15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The House will come to order. The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Father Peter Mascari, pastor of the St. John Vianney Church in Sherman and the Holy Pamily Church in Athens. Father Mascari is a guest of Representative Josephine Oblinger. Will the guests in the gallery please rise to join us in the invocation? Father Mascari."

Father Mascari: "Almighty God, it is impossible for us, no matter how good we try to be, to be as good as we should be. We are so grateful to You for giving us a sharing in Your divine life. We ask You to guide us each day that we may know Your divine will. In the complexity of our society today, be it the State of Illinois or the entire world, we realize that life is not what life once was, and no matter how we try, as I said a moment ago to You, Father, it is so difficult for us to know the right route. We depend upon You now more than ever, especially with the problems that we are facing in our own state which are not new from problems....that are different from problems being faced throughout our society in the United States. We need Your quidance now more than ever. We know that this is We read about the Garden of Eden. blessed land. This is Your new Garden of Eden, the United State of America our State of Illinois. You've given us so much here in this State of Illinois. Let us do our best to be people whom You've made it possible for us to be. gu...ask You to guide our Legislators in every way. Inspire them to know Your will, and give them the strength and courage to carry it out. And as we are people of conviction first in You and our philosophies of life, so shall we assume our responsibilities as Your people in the

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

most complete way possible. Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be lead in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States

 of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one

 Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for
 all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Boll Call for attendance. Are there any excused absences? Mr. Greiman. Mr. Greiman."
- Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representatives Witek and Henry are
 ill and would be excused...leave for them to be excused."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman would you like the record to show
- that Mr. Henry should have been excused yesterday also?"

 Greiman: "Yes, please."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show that Bepresentative Vitek and Henry are excused today because of illness and that Representative Henry should have been excused yesterday because of illness. Are there any excused absences, Mr. Daniels? There are no excused absences on the Republican side. Have all voted who wish to record themselves? The Clerk shall take the record. There are 117 Members responding to the Boll Call. A guorum is present. The Chair recognizes the Majority Leader, Mr. McPike for a Motion. For what purpose does Mr. Ewing seek recognition?"
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, is Representative Vitek present or absent?"

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewing has brought to our attention that someone has recorded Mr. Vitek as "present". Mr. Clerk, correct the record and show that Mr. Vitek is absent but excused because of illness. Thank you, Mr. Ewing. The Chair recognizes Mr. McPike for a Motion on the Adjournment Resolution. Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Clerk read House

 Joint Resolution #14. House..."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 14, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that the two Houses shall convene in Joint Session on Wednesday, March 2, 1983 at the hour of 1:15 p.m. for the purpose of hearing His Excellency, Governor James B. Thompson, present to the General Assembly his budget message for fiscal year 1984 as required by Chapter 127, Section 28 of the revised statutes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McPike has moved for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. The Motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 457, Shaw - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 458, Shaw - Rice, a Bill for an to amend Sections of the School Code and the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 459, Bowman, a Bill for an Act in relation to reports required to be submitted to the General Assembly. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 460, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Mandates Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 461, McMaster, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources research. data collection and environmental studies. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 462, Hastert, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 463, Johnson - McAuliffe - Lauring, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 464, Giorgi - Panayotovich, a Bill for an Act to authorize peace officers to organize and collectively bargain. First Beading of the Bill. Bill 465, Winchester, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections the Agricultural Fair Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 466, Ropp, a Bill for an Act in relation to debts owed to and by the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 467, Kulas, a Bill for an Act to exempt hearing aids from certain taxation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 468, Steczo - McMaster, a Bil1 for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 469, Steczo - McMaster, Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 470, Rea, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the River Conservancy District Act. First Reading of the House Bill 471, Deuchler, a Fill for an Act to amend Bill. Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 472, Deuchler, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 473, Deuchler, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 474, Currie, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Committee Reports?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, Sir. Committee Reports. Representative

White, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources, to
which the following Bills were referred, action taken March

1, 1983, reported the same back with the following

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 77; 'do pass as amended' House Bill 244; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 80 and 104. Representative Terzich, Chairman of the Committee on Executive to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 2, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do not pass' House Bill 248; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 88. Representative John Dunn, Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Motor Vehicles to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 1, 1983, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended' House Bill 265'; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 76."

