpoenas statewide. They have the power to arrest people statewide, and everyone knew that this did not add one bit to the law enforcement efforts of anyone. The other thing that is, to me, kind of personally... I was very disappointed to see the Attorney General send letters out to newspaper reporters indicating that this would solve the problem of multi-county crime by allowing the Attorney General to conduct one trial for multi-county crime. That simply is not the case. Either he intentionally misrepresented, or he doesn't know what venue is, which is in the Constitution that says that, if the... that the trials must occur in the counties where the crime took place. But he still tried to come up with an idea for why this Bill was good. That's the pitch that he used. And everyone also knows that the U. S. Attorney's Office already has jurisdiction

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

over all of these crimes right now, and this would be a third person who could come in and indict. I also might add that everyone also knows that the Attorney General right now, under present law, can indict anybody who he wants by using the current county grand jury system by simply asking the state's attorney if he can use the grand jury. And the Tyrone Fahner told us in Committee that, in the 164 year history of Illinois, not once did ever a state's attorney turn down the Attorney General in asking him to.. when he asked to use his grand jury system. But then remember, this Bill is not the same Bill that was first introduced. They took out the power to indict the polluters and the con artists. Apparently, we can let the polluters and the con artists run from county to county for a few months longer. Right now, we are just going to worry about the drug dealers. Now, we had some Amendments to this Bill, and those Amendments were very important. The first Amendment was Representative Yourell's Amendment. That said, for this Bill to have any meaning at all, we can't let the state's attorneys veto the power to indict, because that's what Mr. Fahner did with his Bill. He cut a deal with the State's Attorneys' Association and said, 'Okay, before we can indict for drug cases, we will need the state's attorneys' concurrence'. So, Representative Yourell put an Amendment in that said, for this Bill to mean anything at all, we can't let the state's attorneys veto a power to indict remain. If he has the power to veto right now, let him indict himself. There's no need to let the Attorney General indict, but the Attorney General said, 'No'. He didn't want to strengthen the Bill, because he had cut a deal with the State's Attorneys' Association. Then Representative Getty had an Amendment. Representative Getty's Amendment said that, if the A.G. gets the

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

headlines, then he... when he indicts people, then he has to promise to do the work. That is, he has to promise to actually try the case; because, if he loses the case, he might take some heat, but the Attorney General said, 'No'. He wanted the headlines, but he didn't want to have to do the work. Then Representative Hannig had an Amendment that the Attorney General also opposed, and that said, we want you to indict polluters. We don't want them going from county to county dumping their pollution, and the Attorney General said, 'No, let them run from county to county for awhile. We'll worry about that some other time'. Representative Telcser has indicated, what are we so worried about? If this is such a harmful Bill... or such a watered-down Bill, what are we worried about? There are very many problems, and bad things can happen as a result of this Bill. As I said before, the state's attorneys and the U. S. Attorney already has jurisdiction. The Attorney General would be a third person who could come and indict. Well, what's wrong with that? Recently, in Chicago - maybe some of you remember reading about this - an FBI agent working on a drug case was arrested by a Chicago police officer working on a drug case. That was an example of two bodies that can indict that did not have the cooperation with each other, and they got crossed up. Now we're going to say there's going to be a third person to come in so we can have a third person to try to gum up the works. Immunity can be given to people. Can you imagine three drug dealers all getting immunity; one from the U. S. Attorney, one from the state's attorney and one from the Attorney General? And there wouldn't be anyone left to indict. Now, the Attorney General says that this... this is not really a problem because we have put in the Bill, we have put in the Bill the veto power of the state's

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

1. 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

attorneys to indict. Well, that's true, but that's a veto power to indict. It's not a veto power to investigate and to grant immunity. So, the statewide grand jury can still be set up. He can still go out and give his immunity and work with undercover agents, gumming up the work that's currently being done by the state's attorneys and U. S. attorneys, and then when he goes to the state's attorney and asks him for permission to indict, it would be too late because the damage would have already been done. Representative Telcser, the first time he introduced the Bill he was very proud to tell us that the Sun-Times and the Tribune were in favor of the Bill. Well, the Sun-Times and the Tribune have come out with recent editorials, and I'd just like to quote from some of those. From the Sun-Times, 'This is a cheap imitation of what it once was. This new Bill allows statewide juries to probe only one area - drugs. Unfortunately, that's the one area where the Attorney General's Office is weak. Fahner isn't asking for more money to hire more people, though his aides say he'll fill vacancies with drug experts. We're concerned that this might weaken his staff in areas where they have proven its competence.' With respect to the Chicago Tribune, 'This Bill has been repeatedly watered down to meet objections from various interests. By now it's all water. There is no practical difference between this and the present system and no visible advantage in having the Attorney General move into areas already covered by federal and county authorities. Mr. Fahner's Bill has become a waste of time, and the Legislature has none to waste.' Now, Representative Telcser said with a straight face that this was not a political Bill. We all know that he's spent over 100,000 dollars in campaign funds to try to get this Bill passed, and then he bragged about the fact that he

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

didn't use any state money to pay for those ads. That would be an interesting precedent, wouldn't it? I think that everyone here knows that it's a political Bill, but it's a harmful Bill at the same time. There's no need for us to play politics with law and order. I think really that's what we're doing here. In the past, there's been Republican Attorney Generals who have proposed this particular Bill, even Republican Speakers of the House have voted against it, and I also would suggest that that former supporter, Mr. Scott, right now, I bet, is probably not so much in favor of expanding the power of people to indict. It's a very harmful Bill. I think I've pointed out, on its merits, why it's not needed. I think I've pointed out, on its merits, why it can be a very bad Bill, why it can hurt law enforcement, and I would ask all of you, please, to look at the merits of this Bill and to vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has been before us on a variety of occasions. I have really gone out of my way to urge my conservative friends on the other side to really stick with the traditions of conservatism. The Illinois Constitution gave law enforcement powers to the various state's attorneys, and they did it for a very good reason; that these state's attorneys were at a local level. They did not give the power to the Attorney General; because, in the very nature of being Attorney General, you are a statewide, political figure in Illinois, and there is no worse combination in the world than giving the powers of..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Katz: "To give the powers of law enforcement to people who are engaged at the top level of politics in Illinois. It is like mixing alcohol and gas. It is a dangerous brew. Now,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

fortunately, we have had an opportunity to observe the present Attorney General, even before he got these powers, to indicate to the public at large how he would use the powers of law enforcement. He has gone around the state singling out particular Legislators implying that these Legislators, in some way, are soft on crime; that they are trying to protect the drug dealers. He is misusing his power, and his position as Attorney General. The ads all say, 'Attorney General Ty Fahner'. These ads say, 'Need your help in the fight against...(cut off)... And then, he proceeds to identify particular Legislators. To the average citizen looking at that, it really would look like the Attorney General is accusing the individual Legislator of having done something terrible, of doing something criminal. Well, I want to tell you, why am I saying that? Why am I saying that over to my friends on the Republican side? Because what Attorney General Ty Fahner has done to Democratic Legislators here - Attorney General whoever he may be - Neil Hartigan or you name him, a Democratic Attorney General can do the same thing to Republican Legislators, and that is why the drafters of our Constitution did not put the Attorney General in a law enforcement position. Well, you know well enough the distinguished Majority Leader when he tells you that the Bill has been watered down and what's wrong with it in its present posture. I can tell you that once these powers are given to the Attorney General, he will be right in there each time getting more and more powers, and he will be getting powers to investigate official corruption, as if local state's attorneys are not interested in official corruption. And, once the Attorney General of Illinois gets those powers, and it will be very difficult once the precedent is established of denying him those powers, you

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

will see an Attorney General misusing the powers of law enforcement to try to win political contests. And for what? For this kind of Bill we're going to establish a precedent, a Bill that the Chicago Tribune says, in its present watered-down version, is absolutely worthless. For that we are going to destroy more than a hundred years of constitutional precedent in Illinois. I say it is now the time we have seen the future. Attorney General Fahner has made his greatest contribution to our cause. He has shown how political an Attorney General can be, and how he can direct those powers, indeed, misdirect the powers of the Attorney Generalship for political advantage against individual Legislators and other individual public officials. I say, let him do a good job in those powers given him under the Constitution. Let him stay out of areas that were given, historically, to state's attorneys all over the state. Let us reject this attempt to go against our long constitutional tradition and vote "no" on Senate Bill 1656."

Speaker Peters: "...on zero now. Alright, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am not particularly opposed to the concept of statewide grand juries. In the past in this House, I have voted for that legislation. I voted for that Bill last year. Twice in Committee I have voted for these Bills; and, as I stated, I do not necessarily believe it is a bad concept. However, I do believe that hazardous waste violations are a direct threat to our health and welfare. I do believe that these are important enough crimes that they must be contained in a Bill of this magnitude. I believe that modern science is just beginning to scratch the surface on the cause and relationship between cancer and hazardous

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

waste. What we have in our environment is causing the cancer that our generation has experienced, and I think that hazardous waste violations and the spreading of these hazardous materials are only causing the spread of that disease. We cannot let midnight dumpers go unpunished, and the Attorney General must take the responsibility in this role. I'm sorry to see that the Attorney General has not had the courage to put this into this Bill; and, as a result, I feel that I cannot support it. I think that, at this point, the Bill is simply campaign rhetoric. It's an attempt by the Attorney General to prop up his campaign, and I, for one, would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Peters: "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 Telcser, to close."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I told you, in my opening remarks, what I thought you would be hearing from the Members of the other side of the aisle... some of the Members from the other side of the aisle, and I'd like to remind you, at this time, that in the Executive Committee this Bill came out with 18 votes with quite a few Members on the other side of the aisle voting for the Bill, because they believe it was right. And it is a bipartisan effort. It's not a partisan one in any sense of the word. And let me again remind you, the Bill takes effect in January, at which time nobody really knows who the Attorney General will be. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I never thought I would hear such outlandish, ridiculous remarks from some of the Members who happen to be on the other side. Now, one Gentleman rose and quoted something

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

from an editorial, but he neglected to show you or tell you about the last closing lines in the editorial which said we still ought to support the legislation, even though, yes, it is watered down. And why is it watered down? It is watered down because people like that are the ones who took out the other good provisions. Why, I think it's ludicrous to hear Members now rising and saying, 'I'd vote for the Bill if this were in it, or that were in it, or this wasn't out of it or whatever'. Why, that's absolutely outrageous to use those specious, foolish arguments. The fact of the matter is that this is a law enforcement tool to help us get to the heart of narcotic trafficking in Illinois. That's what this statewide grand jury Bill is. It's not the political hogwash that some Members want to try to make out of it. This is a Bill that does the right thing for the people whom you represent; and, for God's sake, someday it could be your child or your neighbors' child whose life might be saved because we can prosecute and convict one narcotic trafficker. But you're going to stand on this floor, in some kind of self-righteous indignation, and talk about partisan politics when we have at stake the very future of our country. Is that what you're asking us to believe? I can't believe that Illinois constituents will ever believe that baloney. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this statewide grand jury Bill is the right thing to do in an era where narcotic addiction and drug trafficking is plaguing our society. I don't believe you heard one substantive argument against this legislation. You heard a lot of nonsensical, political rhetoric about a Bill that takes effect after the next election. There is absolutely no logic to that type of thinking. For some inexplicable reason, there are some Members who are opposing this Bill, and I also know there are some Members who oppose this Bill

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

because they say they are opposed to the concept of grand juries. And I respect those Members, and I respect their point of view. I know one Member, who rose on this issue, sincerely believes that, but let me remind you. There has not been one, single Bill this Session to abolish the grand jury system. If you feel that way, why aren't you doing something about it? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, voting for this Bill is the right thing to do, and I believe that Illinois citizens and your constituents are watching us on Bills like this. I think everyone is deeply concerned, deeply concerned about the drug problems in our society. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I sincerely appreciate your vote on Senate Bill 1656. It ought to pass this House today."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1657...56... Senate Bill 1656 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? Representative Ted Meyer, to explain his vote."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've been down here since 1967. This is the first time I've ever risen to explain my vote. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've voted on a lot of political issues; income tax, ERA, all of those things like that which a lot of people say our folks back home don't understand. Well, I'll tell you, there's one thing that any parent in this state won't understand, and that's a 'no' vote. I don't see how anybody could stand on the side of international drug traffic. My Lord, we've got, in the east end of my district, a known family, the 'Heraera' family. They distribute narcotics. I don't see how you could vote to stop another group from coming in and investigating and hopefully putting them out of business.

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

The feds haven't been successful. The county hasn't been successful. I'd only hope that a state... an Attorney General would be successful. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulcahey, to repres... to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't think there's too many people in this room that know, on a personal basis, what drugs can do to a family. I've seen it. I've been down that road; and, if I thought this Bill was going to do anything to improve that problem, I would support it. And whether it's political or whether it's not political, this is not going to resolve a thing. And, to Ty Fahner, a guy who put out this cheap propaganda about me and a few others in this distr... in my district, I think it's absolutely terrible. It's not true. I'm voting on the merits of this legislation. There's no political implications at all. He is not even dry behind the ears to tell my constituents how I should vote on the merits of a Bill. He can take a long walk on a short pier and go to hell. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all... Representative Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, I... I don't think there's anybody in this House that has had the experiences that I've had in the past ten... two years relative to the drug trafficking, not only in this country, but in other countries as well. I have had the occasion to work, for the past two years, with the State Department, with the FBI, with the Drug Enforcement Administration, and I can tell you that this problem that has been cited relative to drug trafficking is the most severe problem facing this country and this world today. I can tell you, also, that

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

I've had meetings with the Select Committee on Narcotics in Washington on 17 different occasions. I had a meeting with some cabinet members when the Drug Enforcement Information, under our present administration, was cut from 1,943 agents spread around 40 countries in the world, now reduced to 426 agents. This, in spite of the fact that we know, they know and everybody in this chamber and everybody in this country knows that this is the most pressing problem facing the world population today. There are only 427 agents under the Drug Enforcement Administration operating in the entire world today under the Reagan Administration, and I pleaded with those people and told them they could use those 109...1,943 agents in the State of Florida alone; because, whether you know it or not - and we hear a lot of talk about the tremendous federal deficit of almost a billion... hundred billion dollars - 68 billion dollars comes into the State of Florida each and every year. Now, I am very much interested in the combat of narcotics and narcotics trade, but I can tell you this. This statewide grand jury is going to do absolutely nothing; because, in a multi-county grand jury system, if you have three counties involved in a narcotics ring - and that's not unusual - take Cook, Lake and DuPage County, then you will have three state's attorneys involved, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the county, the state's attorney and now the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. This is not good legislation. This is a sham, and it should be voted down. And I can suggest one thing to you also; that, if this was such great legislation and the Members of this Body thought that the Attorney General of this state could do something about narcotics and other pressing crimes, they would have voted this Bill out last year, earlier this year, but this is the fourth time it's been before us. And it looks like,

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

once again, it's going down the tube."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last time. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 81 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay'. Representative Telcser. Pardon? On this question there are 81 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill... This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Page six of the Calendar, Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 624 (sic - 654), Representative Alstat."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 654, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. The First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Alstat."