- Speaker Madigan: "On page 2 of the Calendar under the Order of
 House Bills Second Reading Short Debate Calendar there
 appears House Bill 178. Mr. Neff, do you wish to call
 your Bill? Mr. Neff, do you wish to call you Bill? Mr.
 Clerk, read the Eill. House Bill 178."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 178, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to that Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any...Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I've been asked to hold this Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "All right. Mr. Clerk, take this Bill from the record. On the Order of House Bills Second Beading there appears House Bill 20. Mr. Giorgi, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
 - Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 20, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Second

 Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 28. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to call you Bill? The Gentleman indicates that he does not wish to call his Bill. House Bill 57. Mr. Olson, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 57, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of an Act in relation to fire protection
 districts. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was
 adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions relating to Amendment #1 and no floor
 Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 68. Mr. Preston, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 68, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Hawkinson, amends House Bill
 68 on page 1, line 1 by inserting *and to repeal Sections*
 and so forth."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Bepresentative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members please give their attention to Mr. Hawkinson? The noise level has risen

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

significantly. Would the Membership please be in their chairs? Would they give their attention to Mr. Hawkinson? Proceed. Sir."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have offered Amendment #2 to House Bill 68. What the Amendment would do would be to prospectively abolish all legislative scholarships without affecting any scholarships that have already been granted. I would like to speak briefly to the purpose of the Amendment if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Hawkinson: "We're going to hear shortly in this chamber from the Governor of the budget cuts that are going to be facing the people of the State of Illinois in fiscal year *84 and the tremendous budget cuts that have already been made in fiscal year '83. I think that I would like to echo the Speaker's marks after he was sworn in that the Legislature must take the forefront in reducing our perks. Many of here because of or in spite of the cutback Amendment, and the people of the state were trying to send a message to the Legislature that we cut some of our own perks. I do not believe this is the time to increase our perks by doubling the number of legislative scholarships. I want to tell the Members that I like legislative scholarships. 1 have a committee set up to use mine. I recognize the political benefits that flow from them. Many Legislators receive those benefits, particularly when they've been here some time. I'm opposed to them, however, because no standards are set up for the awarding of the scholarships and they can be misused for political purposes. trustee. I am a Member of the Higher Education Committee of the House. I know that there is a need in my district and all over the state for scholarship money. If this

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

Amendment passes and if this House will abolish legislative scholarships. I will join in any Motion to add scholarship money when we can afford it to the regular scholarship funds that can be given on the basis of merit and need and not on the basis of political whim. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Freston. Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment 2 to House 68_ I'm the Sponsor of the Bill. To...At a time when federal assistance and when state assistance for higher education is diminishing, when many of the applicants who come to us for legislative scholarships have nowhere else go and no other way to get in the college door but for our scholarships, to, on top of the diminished federal state aid, to, at this time in our economy, to do away with the schol...with the legislative scholarship program is to cut off the legs of many people who, otherwise but for these scholarships, could not get a higher education, to wipe out the scholarship program makes no sense. Ιf Representative doesn't like the program, or Representative doesn't feel that he or she can adequately that program, then for God's Representative need not grant any legislative scholarships. and let that individual go back to his district and indicate that he or she doesn't feel that people in that district deserve scholarship support. But, for the rest of us who have people clamoring for help and have nowhere else to go for that help, we need not only the scholarship assistance that we have had, but we need increased scholarship assistance. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I'm opposing Amendment #2 and I hope it will be soundly and resoundly defeated."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair would like to advise the Membership that the Senators have arrived. They are standing outside the door. There are approximately five Members who are seeking recognition to speak on this Amendment. If those Members persist in wishing to speak on the Amendment, I shall take the Bill from the record and proceed to the Joint Session. Mr. Ewing, do you persist in speaking on the Amendment? Mr. Clerk, take this Bill from the record. The Chair recognizes the Doorkeeper. Mr. Doorkeeper."
- Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, the Honorable President Rock and Members of the Senate are at the door and seek admission to the chambers."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Doorkeeper, please admit the Honorable

 Senator Rock and the other Senators. Mr. Clerk...Mr.