Alstat: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 654 was passed this House last year, went to the Senate; and, as Senate Amendment 1 was put on it, it was brought back, and we nonconcurrent. It has been sent to a Committee Report. All Members of the Committee have signed it. This Bill simply updates some language in the School Code on reporting. The Senate Amendment also adds the language of a report that has to be made to the...on teachers' dismissals that goes to the State Board of Education. All Members of the Committee have agreed on this. The School Board Association, and the Teachers' Association and I would ask for your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Conference Committee Report on House Bill 654 be adopted?'. This is final action. All 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

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 159 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present', and Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 654 is adopted and the Bill is passed. McMaster 'aye'. The Order of Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 623, Representative Grossi. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 623, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the House adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 623. The Members will recall that Senate Bill 623 was based on a simple idea. That idea was that minors who have not broken any laws should not be treated in the same manner as minors who do. Senate Bill 623 originally took these minors out of the juvenile court system, instead of completely eliminating the juvenile court jurisdiction in cases involving non-criminal behavior, the Conference Committee Report allows social service agencies twenty-one days to work out the problem. If the problems cannot be worked out within that period of time, the minors are then brought within the juvenile court's jurisdiction. This Conference Committee Report is a reasonable compromise between those who wanted complete elimination of the juvenile court's jurisdiction over minors who are truants and runaways, and those who wanted to keep the status quo. The implementation of this Bill will represent real advancement in services... delivery to troubled young people and their families. They will also allow the juvenile court more time to focus its attention on more serious juvenile offenders. It directly addresses the issues raised by the Legislative Study Group Members and concerns articulated on the House floor in April. This

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Conference Committee Report has the support of the Department of Children and Family Services, the Commission on Children, and the Illinois Collaboration on Youth. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 623, as the Gentleman rightly pointed out, when it left the House, and as it was originally introduced prior to the Conference Committee, totally removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court the minors who were guilty of truancy. Many of you received a... I thought, a very well reasoned letter, as a matter of fact, a series of well reasoned letters from a Champaign County Judge who has had a great deal of experience in juvenile court. And essentially, the gist of the letter was that the Bill, as originally put in, and to a... still, to a great extent, now, on the... with the Conference Committee, re... took away the flexibility which the - downstate, at least - juvenile court Judges felt was very necessary and useful in turning around truant young people. So, the Bill, as originally put in, turned this subject over completely to the social workers and took them out of the juvenile court. Now, the social workers, of course, want that, and the juvenile courts feel that this does eliminate a very, very strong tool about turning these young people around. Senate Bill 623 now puts a twenty-one day waiting period before a juvenile truant can get into the juvenile court. But the main gist, I think, of the opinion of the Champaign County Judge was, the system, at least in downstate - 101 downstate counties - has been working, so why fool around with it? It's been working very, very well, in all 101 downstate counties, and why make this major, major change when it's not warranted? Now, Cook County may have a separate problem which may be

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

because of the type of personnel involved, but Senate Bill 623 attempts to fix a problem that really doesn't exist, as far as the 101 downstate counties are concerned. So, I think you should consider your vote very carefully, particularly those who reside in the 101 counties other than Cook, when you vote on this Conference Committee Report. The Conference Committee Report is far superior to the Bill, but it still has a twenty-one day period where the social workers are given free reign at, perhaps, the expense of the truant young person, and I personally intend to oppose the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Conference Committee Report on 623 has one additional provision that was discussed at length by myself and Judge 'Tom Hornsby', the Chief Justice of the juvenile court system in North Central Illinois. The Judge does agree that many of the changes embodied in the Conference Committee, and he had input into that Conference Committee, are advantageous - more advantageous than the Bill as originally presented. The problem related to me as recently as Tuesday was the fact that the only provision which he has some concerns now is a truancy provision that has not been completely considered and evaluated to his best knowledge on the subject, so for the record, I would like to say that I will reluctantly be supporting the Conference Committee on 623, with the understanding that the truancy provision will be addressed next year, and Judge Hornsby and the Judge from Champaign would have input into that particular provision. I would like to as well, point out for the downstate Legislators that do not have many youth service bureaus and social service agencies that could handle this problem, it's going to be very difficult,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

and it will then be transferred back into the court system under the twenty-one day guise. But for all intents and purposes, I do believe that I can support this Conference Committee Report with the objection of the truancy provision. I want you to know, Pat. Fair enough?"

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Kulas: "Representative Grossi, Senate Bill 623 abolishes the category of minors known as minors in need of supervision, and it replaces this category with a second category called a minor requiring authoritative intervention. Could you explain the difference between the two categories to me?"

Grossi: "My understanding that it is simply a change in the description of these types of minors."

Kulas: "There is no difference, as far as factual differences? Is it just a name change, in other words?"

Grossi: "What is described as the same type of behavior, instead of identifying them as minors in need of supervision, they are now known as minors in need of authoritative intervention, and there's the addition of twenty-one days before they are brought before the court."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none... Representative Jack Dunn. I'm sorry, Sir."

Dunn, Jack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Dunn, Jack: "Representative Grossi, in the staff analysis we have here, they refer to limited custody, and the young person may be held for up to six hours, but it may not include a jail type facility or environment. Now, where would they place... hold these young people, if they were brought in and held for six hours. Would they have to create a new holding facility for them, or how would that be handled?"

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Grossi: "Representative, the idea behind the Bill is that these minors have not committed any crime, and that they should not be treated in the same manner as juveniles that have. There would be no special facilities required to contain these people, because they have not committed any crime. All they would have to do is be placed in the police station, but not under the restrictive enclosures, such as the jail cell at..."

Dunn, Jack: "Thank you."

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

Grossi: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 623 be adopted?'. It will be final action. 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 133 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'nay', one voting 'present', and Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 623 is adopted. The Bill is passed. ... Concurrences, ..page five of the Calendar, House Bill 2262, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2262, a Bill for an Act relating to certain Commissions together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the aforementioned Senate Amendments to House Bill 2262?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 127 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 to House Bill 2262. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Art, passed. Representative McBroom. Representative Sandquist, on House Bill 2044. Read it, Mr. Clerk. Excuse me. Go ahead. Yes, sure. Representative Kosinski, are you ready with 2116? Are you ready? House Bill 2116, Representative Kosinski. Read that one, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2116, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure together with Senate Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2116. The General Assembly may remember we passed this out handsomely. It amends the Criminal Code. It permits the State's Attorney to appeal the bail status or a change in the bail status of any individual if his behavior or the severity of the offense is not properly reflected. Amendment #2 from the Senate, as I see it, eliminates some language the Senate felt was unnecessary or redundant. Amendment #3 is a new Bill. It's similar to our House Bill 2117, and it says that the court may, upon the... It asks for a written motion from either party for continuances in... in the court. I think the feeling of this group has been with that sort of legislation. I move to concur."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise, reluctantly, in opposition. May I make an inquiry? I notice it's concurrence on 3. Is it 2 and 3 both?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, 2 and 3."

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Secretary: "Alright. Alright. Well, I'm going to rise, reluctantly, in opposition to the Motion to concur as regards to Senate Amendment #2. Amendment #2 is clearly in conflict with the Illinois Supreme Court Rule 604 and for that reason is in my judgement, invalid and unconstitutional. Amendment #2 allows the State's Attorney to appeal orders granting bail in five cases. Supreme Court Rule 604 provides for appeals from certain judgements and orders. It provides when the state may appeal, and it says, 'only in criminal cases the state may appeal only from an order or judgement the substantive effect of which results in dismissing a charge for any of the grounds enumerated in Section 114-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Arresting judgement because of a defective indictment, information or complaint, quashing an arrest or search warrant or suppressing evidence.' Rule 604 specifically sets forth those instances in which the state may grant... may appeal a court order. Appeals from orders granting bail are clearly not contemplated by this Rule 604 and are not enumerated therein. Thus, Amendment #2 directly conflicts with the provisions of the Supreme Court Rule. As a consequence, it is invalid according to the Illinois Supreme Court decision in People versus Cox in 1980. In that case, the Court was called upon to decide the constitutionality of a Section of the Unified Code of Corrections which altered the standard of review of a sentence imposed by a trial Judge and authorized the reviewing court to enter any sentence that the trial Judge could have entered. That statute directly conflicted with Supreme Court Rule 615B-4 which provides that, on appeal, the reviewing court is empowered to reduce the punishment imposed by the trial court. In striking down the statute, the Court relied upon Article VI, Section 1 of the Illinois

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Constitution of 1970. That provision states, quote, 'The judicial power is vested in a Supreme Court, an Appellate Court and Circuit Courts', end quote. All such power the court held is, quote, 'exclusively and exhaustively', unquote, granted to the Judiciary. Where the power being exercised is judicial in nature, the Court determined that the Legislature is expressly prohibited from exercising it. The Court concluded that the authority to regulate appeals is an inherent power of the Judiciary so that, where a judicial rule and statute conflict on the subject of appeals, the judicial rule will prevail. People versus Cox is, in my judgement, clearly on all fours with regard to the validity of Senate Amendment #2. The Amendment clearly conflicts with Supreme Court Rule 604 and, consequently, applying the Cox holding, a Supreme Court rule prevails where a rule and statute are in conflict. Amendment #2 is invalid and must fail. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't particularly agree with People versus Cox. I happened to be the Sponsor of the legislation which was struck down in People versus Cox. I, however, feel that it is my duty to bring this to your attention. I am not going to support the concurrence Motion, because I feel that I must uphold the Constitution. And it has been interpreted by the Supreme Court. Accordingly, I will not support the Motion to concur."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, as a citizen and an exponent of law and order, I have great concern about some of the bails that have been provided in our criminal justice system. Now, what the judgement of that Court was several years ago may still hold, but I'd like to run it by that Court again; because, I think there are abuses, and I stand to concur in

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2116."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2116?'. Final action. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk. 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 129 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'nay', 7 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments numbers 2 and 3 to House Bill 2116. This Bill is passed. Pardon? Representative Sandquist, House Bill 2044."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2044, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when 2044... when I introduced it and it was originally passed, it only did one thing. It extended the sunset repeal date for all of the various professions and agencies from October 1 of the appropriate year to January 1 of the appropriate year, in order to cover up the problem we had with the structural press controls last year. What the Senate Amendment #1 did to this Bill - it extended the sunset repeal of Social Workers' Registration Act for two additional years; that is, from October 1, 1983 to October 1, 1985. While I am concerned that this Amendment may establish a bad precedent... precedent by altering the statutorily-established and orderly process of sunset review in mid-course, I do believe it has merit, in that it permits the simultaneous review of our state's regulation of major occupational groups working in the mental health professions by... by review of the social work registration

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

into the cycle when psychologists' registration will be considered. For this reason only, and with the expressed intent and expectation that members of the social work community will work conscientiously to assist the Legislature in conducting this most comprehensive review, I reluctantly recommend that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 2044."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm Vice Chairman of the Sunset Commission and have sat in on a number of licensing procedures and sunset hearings. So far, we've studied funeral directors, veterinarians, horseshoers, sanitarians, weathermen, a whole array of different licensing. The social workers came in before our Committee. They've offered testimony. There are serious concerns as to how we should handle them; how we should license them, whether we should have them licensed, have them registered, whether their registration is merely title protection. There's a good possibility there will be significant changes in the area of social work registration. The social workers realize this, so rather than face the reality of the situation, they come... come to us now and ask that we extend their reporting date for another year. This is setting a bad precedent. No other profession, no other occupation has requested this. A couple of years ago, we set up the timetable when these professions were to be reviewed. This is the first attempt we've had to change that, to push the date back. What we're doing today is we're taking the teeth out of the sunset provision. We're allowing one profession to go ahead and set back the timetable. Once we do that, sunset will become meaningless, because one profession after another will do likewise. With great reluctance, I speak

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

in opposition to this concurrence. I would suggest that we continue with our sunset review and vote 'no' on the concurrence. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Hallstrom, one second. The Chair has been asked to announce that per leave given previously, the Elections Committee is now meeting in Representative Telcser's office. Representative Telcser's office, the Elections Committee. I think you've only got one or two quick items there. Now, back to House Bill 2044, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please? Representative Sandquist, would you yield for a question?"

Sandquist: "Yes, I'll yield."

Hallstrom: "Thank you. I did not hear anything that you said in the beginning. I know you said that reluctantly you went along with the concurrence... to concur, but would you tell me, please again, why did you feel that the social workers should be singled out in this way?"

Sandquist: "Well, as I said before and I repeat again, now, I do think that there is some meritorious claim to their position that they should be considered along with the psychologists in the next cycle, and that's what the Senate felt, and the Senate passed it 57 to nothing; And, while I agree with the things that Representative Darrow said, I believe they do make a valid call; that they should be considered with the psychologists, because they're in the same mental health care profession. And, that's for that reason that I would reluctantly go along."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman. No? Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2044. Those in

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 113 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay', one voting 'present', and the House does concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2044. This Bill is hereby declared passed. Representative McBroom, House Bill 2262. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill... pardon? 2266, I'm sorry. House Bill 2266, Representative McBroom."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Drainage Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move to concur with this Senate Amendment. All it does is exempt Cook County, and the DuPage, and Lake and so on, and I have no objection to the Amendment. I move to concur."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? I really didn't understand the effect of the Senate Amendment. Could you explain that please?"

McBroom: "The Amendment exempts counties with a population of less than 275,000 from the provisions of the Bill. It specifically exempts the Counties of Cook, DuPage, Lake, Kane and Will."

Brummer: "It exempts those with a population of less than 275,000?"

McBroom: "More than."

Brummer: "More than."

McBroom: "If I said less, I didn't mean it. More than."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I get a little excited whenever they start exempting parts of the state. First of all, the analysis does say less,

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Representative McBroom, and it... The analysis is really a digest. The real Digest says 'removes public highways, streets and alleys from type of property subject to assessment by drainage district'. What does the.. What does the Bill do itself? It mean, it's very brief and... to look up what the Bill does, and you're exempting Cook County. I was just wondering just what this Bill do briefly, if you can."

McBroom: "Let's take... Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Representative McBroom, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McBroom: "Would this be an appropriate time to recommit two Bills to Committee, Mr. Speaker? Get them off the Calendar."

Speaker Peters: "Sounds alright."

McBroom: "We're talking about Senate Bill 1667 on page four and Senate Bill 1665. It's on... I'm trying to find where it is, but that's the correct number, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Senate Bills, Second Reading, Sir."

McBroom: "66... Page four, Second Reading. Yes, I'd like... I have discussed this at length with Representative Leon who's the Minority Spokesman of Financial Institutions, and I move to recommit both of these Bills to Committee, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bills 1667 and 1665 are recommitted to the appropriate Committee, Interim Study. The Order of Consideration Postponed. Representative, do you... do you have one more here? No, alright. Consideration Postponed. Is Representative Telcser on the floor? Let's start at the bottom of that Calendar then. Senate Bill 1685, Representative Hastert. Representative Hastert. Out of the record? Alright. Senate Bill 1663, Representative Ropp. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1663, a Bill for an Act to amend the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

State Property Control Act. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to move Senate Bill 1663 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Ropp."

Speaker Peters: "What is it? Representative Ropp, Amendment #4."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment 4."

Speaker Peters: "Number 4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Ropp."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp, Amendment #5."

Ropp: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1663 attempts to deal with some of the concerns that Members of this Body had with the selling of a piece of property in the City of Normal that had been chosen by this Body to not use for more than three years, and we have taken out the monetary provision of one dollar and stating that it will be a mutually agreed amount and to further assure that the municipality will, in no way, make a profit from this particular venture; that the monies, should there be any sale of any portions of it, those monies would be used to operate, repair or maintain that particular property. And, should that not happen within 12 months of a sale, that that refundable amount of money would be returned to the Treasurer of the State of Illinois into the General Revenue Fund. As I mentioned a number of times before, this property has been a historical landmark in the community and has been used for more than a hundred years. Now the state has chosen to close that.

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

The deterioration of that piece of property for the last two winters has been severe. There are a number of people and service groups and community bodies that are interested in using part of this property, but it seems that, to this point anyway, the state has not chosen to become too involved in this. This will put it in the hands of a local municipality. All of those people are also elected, and so I can assure you that decisions that will be made there will be very closely scrutinized. And it will be in... in a position to be more effectively used while the buildings are half way in a position to be renovated, and we hope that the people throughout the central Illinois area will, once again, be able to use these facilities. Clearly in the Bill it states that the property would be used for children, for educational purposes, for veterans or any other kind of human service agency within the community, and I ask your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield? You mentioned that the one dollar provision has been eliminated in your Amendment, and you stated that... something about a mutually agreeable price. Now, how do you arrive at that, and who is going to arrive at that? Who is going to be given the responsibility for that?"

Kopp: "Currently.. Currently, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, property sales that deal with the State of Illinois come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Administrative Services, and I would assume that that would be the Agency that would do the negotiating between the municipality and the State of Illinois."

Tuerk: "They'll negotiate with the Municipality of Normal. Is that correct?"

Kopp: "That is correct."

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Tuerk: "So, it could be two dollars."

Rep: "I don't think it would be, but that's always a possibility. I...I think that I certainly have appreciated the sense of this Body in that the intent is that the state should certainly not lose any money. On the other hand, this property, most of it, was given to the State of Illinois, and I don't necessarily think that the state should be in a position to recover any major amount of increased revenue that the state needs through this particular area. It's an opportunity to continue to let the people who have used this property for a number of years to, once again, put it back in the hands where people can continue to use it. There's lots of areas there. It's... Actually, it's comparable to what I have considered Boystown in Nebraska. It's a complete city within itself; and, when you come to negotiating prices, it's not exactly like where you can compare an acre of ground to another acre, as they have, continually being sold over a period of months or even years. Or even homes. When, in fact, you sell several homes, you can begin to determine an average. I, frankly, am not aware, and I don't think anybody in this chamber is aware of the last recent piece of property of this magnitude that has any comparable value. And so, what I am attempting to do is prevent it from continuing to deteriorate, as it has been doing, and put it in the hands where it can be used by people of this State of Illinois."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand your intent, and I think it's a laudible one. But all I'm trying to understand is that the Department of Administrative Services will negotiate a price, but there is no concept at all or no indication at all of what that price might be. And I can understand that, too. If you're going to give them the total negotiating power, you're not really establishing any

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

perimeters whatsoever. Is that correct - in the legislation?"

Ropp: "It doesn't clearly state that, I suppose, in this Bill; however, I am sure that the state is not going to lose any money; that the people of the State of Illinois, people who have been taxpayers, are the ones that, in fact, will be generating value through the services that will be... be rendered as a result of these facilities being put back into good use."

Turk: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mulcahey. Representative Ropp, to close."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, and Members of the House. I'm attempting today to deal with a piece of property in the State of Illinois and particularly in my district that has been used for as many as some 800 young people, as a result of legislation that was passed a number of years ago stating that orphans would have a place to live. Some years later, the state decided that it should be converted to a program Directed by the Department of Child and Family Services. Three years later, this Body and the State of Illinois said that there is no more need to take care of young people who have been delinquent from school, who have been involved in drugs and any number of other things. And, as a result, that property was closed. The history and the number of young people that today are adults in this state, who have made their entire young, youthful lives learning how to become good citizens after living at the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Home, has now been determined that there is no more use for it. There are people in this community now, in the City of Normal, that say, 'We think there is use'. If the state is not willing to continue to fund it and to operate it, then, in

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

fact, the City will as a last resort, take over and direct the activities of this particular piece of property. I know it may be somewhat of an unusual venture; but to me it is far more serious to see state-owned property once viable, and healthy and enthusiastic, sit there in total decay, in a facility that has totally terminated three years ago. There's no life. There's no water. There's no heat. Please, help this property become alive again. As Jesse 'Fell', over a hundred years ago, intended it for it to be. I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1663 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that we suspend appropriate Rule 35(c) for immediate consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Representative Ropp. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I thank you for indulgence in listening to this - what I consider an important piece of legislation in our area. Once again, it provides an opportunity for this area to live by providing service to many people who currently do not have it. By providing a home for people who may not have a home. For providing recreational facilities for people who are crowded out of other areas. I ask for your favorable

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

support in helping put this particular piece of property back to life again. It's important to me, and it's important to the people of the State of Illinois that surplus property should not continue to decay, rot and go unused. I ask for your support."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1663 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question... Collins 'aye'. Braun 'aye'. This question there are 134 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Telcser on 1401. What's your pleasure? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clark Leone: "Senate Bill 1401, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Peters: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to go back to Second Reading to remove one Amendment?"

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend...The Gentleman asks leave to return to the Order of Second Reading. Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Telcser: "Mr...."

Clark Leone: "Amendment #4, Madigan, amends Senate Bill 1401 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan, Amendment #4. Representative Madigan. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, before we take Amendment #4, I'd like to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted. You may recall Amendment #1 was an Amendment which would name a building after a former Speaker John Lewis. The Amendment was adopted, and then during the

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

course of debate on Third Reading, a Gentleman from Cook made a very strong point that he felt that adoption of that Amendment did a great violence to the intent of the State Constitution. I discussed with the Sponsor of the Amendment who has graciously consented to let us take Amendment #1 off of the Bill, thereby, satisfying him and then satisfying the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle with this constitutional problem which, frankly, he may have very well stated. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1401 was adopted."

Speaker Peters: "On that question, Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of that, and I do want to thank the Gentleman for seeing the light and taking off an Amendment that I think had a very serious constitutional problem. And I will support it."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the House reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1401 was adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Senate (sic - House) Amendment #1, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to table Senate Amendment #1... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1401."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1401 be tabled?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled."

Telcser: "Alright, Mr. Speaker, we've got Amendment #4 now being offered to the Bill. I'm not sure the Amendment has been

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

distributed; but, if I may... with the Gen..."

Speaker Peters: "Wait. Hold on. Further Amendments?"

Clark Leone: "Amendment #4, Madigan, amends Senate Bill 1401.
Has not been distributed."

Holcser: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment hasn't been distributed.
I'd be delighted to join with the Gentleman to suspend the
rules to consider the Amendment in the interest of saving
time, if the Members want to grant us leave. This is an
Amendment that ..."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there
objection? Being none, leave is granted. Representative
Madigan, Amendment #4."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #4 would appropriate 12 million dollars for
grants by the Secretary of State as the State Librarian for
the construction of public libraries under Section 8.2 of
the Illinois Library System Act, as amended by this Session
of the General Assembly. This Amendment is offered in
anticipation that other legislation will pass during this
Session which would enact a library construction program
statewide."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Question of the Sponsor. How much is in this?"

Speaker Peters: "Wait a minute. Now, I got too many ears here.
Where are we at now? Representative Hoffman and Madigan."

Hoffman: "Who sponsored the Amendment? Didn't he sponsor it?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Representative Madigan."

Hoffman: "I asked this question of the Sponsor. How much is in
this?"

Madigan: "Twelve million dollars."

Hoffman: "This is crazy. I don't believe this. I mean, Mike,
you know, we're chopping up the budget over here. You say,
'You're spending too much. You're adding stuff.' I mean,

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

this is insane. You know, we cut 125 million dollars out of state aid for schools, and then we come in the last minute like this with 12 million dollars for something that's being passed this time. This is utter and absolute nonsense. You know, to agree to do this, is the height of lunacy. I mean, my God, you know, Louis XIV reigned in France. King George reigned in England, and lunacy reigns here. And this is an illustration of it. Vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to that ..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan; "...excellent oration. Apparently, the Gentleman didn't understand that this is simply bond authorization."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to add a little light to what's being done. It's just bond money; and, as Representative DiPrima said about six years ago, it's not going to cost the taxpayers a dime, because the Government's going to pay for it."

Speaker Peters: "... part. Mr. Doorkeeper. Mr. Doorkeeper. Is there anyone in the Speaker's balcony here? Will the people in the... Will the people in the Speaker's balcony please leave? Are they there? Alright. Alright, let's... let's proceed. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, perhaps today we will reach the heights of ludicrousness, if there is such a word, but the fact of the matter is that the Gentleman has offered an Amendment to... to this Bill. And we could engage in a protracted debate, which I'm delighted to. Frankly, at this point, I'd be opposed to the Gentleman's Amendment, because it did not come in as part of the

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

administration's Bill. And, for that reason, I would oppose the Amendment. However, let me simply say to the Members, this Bill is going to go to a Conference Committee at which time we will consider the Amendment, I'm sure, all over again. So, actually, in the interest of time, that's why I've taken the Bill back from Third to Second to get one Amendment tabled; and, whether or not we adopt this Amendment, the subject will be part of this Bill at a later date, I'm sure. So, if you want to save time, we could adopt it now. If you want to have a longer debate, I'd be delighted to do that also."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, question of the Sponsor of the Bill. Question of Mr. Telcser. Mr. Telcser, how did this Bill leave the Senate? What did the Bill provide when it left the Senate, in terms of increased bond authorization?"

Telcser: "A three dollar increase, Representative."

Madigan: "Three dollars?"

Telcser: "Yes, three dollars. American dollars."

Madigan: "Why was three dollar selected? Is that what that old expression in Chicago..."

Telcser: "It's because the Senate wanted to reach the low point of ludicrously."

Madigan: "Was that like that old expression in Chicago about somebody was like a three dollar, four dollar bill?"

Telcser: "Sounds right. It has a familiar ring."

Madigan: "So now, your... your Amendment #3 does substantially raise the bonding authorization in several categories."

Telcser: "That is correct."

Madigan: "So, you're saying that the Bill, as amended in the House, does not reconcile with the Bill as it left the Senate."

Telcser: "That's correct, and; therefore, I believe it would go

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

1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

to a Conference Committee unless the Senate would recede from its Amendments which is unlikely."

Malignan: "Did the Senate Amendment reduce the authorization to three dollars? Was it a Senate Amendment that did that?"

Telcser: "Yes."

Malignan: "Okay. I... Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"

Clark Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Telcser, your pleasure?"

Telcser: "Could we go to Third Reading then, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we've debated Senate Bill 1401 for some time. As I say, in my opinion, it will go to the Conference Committee. That's what the Agency people tell me, and that's what I believe would happen. So, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate a favorable vote. It takes 107."

Malignan: "The question... The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1404 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by..."

Telcser: "1401."

Speaker Peters: "... by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you said Senate Bill 1404."

Speaker Peters: "No, 1401."

O'Connell: "I thought I heard you say 1404."

Speaker Peters: "No. If I did, I misspoke. It's 1401. To explain his vote, Representative Kane."

Speaker Peters: "For the people who are just coming in, this is the

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

1 1st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

increase the state debt ceiling by some, I don't know how many million dollars are in there now; but, for those of you who are wondering what it is, that is what it is. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This will require 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Looks like it's after the election, Mike. Yes. This question there are 88 voting 'aye', 51... Representative. Representative Frederick. The Lady wishes to go from 'present' to 'aye'. Frederick, 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman votes 'no'. Representative... That's it. Representative Turner. Pardon?"

Turner: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'. 'Yes' to 'no'. Representative Telcser, we are now at 88."

Telcser: "You want to poll the absentees?"