 Clerk, is a quorum of the House present?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A quorum of the House is present."
- Speaker Madigan: "Senator Rock, is there a guorum of the Senate
 present?"
- President Rock: "Mr. Speaker, there is a quorum of the Senate present."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative McPike for the purpose of a Motion."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Clerk read Joint Session Resolution #2?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Joint Session Resolution #2, resolve that a committee of ten be appointed, five from the House by the Speaker of the House and five from the Senate by the Committee on Committees of the Senate to await upon His Excellency, Governor James R. Thompson, and invite him to address the Joint Assembly."
- Speaker Madigan: "You have all heard the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", all those opposed by

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. The following Members are appointed to the Committee of Welcome: from the House, Representative Brookins, Representative Curran, Representative Representative Wojcik; from Representative Hawkinson, Senate, Senator Welch, Senator Zito, Senator Smith, Senator Hudson, Senator Geo-Karis. Would the Members of that Committee please form at the well, and then proceed...form at the well, and then proceed as a group to form a Committee of Welcome for the Governor? Would the Committee retire to the rear of the chamber to welcome the Governor? Thank you. The Chair would like to introduce to the Membership the former Speaker of the California Assembly and the current Treasurer of the State of California, Jesse Unruh. Mr. Unruh. For what purpose does Mr. Vinson seek recognition?"

- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if Mr. Unruh might have some words for us in reference to the proper way to deal with lobbyists."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Doorkeeper. Mr. Doorkeeper."
- Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, His Excellency, Governor James R.

 Thompson, is at the door and seeks admission to the
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Doorkeeper, please admit the Honorable
 Governor. Would the Membership please be in their chairs?
 Would everyone please be seated? Let us give our attention
 to Governor Thompson. Mr. Governor."
- Governor Thompson: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of the 83rd General Assembly, my fellow citizens, last year at this time, I came before you to report that we had been able to ward off the ravages of recession one more year by taking additional cuts in spending, but without

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

gutting state services and without any call for new taxes. We were able to do that because for six years now, with your support, we have tended and squeezed and lowered put spending cut upon spending cut and just transferred. plain managed well Illinois' taxpayer dollars. This occurred during a time when states all around us were paying the price of recession earlier than us bv taking much more severe cuts in service borrowing money. Today, one year later, I come before you to report that four years of recession for Illinois, which we fought and fought hard to stay ahead of, caught up with us. Our economy today is very different from what it was a year ago, when economists were predicting the bright light of economic recovery by mid 1982. Since the state of state message, you and citizens throughout Illinois have had the opportunity to consider my revenue proposals. I present to you the specific fiscal year 1984 proposed budget under which the eleven and a half million people of this state will have to live, just four months from now, if new resources are not provided. For the General Funds budget, I am proposing an appropriations level of 7.7 billion, half a billion dollars below last year. This budget is balanced fiscally. This budget lives within an expected available resources, but this budget is not balanced in terms of human services, which permits citizens to live in dignity. This budget is not balanced in educational services, the path to progress for children in Illinois, and this budget is not balanced in meeting the basic transportation needs upon which our economic future In candid terms, this proposed budget, with no new taxes, is inadequate to meet the peeds that a good, decent, compassionate and homest government ought to provide its citizens. I don't think that is what you want.