Speaker Peters: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Barnes. Capparelli. Davis. Deuster. Dwight Friedrich. Huff. Kornowicz. Krska. Levin. Margalus. Martire. McMaster. Roland Meyer. O'Brien. Ozella. Pierce. Pouncey. Rhem. Schneider. Harry Smith. Stearney and Younge."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Schneider from not voting to 'no'. Representative Reed from 'present' to 'yes'. Representative Fawell from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Leon from 'aye' to 'no'. Yes, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote, what will happen if this Bill doesn't pass right now then the... we're going to have to use a vehicle

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

111st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bill, and it's going to come back later. I think, in the interest of expediting the work of the House, I would urge those Members that are voting either 'present' or 'no' to get enough votes, 107. And let's do it right so that we can expedite the work. We know it's going to be passed. The bond authorization Bill always is passed. So, I would urge some 'aye' votes."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Representative Matijevich just gave my speech. I would like to have my vote recorded as 'aye', please."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

Bowman: "I say he... I'd like to have my vote recorded as 'aye'. I am now voting 'no'. I would like to to be recorded 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, Please. No, wait. One at a time. Mr. Clerk, do we have all that, or do you suggest we do this again? Representative Madigan, do you object if we dump this and try one more time. Representative Telcser. Dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. Yes, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we were dealing this morning playing games with all these Bills that we know that have to be passed and especially some of the professionals that have been around for quite awhile, they know that they're going to have to pass these Bills. I don't want to hear any of them complain the last night of the Session at 11:30 at night when we get an Amendment after Amendment, 80, 90, 100 pages long, coming back to some Christmas tree packages. If we don't start passing some of these Bills and quit playing games and holding up on this, this is exactly what we're going to have, and it happens every time the last night of the Session. Now, I wish we can get on with the work of

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

this House so that we can leave here at a reasonable hour on the last night of the Session without scrambling through 80 pages of Amendments and piling on all these Bills that you refuse to vote on today, adding up on one Bill and none of us will know what the hell we're voting for."

Speaker Peters: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1401 pass?'. This will take 107 votes. 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 111 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'nay, 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hastert, are you ready now? Senate Bill 1685, Representative Hastert. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act in relationship to postage stamp vending machines. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1685 was discussed and debated to a great extent yesterday. Basically what this Bill does is allow private venders to sell postage stamps in private machines without being taxed or having the vending machine tax put on that machine. The reason for this is today more and more people are using mail. People have to have some convenience in getting postage stamps. We can put these machines in shopping centers, grocery stores, places where it's a convenience to people without the Federal Government buying the machines and going through the process. Plus, these stamps can be sold at face value. Now, when... if you're selling the product at face value, you have to be able to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

take a profit margin someplace; and, if we're doing this is postage machines held by private vendors, the margin of profit many times is that tax or that stamp that's put on. I ask that you would give this your favorable consideration. It's an important piece of legislation. It was passed last year. It is set up to go into a pilot project in the northeastern... northwestern suburbs of the State of Illinois. The Attorney General said that we have to pass or suggested that we pass legislation to clear up the rule on whether this is used in municipalities and, in fact, if it addresses the question of exemption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, does this require 107 votes?"

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

Beatty: "Does this require 107 votes?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, 107 votes."

Beatty: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "One question of the Sponsor, if I may. Representative, when you say face value, does that mean that for 20 cents you get a 20 cent stamp, or does it mean for 25 cents you get a 20 cent stamp?"

Castert: "My understanding of face value is that, for 20 cents, you get a 20 cent stamp. For a dollar, you get five 20 cent stamps."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, a question or two of the Sponsor. This Bill would apply to all machines though. Isn't that right? It wouldn't just apply to machines where there was no profit included. Isn't that right?"

Castert: "My understanding, Representative, is this Bill applies to machines that are selling postage stamps at face value."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Freiman: "Well, is this just the same as the Bill we had yesterday, or is this different than that? Because, yesterday,... yesterday, I thought they said something else."

Hastert: "Yes... Mr... Representative, I understand it does apply to stamp vending machines."

Freiman: "Yes, I think that's right. I think it applies to all stamp vending machines, whether they sell it at par or at face value or not. At least, if I read this correctly, it just says 'vending machines which vend only U. S. postage stamps are exempt from license fees'. And that's basically what it says. So that this applies to all machines. It doesn't just apply to those machines that have... that are selling stamps at face value. I suppose, if that were the case, we might indeed give encouragement to this kind of industry and say, 'Well, they are charging only the amount of money that the stamps cost'. I'm not sure how they come out with that, by the way; because, unless you say, 'Well they do it by volume' - but we... That isn't what the Bill says. If I can.. If I read it correctly, Mr. Hastert..."

Hastert: "Can I answer that?"

Freiman: "Sure."

Hastert: "I understand that face value can't go on this unless this Bill passes."

Freiman: "Well, but this... the point is. Alright. Then, on the Bill, we defeated this yesterday, because we concluded that this was not just for these kind of stamp vending machines that would be selling them at face value; but in fact all stamp machines; that there is no limitation on the licensing of these bi... of these machines, and that it would be a loss of revenue. And it would be about the only vending machines that have no... have no licensing. We license vending machines. Now, we haven't heard anything

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

about how much revenue is going to be lost at all to local municipalities, who's going to make up that revenue. We don't hear that. It's just an exemption for a private industry. This is... The vending machine industry is a well-known industry. It's a private, special interest. We... We had Bills, all kinds of Bills exempting them from sales tax over the years, exempting them from this tax or that tax, and now we're starting with an exemption from licensure fees. And I can't imagine why we would give this... grant this special interest to deprive communities of their license fees when they... when we are not doing it to any other industries. It's an industry. People make money off of it, and it makes no sense to deny communities their license fees. I would... going to vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I would strongly advise the Sponsor to take this Bill out of the record at this time."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Take it out."

Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. Representative Stanley in the chamber? Representative Friedrich here? Representative Friedrich asks leave to go to the Speaker's Table, HJR 69. Is there objection? Being none, Gentleman has leave. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this Resolution authorized the Auditor General in cooperation with the Auditor General of the State of Missouri to audit Bi-State, and it can be done with the Auditor General's staff. And I ... it takes the leave of both Houses, and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall HJR 69 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Take the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

record. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. HJR 69, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bower and Brummer, HJR 85. Page nine of the Calendar. Trooper Layton Davis. Page nine of the Calendar, HJR 85, Representatives Bower and Brummer ask leave to go to that order. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Representative Bower."

ower: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 85 calls upon the Department of Transportation to erect an appropriate plaque at the rest areas on Interstate 57 north of Effingham and to name those after Trooper Layton Davis who was killed while on duty, approximately six years ago this month. Trooper Davis was a nearly 20 year veteran of the Illinois State Police. His murder was particularly vicious, and this was an honor that various community leaders in our area ask that we bestow upon him. And I would ask for the adoption of this Resolution."

peaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 85 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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... On this question there are 147 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present', and House Joint Resolution 85 is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 39, Representative Karpziel. Lady asks leave to go to that order. There objection? Being none, leave is granted. Killing some time to find out what we're going to do next. We're on page nine of the Calendar. Representative Karpziel."

arpziel: "Yes... Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you, Ladies and

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Gentlemen of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 39 simply requires the Ill... or requests that the Illinois Tollway Highwa... Toll Highway Authority submit to the Governor, for his approval, a proposal to study the feasibility of expanding the Illinois toll highway system to include SAP 426, which is the Elgin-O'Hare Free... Expressway. And I'd appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution... Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, I would like to inquire of the Lady as to whether the study ought to be as to whether this particular extension that you propose would itself be economically feasible as a toll road, or are you saying as to whether the existing Tri-State might be financially secure, even if they had to build your piece of toll road at a loss? Do you understand my question?"

Harpiel: "Yes, Representative, I understand the question. I have no idea of knowing whether it would be economically feasible...economically feasible. If we haven't done a feasibility study at this point, there's no way of knowing it."

Katz: "Well, but what I'm really asking, in terms of feasibility, and I don't mean to be difficult; but, the Tri-State has existed quite a while. And they built the toll road out toward Aurora based on the indebtedness of the Tri-State, and many of us who have people who live along the Tri-State don't want to pay for any other toll roads. Now, if the feasibility study is to see whether this O'Hare... What do you call it?"

Harpiel: "Elgin-O'Hare."

Katz: "The Elgin-O'Hare Freeway would itself be economically self-sufficient for a toll road. I don't have any

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

objection to that. I just don't want to pay for your toll road. If that particular highway can support a toll road, fine, but I don't see any reason why the rest of us should pay for your toll road. And I want to inquire as to whether the study you are looking at is whether or not the O'Hare-Elgin Freeway would itself be economically feasible to operate as a toll road."

Carpiel: "I believe they're going to have to set up a new tollway authority."

Lat: "Alright. Well then, if the answer to your question then is the answer to my question, that you would want them to study whether or not the Elgin-O'Hare Freeway would itself be feasible as a separate toll road?"

Carpiel: "Yes."

Lat: "Alright. I have no objection to that."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 39 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question there are 125... 125 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Joint Resolution 39 is adopted. Representative Bullock, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move consideration of HJR (sic - SJR) 76."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves for immediate consideration of SJR 76. Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 76, urges Congress Committees to reject reorganization of the Railroad Retirement System."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 76, sponsored by Ryan - Bullock, calls upon the Congress to reject the reorganization of Railroad Retirement System in the '83 federal budget. The situation involved is that retirees would not be entitled to accept Social Security benefits and railroad retirement benefits. Know of no opposition. It passed the Executive Committee. Request a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would Representative Bullock talk a little bit more clearly and a little louder? Did you say that these peo... there are certain people who would not be able to collect railroad retirement as well as Social Security, even though they may be entitled to it?"

Bullock: "Yes, Sir."

Van Dwyne: "Why would you want to do a thing like that?"

Bullock: "No, I want to prevent that, Representative Van Dwyne. I want to prevent that."

Van Dwyne: "You want to prevent the prohibition. Oh, thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 76 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Matijevich, would you do 72, please? SJR 72. Page nine of the Calendar. SJR 72, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution #72, sponsored by Senator Rock and Representative Peters, calls for the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation and the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission to consider the consequences of

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

deteriorating public facilities on the economic vitality of the state. The Executive Committee recommended this, 'do adopt', and I urge... I move for the adoption of Amendment Senate Joint Resolution 72 and urge your support."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 72 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Messages from the Senate. On this question, there are 148 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This... SJR 72, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared adopted. Now, Messages from the Senate. Representative Bell, would you come up, please?"

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in passage of Bills, the following titles, to wit: House Bills 2038, 2039, 1607, 394, 2439, 1423, 1060, 712, 891 and 396 passed the Senate as amended June 25, 1982'. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of Bills, the following title, to wit: House Bill 2289, together with attached Amendments hereto, and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Amendment #1, #2, and #3 to House Bill 2289 passed the Senate as amended, June 25, 1982 by three-fifths vote'. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of Bills, the following title: House Bill 608 passed the Senate June 25, 1982'. Kenneth Wright,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Secretary."

Speaker Peters: "Page eight of the... Representative Bell, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Jeff Mays and I are Cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 26, and we request that we hear that."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration of HJR 26. Is there objection? There being none, Mr. Clerk, HJR 26. Representative Bell - Mays."

Bell: "Thank you very much. I will open any questions Representative Mays will take care of. As we know, the State of Illinois has passed our State Mandates act, and it appears to have been very successfully implemented. We have seen, in just one legislative Session, that over two billion dollars worth of new mandates have been saved. In other words, State Government, through our Mandates Act, has been saved the burden of two million... two billion dollars. We believe that it's time that the Federal Government do the same thing. If the Federal Government passed a Mandates Act and if they mandate to any unit of government, be it state, county, municipality, whatever, that they also, if they mandate it, they must fund it, and that's all we're asking the Federal Government to do - pass a law just like we did here in this Legislature last Session. And I certainly would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 26 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this... Hastert, 'aye'. On this question, there are 100... Kelley, 'aye'. Pechous, 'aye'. Hoxsey, 'aye'. My God, what is this? Neff, 'aye'."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bartulis, 'aye'. How many more is that? Jim Kelley. On this question, there are 148 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. House Joint Resolution 26 is adopted. Representative Rea, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for leave to consider House Resolution... Joint Resolution 21 immediately."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion for immediate consideration of HJR 21. Is there... Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Representative Rea."

Rea: "House Joint Resolution 21 would create the Joint Committee... or recreate the Joint Committee on Nursing Home Care Reimbursement. This was a recommendation of the former Members of the Committee, and it has to do with the Medicare payment system for nursing homes administered by the Illinois Department of Public Aid. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Shall House Joint Resolution 21 be adopted? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 152 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having... House Joint Resolution 21, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bower, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to consider House Resolution 866."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for immediate consideration of House Resolution 866. Is there objection? Being none,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

leave is granted. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 866 relates to Dixon Springs Agricultural Center."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a bipartisan, multiple district Resolution. The Dixon Springs Agricultural Experimental Station has been in operation for nearly fifty years, under the auspices of the University of Illinois on federally owned land. In the last few years, there has been considerable problems and concerns that the Federal Government, which owns the land, might require that the experimental station be moved. This resolution calls upon the Congress of the United States to urge the Department of Agriculture to give this land to the University of Illinois. It is the major agricultural research station for Central and Southern Illinois. Representative Rea, Representative Winchester, Representative McCormick, and Representative Robbins are all Cosponsors of this Resolution with me."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins. Discussion, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "At... At this time, the University of Illinois, and my... and myself, and the Senators and the Congressmen from this district are all working on this, and this Resolution would be a big help to help advance this on through. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "What is the U. of I.'s position on this?"

Bower: "They tell me they are supportive of it."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, the question

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

is, 'Shall House Resolution 866 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 151 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This... House Resolution 866, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let's... Representative Kelly, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd... I'd request immediate consideration on Senate Joint Resolution 44."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? None. Leave is granted. SJR 44, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 44, which is a Resolution... Joint Resolution sponsored by Senator Nimrod, who was just in our Chambers a few moments ago - this is a Resolution which is the annual Resolution which... which has been introduced on the subject of 'Respect Life Week'. This Resolution calls on Governor Thompson to proclaim the week of October 3rd through October 10 as the 'Respect Life Week' in the State of Illinois, and in recognition of the national 'Respect Life Week' movement. I..."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? I'm sorry... I'm sorry, Sir."

Kelly: "I would just ask for your favorable adoption of SJR 44."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Kelly, what is the Amendment?"

Kelly: "The Amendment - believe it or not, this Resolution should have been considered a year ago, but we had amended it to change the date from what it was last year in 1981, to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

1982, because no Resolutions passed out of this General Assembly or were considered during the last Session... during the last spring."

Cullerton: "Does this wording have anything to do... could be ever... be construed to have anything to do with capital punishment? The wording of the Resolution?"

Kelly: "No, there's nothing detailing or mentioning capital punishment at all."

Cullerton: "It just says, 'Respect Life'?"

Kelly: "That's right."

Cullerton: "I... I can't see how anybody could be opposed to it."

Kelly: "I wish you'd speak up a little bit louder, because I can't hear you."

Cullerton: "I can't see how anybody would be opposed to a Resolution saying we should respect life."

Kelly: "Well, I agree. I suppose the reason... I don't think anybody should be at all against this Resolution, for any possible reason. The... the only potential or the only reason I would see is that the hyphenated Sponsors or the Sponsors of this Bill - Representative Pullen, myself, and several others, are those that normally are with the pro-life movement, but this Resolution just doesn't point itself toward... Oh, no."

Cullerton: "It doesn't mention the unborn is the Resolution, does it? It just says 'Respect Life', right?"

Kelly: "It mentions the unborn and mentions the elderly, and human life in general."

Cullerton: "Death row?"

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Satterthwaite?"

Satterthwaite: "Representative Kelly, if you would expand a bit in terms of what reference is made to the unborn - are we, by this Resolution, essentially recognizing the unborn

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

child as a person?"

Kelly: "Yes. The Resolution does, in fact, recognize that there should be respect for... from the moment, you know, of conception, unborn children included. So, I would say if... if you were in favor of abortion, you probably have a tendency not to support the Resolution, but it covers all aspects - the handicapped - it covers the elderly - it covers, you know, every... every different type of race, religion, and all. So, it's..."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, then if I may speak to what I understand as the substance of this Resolution to include..."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "It would, in fact then, define an unborn child as a person, which is contrary to the laws of our state and nation, currently. And while I do not favor abortion as such, I do favor pro-choice, and I would hate, by some subterfuge, such as a Resolution like this, to be doing something that really is contrary to the definition of 'person', as it has been used in past in this state and in this country. And while I certainly respect life, I certainly have respect for the handicapped, I certainly have respect for the elderly; and, in fact, I have respect for the fetus, but I think that it is far different to do something that gives a legal status for the fetus equivalent to the legal status of a person. And for that reason, I will oppose the Resolution."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution has passed this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

General Assembly at least seven times that I know of, and by quite substantial margins. We have, on numerous occasions, given our approval to this Resolution, and I don't see where there's any problem, except if you are, let's say, pro-abortion, you might want to not support this Resolution, but this is probably one that - and, most generally, I would say if you have any inclination at all to recognize human life, and even that before the point of delivery, I would say you should support this Resolution. So, I would ask for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 44 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 44 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? Have all voted who wish? Representative McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's tough to ever oppose Mr. Kelly, but I'd like to point out to those people that are pro-life, that the Governor is pro-choice, so that it's very possible in declaring this week of October 3 to October 10 as 'Respect for Life Week', that the Governor's focus will be on pro-choice, rather than respect for, as Mr. Kelly would determine, once there is conception, there is life, so I'm voting 'present', just because I think the Governor could very easily just make it after the baby is born, be the respect for life, and because of that, I'm voting 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last time. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'nay', 23 voting 'present'."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Senate Joint Resolution 44 is adopted. Representative Kelly, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the easiest way to... I've got HR 814. It does exactly the same thing. I suppose I would request that it be tabled at this... at this particular moment."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. House Resolution 814 is tabled. Representative Stewart, what purpose to you seek recognition? Does she not seek recognition?"

Stewart: "I was going to explain my vote, so..."

Speaker Peters: "Take the record. Clear the Board. Let's go. All right? Now, Representative Stewart, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stewart: "I don't."

Speaker Peters: "919. Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. HR 919 would..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. The Lady asked leave for immediate consideration of HR 919. Is there objection? Being none, leave is granted. Representative Stewart."

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 919 would establish a special House Committee to investigate the use of the 'Mastery Learning Reading Program' in the Chicago Public Schools. This program is a spin-off of the 'Continuous Progress Mastery Learning Program', and is a method of teaching children, kindergarten through eighth grade. It has been criticized by both teachers and parents alike as an ineffective tool which... which takes more teacher time out of the classroom and from the students. I think that the controversy surrounding this issue deserves a platform by

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

which parents and teachers can express their sentiments concerning this program, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Now, are the lights flashing for other purposes, or discussion on this issue? On this issue, Representative Barkhausen? No. On this issue, Representative Stanley? On this issue? No. Further discussion? Being none, the question is, shall House Resolution 919 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 123 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present', and House Resolution 919 is passed. Representative Jaffe, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to hear House Resolution 708."

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

Jaffe: "708... House... Leave to hear House Resolution 708."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. House Resolution 708. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 708 relates to investigation of sweat shop operations."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, House Resolution 708 is really an Agreed Resolution between management and labor, and basically, all that it does is request the Department of Labor to investigate sweat shop operations within the State of Illinois, to consider ways in which labor laws may be better enforced against sweat shops and report its findings, including suggestions for needed legislation, to the General Assembly."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 708 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Birkinbine, on the issue."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask the Sponsor of this, if such sweat shops..."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on one second."

Birkinbine: "Aren't already..."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on. Hold on, Representative. Mr. Clerk, there's a... there's a couple lights on, here. Dump... Dump the Roll. Now, any discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Yes, question of the Sponsor. Aren't such sweat shops already against federal law?"

Jaffe: "Well, there are illegal sweat shops that are operating. As a matter of fact, both management and labor have found that there has been a resurgence of sweat shop operations in recent years, and the problem, that you know, is that a sweat shop is a clandestine manufacturing operation which ignores requirements imposed by federal, state, and local governments. And they violate labor laws regarding minimum wages, overtime, and job safety, and they also fail to pay corporate social security and unemployment tax, thus depriving the government of revenues to which they are entitled, and the Department of Labor of the State of Illinois, I think, is the proper one to investigate them."

Birkinbine: "I think that was the longest 'yes' I've heard. Well, if they're... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Jaffe: "Well, I... I do like to enlighten you, Sir."

Birkinbine: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if something like this is already against federal law, I don't think we need the good intentions of the State of Illinois to get messed up in this. We've got a penchant for getting involved in

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

more things that are none of our business than probably any other Body on earth. For heaven's sakes, whether it's Infant Death Syndrome, another great thing that would... that we could get rid of but really is none of the business of the State of Illinois or sweat shops, let's stop and think about what is the role of State Government before we start plunging in to yet another nifty idea. That's something that we really shouldn't do."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Jaffe, to close, if you wish."

Jaffe: "Yes, just to enlighten the Gentleman, I would just tell him that this is not against federal law, but is against state law. I think that you made a misassumption, there, when I gave you the long answer. Evidently, you didn't follow it, and the reason that the state ought to get involved is because there are corporate taxes, social security taxes, and unemployment taxes that the government, the State of Illinois Government, is being cheated out of, and we ought to pass this thing overwhelmingly, without any dissenting vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 708 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 113 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'nay', 10 voting 'present', and this Bill... this House Resolution 708, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared adopted. Representative Hallstrom, for what purpose do you seek recognition? 737, Representative Hallstrom?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Peters: "What... The Lady asks leave for immediate

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

consideration of HR 737."

Hallstrom: "That's exactly right. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you very much. House... Resolution 737 urges the Illinois Congressional Delegation to support House Resolution 5180 and Senate 1958 in the United States Congress. To tell you just quickly, a little bit about the hospice program - House Resolution 5180 and Senate Resolution 1958 creates the Hospice Reimbursement Act. This Act provides Medicare treatment for persons in need of hospice care. Hospice is the term given to a medical facility which provides services to terminally ill patients. Many of the large insurance companies are now providing reimbursement for hospice care. Hospice care is less costly than traditional hospital care for terminally ill patients. More important than that, it's a very humane way for persons who are terminally ill, have cancer, can then spend some time with their families in a situation where they are also getting the medical care, and I would urge the adoption of the Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 737 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 147 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', none voting 'present', and House Resolution 737 is adopted. Representative Barkhausen, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, to ask leave of the House to take up immediate consideration of House Resolution 575."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

any objection? Being none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 575 relates to Wisconsin liquor laws."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Barkhausen."

Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Resolution 575 addresses itself to the problem that Wisconsin has a lower drinking age than Illinois now has, and as a result of this differential, those of us who live in areas along the border between Wisconsin and Illinois find ourselves in situations where a number of our younger citizens are attracted northward across the border in order to take advantage of the lower drinking age. The result of this is that there are countless tragedies resulting from drunk driving incidents involving our youngsters going north and sometimes their compatriots and sometimes innocent citizens in Wisconsin or in Illinois. In Lake County alone in the last... within the last year, there have been over 30 automobile fatalities that law enforcement authorities directly relate to this differential in the drinking age. By this Resolution, we're asking the Legislature in Wisconsin to consider lowering... to raising their drinking age, rather, selectively, for out-of-staters, so that the drinking age which applies would be the same as it is for the youngsters in the state from which they're coming. So that, for youngsters eighteen to twenty-one years old from Illinois going north across the border, they would have to live by the Illinois drinking age of twenty-one years old, and I'd be happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, I would move its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Representative... Any discussion? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, what... First question is, what... what does the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Resolution do? Does it specifically ask the Wisconsin Legislature to make it illegal for Illinois citizens to drink in Wisconsin, if they're... don't meet the Illinois age requirements?"

Barkhausen: "Yes, essentially, although it's not confined to Illinois residents. It addresses itself to out-of-state residents generally."

Johnson: "Have you... You know... Number one, Representative Barkhausen, you're an attorney. You ought to know that this is an absolute, total violation of the Interstate Commerce Clause. How on earth can you have a... have a state pass a law that... and the Equal Protection, too, that makes one set of standards for its own citizens, and one set of standards for somebody else. That's just absolutely, blatantly unconstitutional, and I would join with Representative Birkinbine in... in pointing out that what on earth do we have... business do we have, calling on the Wisconsin State Legislature or the Arizona State Legislature or anyone else, to pass laws that are totally outside of our domain? I didn't agree with the twenty-one-year-old drinking law in Illinois, but we passed it, and it's law. Wisconsin has an eighteen-year-old drinking law, and that's law. And for us to be... to go memorializing other states, I suppose we can ask the Kentucky and the Missouri State Legislature to do the same thing, because they're on the borders, and it just doesn't make sense. We don't have any business involving ourselves in other states' activities. It's absolutely, totally unconstitutional for Wisconsin, if they did enact a statute like this, and you ought to know that. You know, you come up with these things, and you know, you might as well pass a law that abolishes the Fourteenth Amendment. It's just about, you know, equivalent. It just doesn't make sense.

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

And I don't... You know, I don't want to see anybody die on the highways any more than anybody else, but to pass this Resolution is totally ineffective, it's unconstitutional, and it's stupid, and I'd ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Who would the... If the Resolution passes, who does... who do we send the Resolution to?"

Barkhausen: "I would say the legislative leaders in Wisconsin, Representative."

Leverenz: "Isn't that specific, in your Resolution?"

Barkhausen: "I don't have a copy of it in front of me, but I assume that that is the case, either that or all the Members of the Legislature in Wisconsin. It's not unlike a number of other Resolutions we've passed here today and on other days, addressing themselves to problems between Illinois and the Congress, or between Illinois and other states."

Leverenz: "Are you familiar with the most recent study of the Department of Transportation which says that accidents related to the use of alcohol, the majority are between the ages of twenty-one and forty-two. Are you familiar with that study?"

Barkhausen: "No, I'm not familiar with that specific study, but in Illinois, that would probably result from the fact that our drinking age is twenty-one. Therefore, unless youngsters are drinking illegally, they wouldn't be involved in alcohol-related accidents."

Leverenz: "Would you want to pass this with an Amendment to move the age up to forty-two?"

Barkhausen: "I'd leave that to you, Representative."

Leverenz: "Have you taken a poll, since this is going to be

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

outside of the State of Illinois, have you taken a poll to get the feelings of the states of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Canada, or Iowa? How do those folks there feel about that? Because you're asking Wisconsin to do something about those that are out of their state, how do you feel this is going to impact on the youth of Minnesota?"

Barkhausen: "It would depend on what the drinking age in Minnesota is. If the... the drinking age there is the same as it is in Wisconsin, which I don't know, would have no impact at all."

Leverenz: "Would you just consider sending a personal letter to the Speaker of the House and the leaders in the Wisconsin General Assembly?"

Barkhausen: "Well, Representative, the purpose... the purpose of this Resolution is to ask the Members of this Body, and they're free to say 'no' if they like. Whether they don't think this is a serious problem that... so serious that they'd like to express the sense of this Body, that it would be our desire, that working in cooperation with the State of Wisconsin, we could do something about a problem which no one can effectively argue isn't causing countless deaths."

Leverenz: "I'm not too happy about the State of Wisconsin and what they charge for an out-of-state fishing license, but to this... this Amendment, do you get any additional points with your local newspaper for introducing this Resolution?"

Barkhausen: "Well, if you got a letter from me last week, you can see that it's a subject that concerns everybody in our area, including the representatives of the media."

Leverenz: "To the Resolution. I would, maybe, want to pass a Resolution that would implore the Sponsor of this Resolution to take the special insert to his local

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

newspaper and send that to the Wisconsin General Assembly and to their Speaker and to their leaders, and I think it would be much more effective to show them the... the horrible pictures and the tremendous writing material that was included in these newspaper articles, and I think the proper way to be recorded on this Resolution would be 'present'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

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

Woodyard: "Representative, do you have any indication, or do you feel that this would in any way precipitate another war between Wisconsin and the State of Illinois? Two years ago, here on the floor of the House, we did have to mobilize all of the General Assembly into uniform to go and do battle with Wisconsin."