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

I don't think the citizens of our state will want it ¥e have reached the point in the race against recession where you and I literally must assume the task of newly defining the role of State Government in Illinois. The choice is between severely cutting and, in instances, eliminating state services which you and I worked so hard to build up and improve or raising taxes which will allow us to restore, maintain and stabilize those vital services that a responsible government secures for its citizens. That choice is our challenge during next four months. The most severe hardship suffered during recession is unemployment which forces working men and women into state aid systems. This has been especially true in Illinois where we expect the number of public aid recipients to remain at record levels next year. Even so. am recommending for the Department of Public Aid appropriations of 2.6 billion, nearly 400 million less than the current fiscal year, and the level that is inadequate for the Department to meet its rising caseloads, help reduce the effects of poverty and provide for the health and well-being of our citizens. As a result, many programs will be cut and, in some instances, completely eliminated, affecting more than 900,000 of our fellow citizens. General Assistance Program, for example, which is the resort for many men and women who have absolutely no alternative source of income or medical coverage. will be forcing 125,000 people in Chicago onto the eliminated. streets and eliminating similar services for another 14,000 downstate. In addition, totally people state-funded medical services for 32,000 needy individuals will continue to go unfunded for the second year in a row. Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. already feeling the hardship of budget cuts previously

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

taken, funding under this budget will be below levels of the last two fiscal years. Nearly a seven reduction on top of cuts already made is, I think, a callous alternative that ought not to be chosen in a state like ours which has taken pride in a record of service to protect the feeble and the troubled and the physically mentally afflicted who lead torturous lives through the cruel and arbitrary choices of nature. Yet, in order to keep within available resources, without a tax increase; I am proposing a budget level for DMHED that is 35 million dollars below the current fiscally year. This reduction decreases services in state institutions while forcing the number of individuals who are now cared for in community centers to find other alternatives. In short, this reduction comes close to throwing Illinois back to years past when the state essentially was in the business of warehousing mentally and emotionally and physically disabled people. Moreover, the Guardianship and Commission which oversees low income and mental health adults who are wards of the state, making sure that have acceptable housing, adequate care and services, will be gone. The discretion and future of these individuals now will rest with the courts under this budget proposal. However, more than numbers, these reductions tell another Real live stories of services not met, hopeless individuals left with no alternatives and family lives which are critically altered. I have received hundreds of letters, as I'm sure you have too, from worried concerned citizens and desperate patients who write out of the fear and frustration of having no place else to turn. These are your constituents as well as mine. A blind mother who has a three-year-old daughter suffering from the triple afflictions of cancer of the

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

eyes, a hearing loss and severe response delays fears that funding reductions will cost the life of her child. parents of a 32-year-old son who lives in a community living facility and works at the Elgin Behabilitation Center are concerned that the cuts will force their son to lose both his job and residency at the center to wander aimlessly on the streets. A rural Galena couple face the choice of sending their two-and-a-half-year-old handicapped child into a local program with inadequate services or sending him away to a foster home in the city. And 80-year-old mother who has been widowed for 26 years and is just getting by on social security worries for her daughter who she helps support in the Lake Zurich care facility. She writes, *Governor, if you could see to give aid, even if it is to raise taxes in liquor and cigarette. If people can afford to buy those things, they can afford to pay the taxes. And a paraplegic father who is getting clerical job training under a special vocational rehabilitational program writes, *There are a lot of disabled people like me who want to work and have a chance to make something of themselves. I have four kids and I want them to be proud someday, knowing that their daddy was not a man who was lazy just because he was in a wheelchair. Aren*t these, after all, the real human needs that government ought to be meeting first? Isn't it the role of government to help insure the safety and the health and the well-being of its citizens, giving them a better chance at life? of the measures of a state's commitment to its future is education. For me, there has been no higher priority. as I said less than four weeks ago, funding for elementary and high schools in Illinois will be reduced by 200 million dollars in fiscal 1984. In very real terms, it will mean larger class sizes, school closings and reduced