Barkhausen: "I believe in taking a more diplomatic approach, Representative. Not that I'm in any way a pacifist, but I don't think this calls for taking up arms, serious as the problem is."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels? Representative Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know, I think that this Resolution really points out how unrealistic we are when we address problems. You know, when we passed a nineteen-year-old beer and wine Bill into effect in the State of Illinois, one of the reasons that we did it was because the statistics showed us that kids were crossing over state lines, you know, into Wisconsin, into Iowa, into Michigan, and there were more deaths because of that than any other thing. However, because we were so unrealistic and because everybody panicked because they read two or three articles in the paper, and they looked at some, actually, at some articles that were published that

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

did not have any facts backing it, we ran back and we repealed the nineteen... the nineteen-year-old beer and wine Bill. And what did we find? We find that the same thing is happening, that these kids are now crossing over into Wisconsin and into Iowa, and these kids are now getting killed on the highway. I think that we were ridiculous, really, in... in taking that nineteen-year-old wine and beer Bill and repealing it, and to pass a Resolution like this is totally unrealistic. It's merely a PR Resolution, which will not solve any problem, which will not bring back one kid, which will not do anything except get some ink in the paper. I really think that we're so unrealistic, and we hide our heads in the sand so often, that we should start looking at problems more realistically. We should start dealing with problems as they exist, and not as we believe they exist politically. And therefore, I would vote 'no' on this particular Resolution"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, I move..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Hold that. I did promise Representative Reed, before we took that. Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the former speakers pointed out that Representative Barkhausen was an attorney. He should know that this particular kind of Resolution was unconstitutional. I merely am the parent of two children that grew up in Lake County, at the very Wisconsin border, and I say to you, in the border counties, we don't care whether it's constitutional or it is not. Every Saturday morning, when you breathe a sigh of relief that your child has made it back from the blacktop safely, you are ready for any effort at conciliation between the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

adjacent States of Wisconsin and Illinois. I realize that Representative Jaffe has a very good suggestion. We should look at the problem, but while we wait to get around to looking at the problem of changing the drinking age back to nineteen or eighteen, certainly this effort is one that may prove to be beneficial on an interim basis. I urge that you consider this Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vitek? 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 Barkhausen, to close."

Barkhausen: "Briefly, Mr. Speaker, to try to answer some of the points that have been made by those who have raised questions about this Resolution. First of all, not just because I'm a lawyer, but I think it's the obligation of the Sponsor of any measure to consider its constitutionality, and I did consider the equal protection question. Is it in any way discriminatory to have a drinking age that applies to residents of one state and not to out-of-staters? I don't think it is, because where it can be shown that the general welfare and safety of citizens will be promoted by a differential in the drinking age, I think that the discrimination can be sustained, in that kind of circumstances. And as I pointed out, there have been any number of tragic injuries and deaths that have been directly related to the differential in the drinking age that now exists. Secondly, is it, is it meaningful for us to pass a Resolution urging another Legislative Body to take action? I think it is. I think, in the spirit of cooperation, we should, wherever it might be shown to be effective, work with our neighboring states and with the Congress to work out problems that are joint

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

concerns. Thirdly, can such a measure be effective? I say 'yes', because this identical... identical suggestion has already been made in the Wisconsin Legislature, and has been seriously entertained by them, but up to this point, it has not yet passed. I think our showing a collective interest in their taking this kind of action could help to spur them on to the point where they will enact this kind of measure and ultimately save lives of many of our citizens, and I would urge the passage of this Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 575 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I realize this may not be binding on anybody, and I realize that what is proposed in this Resolution might not be legal, but I can tell you, if Wisconsin would raise their drinking age to what we have, it might save hundreds of lives. We raised it here a few years ago. Clinton County was killing almost one young person a month. I can tell you now, it's down to almost one a year, and believe me, I... that was my reason for voting then. Again, I hope this, in some way, might encourage the Wisconsin Legislature to raise their drinking age."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallock, to explain his vote."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know, those of you who live in Central Illinois may not deem this to be a major problem, but if you live as I do, just twelve miles from the Wisconsin border, and see every weekend, the cars of young people heading north on I-51 and I-90 to Wisconsin, and coming back late that evening and getting in accidents and killing themselves and killing many other people as well, you would see that this is a

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

very important issue. All this Resolution does is urge the Wisconsin Legislature to take action. It does not mandate anything. It's a good idea. I believe it would catch their attention. I think it's a good idea, and I hope it passes. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "To explain his vote, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yeah, thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to stand in support of this. I normally don't even think Resolutions do a heck of a lot of good anyway, but here we have spent an awful lot of time, and you've got hundreds of letters from people who are saying, 'Draft a Resolution to prevent the increase of nuclear energy, because you're going to kill everybody'. Well, that's off into the future. This Representative is attempting to deal with a problem that is now. We're causing young people to go up to Wisconsin at a younger age, come home and, literally, are being killed today, as a result of this. I think this a good Motion... a good Resolution and ought to be supported."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "This is uniquely an Illinois state problem that we can't solve, and the only one who can solve it is the Wisconsin Legislature. Accordingly, I'm voting 'aye' to let them know that it's a problem we can't handle. We hope they will."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote. Is that it? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. You know there are still about nine lights flashing, here. I mean, I have no idea whether that's on this or on something else. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'nay', 10 voting 'present'. House Resolution 575 is adopted. Now, Representative Vinson, what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would request unanimous consent to have

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

House Resolution 116 heard at this time."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any objection? Being none, leave is granted. It's page seven."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of House Resolution 116, which would request that the Department of Public Health conduct an investigation into the feasibility of abolishing health systems areas and establish a single system for the state."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate it if Mr. Vinson would do more than just read what each one of us can read in the Calendar. I'd like to know why he's proposed this, and why he thinks we should vote for this bad Resolution."

Vinson: "Because it's a good idea. It'll save money and it'll make life a lot simpler for people."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I really didn't think that was a very good explanation. Is it your contention, Representative Vinson, that the health systems areas have no place? What... What is the problem that you're trying to address, by this?"

Vinson: "The current health systems agencies structure in the state is so fractionated that all it does is impede progress in the field of health care. By having a single area for the state, I believe that legitimate planning will be facilitated and paper work will occur on a much quicker basis."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker, then, if I may address the issue."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Satterthwaite: "I think the Sponsor of this Amendment... of this

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Resolution really does not see the significance of what I see has happened in my area of the state, where we have a very good health systems agency. It has been very effective in planning. It has been very effective in bringing together various segments of the health delivery system within our community in order to provide a much better health system. And it seems to me that if we abolish that plan, now that it is in effect and is operating in many areas of the state very well, that we, in fact, negate a great deal of work that has gone into the system and we then come to an ineffective statewide system that does nothing. Now, if the Sponsor really feels that we should not be doing any planning, we should not be putting any restrictions on building in hospitals, in acquisition of very expensive kinds of pieces of equipment that are now necessary to be up to date in the provision of medical services, then we will find, I think, that the cost of health care escalates even faster than it has in the past, and I think it would be a very poor move to abolish the system that is in place and go to a statewide one."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions, please."

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

Pullen: "Does this Resolution have the effect, in itself, of abolishing the health systems agencies?"

Vinson: "No, the purpose of the Resolution is to have the department study whether that would be the most... whether the current system is the most feasible way of engaging in the function, or whether there's a more feasible way with a single agency."

Pullen: "Is it your own feeling that by going to a single agency, there would be less bureaucracy than having little agencies

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

everywhere in the state?"

Vinson: "Yes, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Thank you."

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

Vinson: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 116 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Well, I had wanted to ask the Sponsor some questions, since he didn't explain what the Resolution did, but since he was flip in his response to a request for a presentation about the Resolution, I think it's necessary to point out that this Resolution will cost money, and that this is a year when the Department of Public Health has had to cut back on services which are important to constituents, and this is a frivolous waste of the taxpayers' money, when the Department needs to be serving individuals and working at cost containment, rather than... than following up on flip requests."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Rea, to explain his vote."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House. I rise in opposition to this in explaining my vote, because I have seen the health systems agencies established in the state. I have seen them established in the rural areas on a multi-county basis, and as a result, they have brought about a coordinated system with much less duplication, with good planning, and I feel that this is very important to be

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

more localized than to be a statewide organization. I think as a result, we will provide much better and plan for much more quality of good care at... with the limited resources that we may have. I would encourage you to look carefully at this and not pass this Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am voting 'no', and I came to the realization here that they requested the Department of Public Health to conduct an investigation into the possibility of abolishing the health system areas in establishing a single area for the state. Now, what you're really saying if you are voting for this, to all those people out there in those particular geographical areas - you are saying to them, 'Look, you've been doing a miserable job. Turn it over to the State Government. Put it in one great big, large system.'. You're offending an awful lot of people by adopting this Resolution. Some of you people that are green ought to get over to red. It's a terrible Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who... Representative Bullock, to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Vinson and I Cosponsored similar legislation that would have abolished these HSA. Most of you know, at the state, we have a State Health Coordinating Council which could very well do this job. When the Congress passed Public Act 94-641, they intended to coordinate health planning in our state. That has not happened. It will not happen. I think Representative Vinson should be supported in this Resolution. We should send a message to the Department of Public Health that we want greater reliance on the State Health Coordinating Councils. Many of the local agencies are a nuisance to the hospitals. They're a nuisance to the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

doctors. They're a nuisance to health providers. They haven't functioned. Some of the consumers are stifled because of hospital predominance. I certainly think it ought to pass, and I think we should abolish all of the HSA's at the local level."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Currie, to explain her..."

Currie: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. How many votes does it take to pass this Resolution?"

Speaker Peters: "89, I would think."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Doesn't it take only a Majority of those voting on Resolutions, unless it appropriates money or involves the use of money?"

Speaker Peters: "Well, I... I thought this was to investigate something. Oh, it requests the Department. I would think the Majority of those voting on the question. Representative Currie"

Currie: "My recollection from the earlier part of the debate was that Representative Chapman pointed out that this would cost money. This will require the expenditure of sums, and I would suggest to the Chair that it would require 89 votes."

Speaker Peters: "Let... Let the Chair put the question, and then we'll answer that one. Okay? That's fair? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Currie."

Currie: "After we have your ruling on how many votes is required to pass this Resolution, we may request a verification. That is, Mr. Speaker, if you rule it takes 89 votes, then we will request a verification."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd say that's the best reason in the world for... for ruling that it doesn't take 89 - just a Majority..."

Unknown: "We're perusing."

Speaker Peters: "Perusal of the rules. The Chair rules it takes 89 votes. Now, on this question, there are 91 votes voting 'aye', 60... oh, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Then we would persist in our request for verification."

Speaker Peters: "The Lady... The Lady requests a verification of the affirmative vote. 89. The... Let the Chair just indicate that once we get through with this, we have two more, I think it's two more, pieces of legislative... or, relating to legislation - one Motion, and then the adjournment. Now, we start with 91. Representative... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Change me. I wanted to vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich, from 'yes' to 'no'. That's 90. Representative Irv Smith, from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Robbins, from 'aye', to 'no'. That's cooperation. Jack Dunn, from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Davis, from 'no' to 'aye'. Do we have that, Mr. Clerk? Davis, Jack Davis, from 'no' to 'aye'. It that it. All right. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 92? There are 92 'ayes', 67 'nos'. Mr. Clerk, read the... Representative Hastert? From 'present' to 'aye'. Representative McGrew, from 'present' to 'no' - from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Flinn, from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Leon, from 'yes' to 'no'. Okay? Representative Wolf asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Read the affirmative vote, Mr. Clerk. Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "To avoid the problem of Woody Bowman, I just withdraw the whole thing."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson, we have an affirmative 91 votes on this. You can't just... Now... are we... Representative Cullerton, are you suggesting the Chair violate the rules and the rights of the Members who want to be... who want to be recorded as voting 'aye', and 'nay'? Their elections may depend on this. This whole thing is crucial. Now, we have 91 affirmative votes. Now, is there, is there objection? Well, I'm not going to even ask to dump... Let... Let them, okay? Here's... Here's where we are. It's got 91 votes, 2 more than required to pass. The Lady requests a... a verification of the affirmative vote, and that's where we are at. You can't... Representative Chapman, we have a Roll Call up. If it gets below 89, that's one thing. If it gets over... See what the verification of the affirmative vote. Well, it's still above 89. Okay. Dump the Roll Call? Representative Vinson? We dump the Roll Call, there is no..."

Vinson: "Well, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, I mean... you got in a very difficult position one time on that. I don't want to put you in a difficult position. You've got to make a decision to do something like that. That's what you're paid for."

Speaker Peters: "Well, I... I have to stick by the rules. Representative O'Connell?"

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, please change my 'aye' to a 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "O'Connell from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Schraeder? From 'aye' to 'no'. Stuffle, 'aye' to 'no'. That's fine. On this question, there are 87... 87 'aye', 60 some odd... 72 voting 'no'. Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a copy of the Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Postponed consideration. What is it, 87? On this question, there are 87 'aye', 72 voting 'no'. Res... House Resolution 116 is lost. Now, on the Order of

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Consideration Postponed, Senate Bill 1685, Representative Hastert. We have discussed this previously."

Hastert: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've talked about this Bill two times previous. Let me just refresh your memory. Basically, this is to allow vending machines to sell postage stamps at face value. This Bill has to go through before than can sell them at face value. It's for people who can't get access into post offices, that can go in and spend their money, get their stamps, pay their bills. It's for people in little towns as well as big towns. We have to drive ten or fifteen miles to get to a post office, whether it's the Atwoods or Durands or Christophers or Wilingtons or Senecas, in the State of Illinois. It's for people in the rural areas and big towns. I think it's a good Bill, and I ask for your positive consideration."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Bill 1685. Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall... It's not a Joint Resolution. Senate... All right. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1685 pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills Second Reading. Page four of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1503. That is the last one."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1503, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code and Act creating the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs has been read a second time previously. Amendments #2, 4, 5, and 10 were adopted in Committee."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions with respect to the aforementioned Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #11 was ruled out of order. Next Amendment is Amendment #12, McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 1503 on page four and so forth."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #12, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 is very simple in its report. What we are looking at is the problem for the Illinois Veterans' Scholarships, and what we have done in the past is to appropriate money - not enough - it has been pro-rated to the various institutions, and the institutions have been told that they have to eat the money and come up with it out of their own pocket some way. What this Bill... What this Amendment would do is simply to say that the Veterans' Scholarship Program would fund whatever the... the application, or the appropriation would be adequate to cover, and that the colleges and universities could, indeed, bill the student for the additional amount. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In reading the Amendment, it says pretty much what you said, Sam, but then it has a clause that I'm rather concerned with. 'The holder shall pay the difference between the amount of tuition chargeable to him and his pro rata share of any amounts distributed pursuant to this Section to the institution he has.' Does that mean that these veterans that we have, by law, given the right to a scholarship or... or whatever, will have to then make up the difference out of his own pocket, if the state fails to

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

appropriate the money?"

CGrew: "That's true. The problem is that we have not been funding it. We are in a very tight budget situation for all the major colleges and universities, community colleges, and so on and so forth, around the state, and they have just been told that they can't have the money, and they're all reducing programs and staff and everything else because of it. What we're saying is that all the money we'd appropriate would go toward a percent of their pro rata share. They would pay only the difference in what the cost of tuition would have been, and what the scholarship commission paid. Let... Let me give you an example, okay? We're funding at 70% right now. If... If the total tuition charge to a student was 100 dollars, the scholarship program would pay 70 and the school could indeed, bill the student then, for 30."

ays: "And instead..."

CGrew: "And if we fund 100 dollars, then the student pays nothing."

ays: "How much are we ent... suppose... How much are we supposed to fund right now? 100 dollars?"

CGrew: "That is correct. That's what the law reads, but we haven't been doing it."

ays: "How much did we do with Larry's Amendment last night?"

CGrew: "With Larry's Amendment, we would fund 100 dollars. And if we can get the Governor to sign it, this would be useless information. However, it would be a protection in case he should use his pen to reduce that other amount."

ays: "Thank you very much."

CGrew: "You're welcome."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima."

iPrima: "Yes Sam, listen. You know what I propose to do. I'm

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

going to get all the veteran organizations to get after the Governor to sign that Amendment of mine for the four million dollars. Now, won't your Amendment and mine conflict with one another?"

McGrew: "Absolutely not."

DiPrima: "Yeah, but the Governor might decide to sign yours and dump mine, because yours... the guys... the veterans got to come up with the trump, then."

McGrew: "Well, if... if the Governor signs yours, mine is just words in the law books. It means nothing. If the Governor signs mine and yours, it's the same thing. If he vetoes mine and signs yours, we didn't need it. If he signs mine and vetoes yours, then in that case the universities would no longer be stuck with an additional 2.5 million dollars."

DiPrima: "Doesn't your Amendment take money from the veterans?"

McGrew: "No, Sir. It would require them to pay the difference if we didn't appropriate the money. We're not taking anything away from them."

DiPrima: "Are they required to pay the difference now?"

McGrew: "No Sir."

DiPrima: "Well, you're setting a new precedent, then."

McGrew: "Well, the Legislature last Session with the consent of the Governor's amendatory veto, set a new precedent."

DiPrima: "Listen. Listen to me. Stick with mine. I'll see that the Governor signs it, and we'll be on solid ground. It's better than the one you've got. Where are you, Sam?"

McGrew: "As... As you are very well aware, I got up and spoke last night, as did Representative Steele on behalf of your Amendment, and I support it 100%. The problem is that I don't get the same kind of feeling on the second floor. If you adopt this Amendment, you still talk the Governor into it as you say you're going to do, I'll be right with you. We haven't heard a thing."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

DiPrima: "I guarantee you, he'll sign mine."

McGrew: "Will you pay the 2.5 million to the universities if he doesn't?"

DiPrima: "I will. Let's sink his Amendment. Stick with me, believe me."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative DiPrima happens to be very right. There's a requirement now that we appropriate for the scholarships that are authorized by law, and I can very well see the Governor vetoing the proportion of... of DiPrima's legislation and letting Sam stand, and that means the veterans themselves are going to have to pick up this 20 - 30 or whatever percentage it is at the moment. And it seems to me that we just got to go along with DiPrima on this one."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker. I think this would encourage the Governor to veto DiPrima's Amendment, and I think we better stick with that, and if he wants to do it, he has to take the responsibility."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1503 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. The Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #13, McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "McGrew, Amendment #13."

McGrew: "I move to table Amendment #13."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #13. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #14, Stanley. Amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley, Amendment #14."

Stanley: "I move to table Amendment #14."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #14. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #15, Katz - Grieman, amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz, Amendment #15."

Katz: "Amendment #15 provides that non-appropriated money that was once given by foundations to the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly, which Commission is no longer in existence, that those funds will be transferred to the Illinois Legislative Council to be held in a non-appropriated trust account to be used for the purposes of the original research that was to be undertaken by the Commission. I would move the adoption of Amendment #15."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I guess a point of order. I have no problem with what Representative Katz wants to do. I want to know, in the question of the Chair, whether or not this Amendment is germane to the Bill and whether or not it fits with the other Amendments. That's my concern - that it may not, and we may end up in the same situation we did last night, and the reason we're back here today on this Bill - that we had one Amendment which we took, which did jeopardy to the rest, at least to some of the Amendments, otherwise. And I, as I say, have no opposition. I'd like to know if it fits in the Bill and if it's germane to the Bill, and what damage it does to the rest of it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty, on this question."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I was rising on the same point that Representative Stuffle was. I... I... As I look at the title of the Bill and what the Bill does as amended, I

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

just seriously question whether, if we were to put this in, we wouldn't have a violation of the single subject rule, and it would become unconstitutional. I just... I just question the sensibility of putting this in. I have no objections, I want to make it clear, to what Representative Katz wants to do. I just think there's a serious constitutional question on single subject, here."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair would rule that the objections raised are valid, and the Amendment is not germane. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #16, McGrew, amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew, Amendment #16. Withdraws Amendment 16. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #17, Stuffle - Stanley, amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle, Amendment #17."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. This Amendment is an Amendment to the School Code, as are other Sections and Amendments to the Bill at this point in time. Last year, we passed House Bill 701, which set up the first framework statutorily proposed and enacted in this state to deal with the subject of negotiations and bargaining in the public school districts of the state, and that Bill dealt with all the school districts of the state - the public districts. In that particular legislation, there was no time frame stated for the beginning of negotiation. This Amendment provides, number one, that there is a time frame for the beginning of negotiations, where a bargaining representative is selected by the teachers or educational employees under that Bill, and number two, it provides a time frame at which time there shall be elections pursuant to the elections provided for in that Bill, and number

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

three, it provides language that would put in place a mediation board at the state level under the office of education and provides and attempts to prevent impasse and strikes - if you will - a great concern to this Body, by providing a time frame in which both parties could mutually ask for arbitration in which one could invoke... rather, mediation, strike arbitration, rather, mediation, and one in which the State Board could invoke mediation to attempt to end a strike if, unfortunately, one would occur. As you know, there is no language on strikes on that Bill. There is none on this, and we want to prevent them, if at all possible, and that is the scope of this particular Act. As you know, there's been some question about the meaning of 701. We attempt to clarify it here. We attempt to do so in a manner that will bring both sides to the bargaining table and will give some statewide application to a method of providing relief to the public and the parties involved, and to prevent strikes, as I said, and to have ongoing good faith bargaining, and to that end, I would move you... the adoption of Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1503."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion. Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "You mentioned that this affects House Bill 701 that we passed last year. I think you said it clarifies it. 701 was a permissive Bill, was it not?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "701... excuse me. Pardon me, Representative. 701 provided the framework for negotiations in the school districts and provided for a means by which employees could prove to the local regional superintendent that they had a bargaining unit, and be recognized therein. Now, the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

question has arisen since then, in the courts, and of course, in discussions among the various educational personnel as to the meaning and the intent of that Bill. Obviously, we passed a Bill in giving the right to be recognized. In my opinion, we gave the right to bargain. It seems and flows obviously from the fact that you recognized a bargaining unit, that you intended them to bargain. Now, some suggest we didn't intend them to bargain, and some suggested that all we did was intend to recognize bargaining units. It seems to me absurd to assume that you don't have a bargaining element there if you are going to recognize the unit, so it's my opinion whether you want to call it permissive in a sense or not, that there was an intention to bargain, and what this does is attempt to put into place language that would specify a time frame in which bargaining would begin after the representative is selected and if that representative is selected."

Birkinbine: "Well, you seem to be dancing around the point, but when 701 was put before the House last..."

Stuffle: "I didn't dance around it at all, I said it's your opinion."

Birkinbine: "I asked a question as to whether or not was permissive, and last year when 701 was put before the House, one of the principal arguments that your side, or the people in favor of 701 made, was that it was permissive legislation. That was the argument on the floor of the House. This Amendment here makes it mandatory, does it not?"

Stuffle: "This Amendment here, to me, is an extension of that. If you want to use the word that that was permissive, I'll let you make your own definition of that. This does not compel them to sign a contract. It doesn't force that, and

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

it doesn't force them to make any concessions at all. So if you want to define permissive in a different way than I do, go right ahead. I don't think that's the case."

Birkinbine: "Well, I was using the words expressed last year when 701 was put forward. Does this, or does it not, mandate collective bargaining?"

Stuffle: "It mandates that you negotiate. It mandates that you sit down in good faith and negotiate from a certain point in a time frame. If you want to argue that, I submit that is true. It does not mandate, on the other hand, that they reach and sign a contract, as I read the Bill and the Amendment. It's..."

Birkinbine: "Can you tell me, does the Bill spell out what areas shall be subject to bargaining?"

Stuffle: "As I read... You mean the Amendment, I hope. The Amendment provides..."

Birkinbine: "The Amendment..."

Stuffle: "As I read the Amendment, 'the bargaining between the employer and the exclusive agent shall begin within 60 days of the date that a representative is certified with the regional superintendent' and it goes on, 'within 60 days of the receipt by a party of a demand to bargain issued by the other party. Once commenced, bargaining continues for at least 60 days, unless a contract is entered into, the failure to adhere to those bargaining requirements may be reported to the state board and immediately investigate the situation and where needed', it goes on, 'the status to compel compliance with the Section'. The compelling of compliance with the Section is the bargain. You will find nowhere in here where it says they have to reduce it to writing in any form, and I don't think you'll find anywhere in here, because it's not in here, a scope of negotiations, at least as I see it, in this Amendment."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Birkinbine: "Then, I gather, it does not spell out what areas are subject to bargaining."

Stuffle: "Well, I'm looking at the Amendment's new language."

Birkinbine: "So am I."

Stuffle: "The new language of the Amendment deals with: number one, the mediators; number two, it deals with when you hold the election; number three, it says you have to bargain in good faith within 60 days of the certification. And then, it provides the same language - that you can go to the state board and indicate that you got an impasse situation. It doesn't say in that new language anywhere, that you've got to bargain on anything in particular, that I read in here, and I've read it over now for the fifth time - the new language."

Birkinbine: "Well, I've got the... In other words, no. The areas are not spelled out. Does the Bill spell out management? What consti... Does the Amendment spell out what constitutes management or management rights?"

Stuffle: "No. The original Bill, as you will recall, spelled out who the employer and the employees were, and spelled out that the school board would be involved, the school district and so forth, and the regional superintendent, and the teachers, if they picked a bargaining agent by an election. This Bill does not deal with management rights. This Amendment doesn't deal with the spelling out of unfair labor practices either."

Birkinbine: "Can you tell me - does the Amendment prohibit agency shop?"

Stuffle: "The Amendment doesn't deal with agency shop, in affirmative or negative language, either."

Birkinbine: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have here offered an Amendment that alters distinctly House Bill 701, which we passed last year - a

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Bill that was trumpeted as being permissive. We are now making mandatory, something that was permissive and apparently at the time, it was very important that it be permissive, for it to get passed. Now, they're trying to alter it. It is a Amendment that does not spell out what constitutes management. It's an area that does not spell out what areas shall be subject to bargaining. It's making a change in a Bill that is presently being contested in the courts. I recommend this is a bad idea, and I recommend that people vote against it."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Mays: "Larry, in the previous Amendment #11 that you had introduced, which did basically the same thing, there was a Section that you had in there that exempted the State Mandates Law from this... from app... application toward this Bill. I don't see that in #17. Is there any reason for that?"

Stuffle: "It's on page five of the particular Amendment, and in my opinion, that is in there because we aren't providing any new cost factors beyond 701. The only cost factor would be the mediators, and they are state mediators."

Mays: "So the mediators are furnished at state expense."

Stuffle: "Yes, the mediators are mediators provided by the State Board of Education."

Mays: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, and I don't want to be tedious. Representative Birkinbine raised a number of valid points about this legislation. As you remember last year, House Bill 701 passed out of this chamber. It was billed as a permissive piece of legislation. Unfortunately, most of the people were not here on the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

floor when that Bill was taken up, and it flew out of here without much debate at all. Now, here we have a piece that just, as it was said last night, is just a technical Amendment, taking it another step forward. And basically, what this thing does is require the regional superintendent of schools to recognize the bargaining unit after the election's taken place, which was required by 701. I guess it's a logical step. I guess, as a rookie over here in the House, you're going to have to learn, or I'm going to have to learn, that the foot in the door idea, to scare you off of a good Bill initially, is as valid as ever. I would urge everyone to look this over very, very carefully and vote 'no', if you can."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpziel."

Karpziel: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Karpziel: "Larry, does this Bill differentiate between professional and non-professional employees?"

Stuffle: "The Bill doesn't... The Amendment, I assume you mean..."

Karpziel: "I'm talking about the Amendment, yes."

Stuffle: "The Amendment doesn't deal with that subject in... at all. It doesn't deal with the bargaining unit at all, only the subjects I mentioned - 701 dealt with the bargaining unit and the educational employees. This doesn't touch or change in any way, the bargaining units that would have been allowed in that, and doesn't, in any way, attempt to define anyone in any different fashion."

Karpziel: "So, that you have no unions... appropriate unions... Units."

Stuffle: "I'm sorry. I did not hear that."

Karpziel: "You have no appropriate units established in this Amendment."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Stuffle: "That's the... The units could be established under 701 in last year's Bill. We don't touch that at all in this Amendment. It does not affect that situation. It doesn't affect the units or how you would define them at all, in any shape, in this Amendment. Nothing."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle, excuse me. Representative Birkinbine, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Birkinbine: "Question of the Chair - parliamentary inquiry. This now amends - I think Amendment #10 became the Bill and dealt with tax abatement reimbursement. This amends the School Code. I would question the germaneness of Amendment #17."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Stuffle, to the point. Amendment 10."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we discussed that last night. The Chair admitted being in error when they said that 10 had struck the Bill. 10, in fact, later was found not to strike the Bill, and the School Code was and is and remains a part of the Bill, and so is this Amendment. It's obvious on its face that that point is not well taken."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn, on this point."

Flinn: "No, I was trying to move the previous question, not on this point at all."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino, on this point."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #10 was my Amendment too, and we did get it clarified last evening before we adjourned, and it was given orally into the record in the transcript, so I did want to correct Representative Birkinbine's statement in that regard."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #16 was ruled non-germane. Am I correct?"

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "It was withdrawn, Sir."

Tuerk: "It was withdrawn? Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kane: "On a completely unrelated matter. There's been distributed Amendment #21 to Senate Bill 1654 that is completely indecipherable, and if you would ask the Clerk to reprint it, it would be useful."

Speaker Peters: "Okay. Yes. The... originally, the legislation was filed as related to scholarships. It was the School Code and the Department of Veterans' Affairs Act were subsequently amended and added to the Bill. A further Amendment was passed which dealt with the Unemployment Insurance Act relating to defaulted student loans. The next Amendment passed related to the School Code, relating to parent-teacher conferences. A further Amendment was added relating to the Administrative Code. And another Amendment was passed which related to the Revenue Act. It would appear to the Chair that at this point, regardless of what it amends, it doesn't make too much difference, because the entire Bill, starting from the first Amendment, would appear to be violative of the legislative process. And in that spirit, the Chair would ask that the Gentleman withdraw his request for a ruling on germaneness, which he does, and we will now proceed to defeat the Bill. That was editorial comment. Representative Stuffle, on the Amendment."

Stuffle: "Well, am I closing?"

Speaker Peters: "Is there further discussion? Representative Mays? Mays."

Mays: "Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with what your statement just was, I'm just wondering if it might be in contravention of our State Constitution, Article IV, Section 8(d), the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

single subject part of the Constitution. Would you care to rule on that?"

Speaker Peters: "Well, no, I would not. Representative... Let's end this up, now. Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Well, you've heard this speech before. I'd appreciate an affirmative Roll Call. People want us to extend the scope of bargaining one day, and they want to cut it back the next. You can't have it both ways. 701's in place, and if it's going to work for all sides and going to be fair and keep people from being out on the streets instead of in the classroom, then it's got to have some clarification as to language as to dates and when you negotiate and how you keep people in the classroom, and for those reasons, I'd ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1503 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #18, Stuffle - Stanley, amends Senate Bill 1503 as amended."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley, Amendment #18."

Stanley: "Withdraw Amendment 18."

Speaker Peters: "18 is withdrawn. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #19, Katz - Grieman, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz, Amendment #19."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of your previous ruling, that you weren't going to be paying any attention to silly things like germaneness, I'll give you a chance to change your ruling that you made before, with regard to my Amendment #15. Otherwise, if you adhere to it, I will table Amendment 19. I'll withdraw it."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 19. Further

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Now, Representative Stanley, do you wish to suspend the rule to hear this? Just forget it? Representative Davis, you... you withdraw... you withdraw this? Representative Davis withdraws his request for a fiscal note. Representative Mays, you're pursuant to Rule 34(d). The Gentleman withdraws that request. Thank you, Sir. Representative Stanley, 1503."

Stanley: "Yeah, pursuant to 34(d), I request leave to have 1503 considered immediately."

Speaker Peters: "Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. Senate Bill 1503, Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1503, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code an Act creating the Illinois Department of Veteran Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I yield to Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Peters: "Representative DiPrima, you have been yielded to. He doesn't take to yield. It's back to you. Thirty love, or whatever."

Stanley: "I'm not sure right now what this Bill does, to be honest with you."

Speaker Peters: "It's probably the best piece of legislation to vote for."

Stanley: "I can tell you that it doesn't have any collective bargaining legislation in it, and it does change... well, I think maybe what I'll do is just yield to Representative Mautino, because the Bill basically now has his Amendment on it, and he could explain it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino. Representative? Representative Mautino, remember, this is a close election coming up. Proceed."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, today I don't yield to anybody. My Amendment isn't the Bill, in my estimation, but I happened to step out of the room when... oh - basically, the Amendment authorizes that school districts that abated taxes under our existing law, to bring industry into the State of Illinois, would not be penalized under the School Code. If there was any loss to the school district, it would be reimbursed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs under their provisions. It was put in specifically for the Iowa Beef Processors application in Bureau County. It's the same Bill - it is the Bill that Senator Schuneman passed out of the Senate, Senate Bill 1274. There's no fiscal impact in this year or next year. A possible, but not probable, fiscal impact could be in 1985-86, but if the plant were to be built, the 25% that is involved in this Bill would certainly be offset by the assessed valuation. It's a nothing thing. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor, I guess, yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Is this an emergency, Dick, are they... doesn't sound like they're going to build. I don't see any emergency, and I see no necessity of passing it at this time."

Mautino: "Well, it's... As I said, it's only a protective measure. I made that evident last... last night."

McMaster: "It seems to me like it's a waste of time to put this on the statute books or the Governor's desk when there's absolutely no need for it. If Iowa Beef does come in there in the next ten years, why, we'll do it then."

Mautino: "The problem is, Tom, Iowa Beef recommended this to the school districts. They will make the same recommendation to any school district where they would buy farm land out

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

for the possible... influx of their new building. If they don't do it in Bureau County, they'll do it in Lee or whatever. This was their request. This is what Cal Schuneman did, and I'm just carrying it."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "No, if there isn't any other discussion, I would request a favorable Roll Call for Representative Mautino's Bill."

Speaker Peters: "There's quite a bit of discussion. Representative Olson. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise in support of my fellow 37th District Legislator, Representative Mautino, and in deference to the Bill which came to us from us the Senate, Representative (sic - Senator) Schuneman. I'd suggest an affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "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 Stanley, to close. He does not close. Mautino, to close. Nobody closes. The question is... Who? Roll it. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1503 pass?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Fawell, to explain her vote. Representative Fawell, to explain her vote."

Fawell: "Just a point of inquiry. If this thing passes, does that mean it goes into Conference Committee? I think that's a good reason to vote no."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Davis: "Well, Speaker, I... we didn't press the issue of violating the Constitution, but there are 15 different subjects in this Bill. We're going to look like a bunch of fools if we stand here and do this. You know it, I know it, everybody knows it. It's an awfully good reason to kill the Bill. There's a lot of good stuff in here that didn't make it, but I think we ought to kill the Bill, because sure as hell, we'll see it again in some Conference Committee next Wednesday, and God knows what'll be in it then. So... It's obviously, grossly violative of the Illinois Constitution, and if we've learned anything in the last few weeks, it's to... that we've got some oath to protect, and we'd better protect it. And this is just absolute insanity."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Nelson, to explain her vote."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Members of the House. I would like to point out that Amendment 5, which was added to this Bill, allows school administrators to become administrators without ever having had teaching experience. I don't think that's a good idea, and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 79 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. There's no time to hear it. Now, I think that's it. Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you rise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on. Hold on. Hold on a second. Can we do...one second. Represent... We got. Get the Agreed. Agreed Resolutions. Last thing."

Clerk Leone: "Agreed Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 100,

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

DiPrima - et al; House Joint Resolution 101, DiPrima - et al. House Resolution 1044, Stuffle - Donovan; House Resolution 1045, Jack Dunn; House Resolution 1046, Collins - et al; House Resolution 1047, Collins; House Resolution 1048, Kulas - et al."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti, on the Agreed Resolutions."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution, (sic - 100) DiPrima - et al. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held their 63rd annual Department Convention at the Conrad Hilton Hotel on June 16th through the 20th. DiPrima - Ryan - Madigan - et al, House Joint Resolution 101. The Class A Division winners were Senator Arthur Berman and Dick 'Shell Oil' Marshall who captured their title by defeating Senator Harber 'Retired and Tired' Hall and Bob 'Allstate' Miller in a grueling 5 to 3 tennis match at 1:30 a.m.. House Resolution 1044, Stuffle and Donovan; that we congratulate and commend Alice Donovan about being named Woman Educator of the Year by Danville Branch of the American Association of University Women. House Resolution 1045, by Jack Dunn; that this House thanks Festmaster Harry Smith for his community-minded ideas and efforts on behalf of Tinley Park and congratulates him on the enormous success of his brainchild creating an Octoberfest in Tinley Park. Collins - Leinenweber and Ryan, House Resolution 1046. Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Betts of Springfield, Illinois celebrated their Silver Wedding Anniversary May 26th. House Resolution 1047, Collins. George A. Betts and his lovely wife, Hazel (nee Heltman), celebrated their Golden Wedding Anniversary at a reception and dinner held on Saturday, June 12, 1982. House Resolution 1048, Kulas - et al; that whereas, 1982 marks the 24th anniversary of the

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

Captive Nations Week, and the observances which are to be held throughout the United States and Canada will include a commemoration ceremony in the City of Chicago. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Motions (sic - Resolutions) are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1050, Catania, in respect to the memory of Adade Wheeler."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I move for the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1049, Bianco - et al."

Speaker Peters: "Committee on Assignments. Is that it? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first let me announce that the Republican Leaders will meet in Speaker Ryan's Office after adjournment. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Speaker Ryan has conferred with Representative Madigan on this matter, and I believe it's agreed between the two Gentlemen. I would now like to move to suspend the provisions of Rule 35(g) in connection with Senate Bills 1599, 1654 and 1396 and extend the deadline to June 30, 1982."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'."

Telcser: "This would extend the deadline until Wednesday for

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

131st Legislative Day

June 25, 1982

these three Bills."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question there are 136 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm now going to move to adjourn, and I want to remind the Members that we're going to adjourn until tomorrow morning, 9:00. We may... We will probably have a concurrence Motion on items that came over from the Senate today. So, there is a good chance we will be considering nonconcurrences, possibly some concurrence Motions. We'll be in Session tomorrow morning 9:00. We'll adjourn tomorrow after a reasonable time until 6:00 Sunday evening. So, Mr. Speaker, I now move the House stand adjourned until 9:00 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Motion is adopted. The House is adjourned."

09/27/82
08:52

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

PAGE 1

JUNE 25, 1982

HB-0654	CONFERENCE	PAGE	154
HB-1913	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
HB-1938	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
HB-2044	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	163
HB-2079	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
HB-2095	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
HB-2116	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	160
HB-2126	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
HB-2175	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	40
HB-2234	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	33
HB-2262	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	159
HB-2266	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	166
HB-2276	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	41
HB-2285	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HB-2286	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
HB-2286	MOTION	PAGE	15
HB-2357	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	27
HB-2391	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
SB-0623	CONFERENCE	PAGE	155
SB-1359	THIRD READING	PAGE	51
SB-1363	THIRD READING	PAGE	42
SB-1386	THIRD READING	PAGE	51
SB-1396	MOTION	PAGE	239
SB-1397	THIRD READING	PAGE	43
SB-1398	THIRD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1399	THIRD READING	PAGE	50
SB-1400	THIRD READING	PAGE	113
SB-1401	RECALLED	PAGE	173
SB-1401	THIRD READING	PAGE	178
SB-1402	THIRD READING	PAGE	118
SB-1404	THIRD READING	PAGE	120
SB-1405	THIRD READING	PAGE	57
SB-1406	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
SB-1413	THIRD READING	PAGE	69
SB-1413	THIRD READING	PAGE	123
SB-1414	THIRD READING	PAGE	77
SB-1414	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
SB-1415	THIRD READING	PAGE	84
SB-1417	RECALLED	PAGE	99
SB-1417	THIRD READING	PAGE	129
SB-1417	OTHER	PAGE	126
SB-1418	RECALLED	PAGE	85
SB-1418	THIRD READING	PAGE	87
SB-1419	RECALLED	PAGE	89
SB-1419	THIRD READING	PAGE	91
SB-1420	RECALLED	PAGE	92
SB-1420	THIRD READING	PAGE	94
SB-1422	THIRD READING	PAGE	133
SB-1425	THIRD READING	PAGE	55
SB-1427	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
SB-1445	THIRD READING	PAGE	113
SB-1503	SECOND READING	PAGE	218
SB-1503	THIRD READING	PAGE	234
SB-1524	RECALLED	PAGE	97
SB-1524	THIRD READING	PAGE	98
SB-1599	MOTION	PAGE	239
SB-1654	MOTION	PAGE	239
SB-1656	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
SB-1663	RECALLED	PAGE	167
SB-1663	THIRD READING	PAGE	172
SB-1665	OTHER	PAGE	167
SB-1667	OTHER	PAGE	167
SB-1678	THIRD READING	PAGE	138
SB-1685	THIRD READING	PAGE	181
SB-1685	THIRD READING	PAGE	217

09/27/82
08:52

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

PAGE 2

JUNE 25, 1982

HR-0116	ADOPTED	PAGE	211
HR-0575	ADOPTED	PAGE	201
HR-0708	ADOPTED	PAGE	198
HR-0737	ADOPTED	PAGE	200
HR-0814	TABLED	PAGE	197
HR-0866	ADOPTED	PAGE	192
HR-0919	ADOPTED	PAGE	197
HJR-0021	ADOPTED	PAGE	191
HJR-0026	ADOPTED	PAGE	190
HJR-0069	ADOPTED	PAGE	184
HJR-0085	ADOPTED	PAGE	185
SJR-0039	ADOPTED	PAGE	185
SJR-0044	ADOPTED	PAGE	193
SJR-0072	ADOPTED	PAGE	188
SJR-0076	ADOPTED	PAGE	187

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER PETERS	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND WIKTKOP	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	189
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	237
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	239
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	239
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	240