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

funds for all programs including special. gifted. bilingual, vocational and general education. In higher education, the state in the past has had a proud record of assuming some of the cost burden for citizens through state support and scholarship programs. But this budget proposes funding reduction of 108 million dollars, a loss to be made up through faculty lay-offs and salary reductions, the elimination of academic programs and curtailment services. 30,000 essential Moreover. requested scholarships will unfunded. But the qο greatest consequence, the larger danger is that we will he underfunding education just at a time when we expect it take the lead in the fight for economic renewal and the diversification of our economic base for the next century. We expect our elementary and secondary schools to teach more math and science SO that our children grandchildren can compete. How can they under this hudget? expect community colleges to retrain displaced workers to give them and their families a second chance in life. How can they under this budget? We expect universities to lead the high-tech renewal of Illinois as lose manufacturing employment. How can they under this budget? Our prisons, taken for granted when they're quiet, will also see the loss of services which safequard our citizens. to develop a criminal justice and worked hard corrections system in this state which does well that which it is supposed to do: take violent, defensive, hard-core criminals off the streets and put them in prisons. persistence has paid off. Today, there are more violent criminals behind bars in Illinois than ever before. despite the emphasis we have placed on criminal justice through Class X and on corrections under our prison expansion program, this budget reduces the phase-in level

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

at the new Dixon Correctional Center, puts new cells on hold, cuts in half the parole staff who supervise adults juveniles on release and reduces work-release beds, already cut, from a level of 800 last year to just over 200 this year. The result will be to put more criminals back on the streets on early release before their prison terms are completed. Adoption of the corrections budget at this means General Assembly approval, your approval, of early release at a level far higher than we have ever known. You should know that. You must know that. Not. only is this a setback in the progress that we've made, but it seriously abridges one of government's most fundamental duties, to protect and defend the safety of citizens. In transportation, I should not have to remind you again of the critical need for new state dollars. believe that Illinois motorists who rely on our roads. and bridges for their livelihood, highways personal mobility and safety, fully realize the need to upgrade and bring on line new projects. And I think that the citizens of our state understand that, to receive these services. they must be willing to pay the costs. I believe they are willing. Not only do these dollars directly pay for system improvements and construction, not only do these dollars spread to local units of governments which depend on our revenues for local transportation services, but additional funding is paramount to whether or not we receive new federal matching funds. With BO new transportation we stand to lose nearly two billion dollars in revenues, federal matching funds over the next four years, money down the drain, money collected from taxpayers in Illinois which will be sent to neighboring states. Based on aп appropriations level of 2.7 billion dollars reflecting no new revenues, this budget proposal places in jeopardy some

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

340 million in federal transit capital funds in fiscal 1984, offers no new state operating assistance for transit in northeastern Illinois and shows a drop in funds to local governments of more than 20 million dollars. The issue of increase revenues for state transportation where there have been no increases in 14 years must be settled once and for We are talking about our economic health and progress, about citizens in poorly accessible areas of state who desperately need new and better roads, about citizens who rely solely on mass transit systems to qet from homes to jobs and about the safety of motorists who are driving on deteriorating roads and crumbling bridges. proud that, through some road improvements and can be law enforcement efforts, traffic accidents and fatalities on our roads have steadily declined in the last five years, record no other state can boast. But, pride stops there when months and months of hard work in Washington to secure more federal dollars for Illinois will end up in other states which have responded to their growing transportation burdens with new tax revenues. Moreover, a capacity for increase and transportation taxes is surely there. The price of gasoline has dropped 13 cents a gallon in less than a year. In natural resources, 13 percent reduction in the Department of Energy and Natural Resources will completely eliminate the coal promotion program and delay for a year new funding for coal desulfurization research which is carried out through the Coal Research Board. marks a significant setback for our coal program through which we have aggressively fought to make Illinois more attractive. This is the nation's number agricultural state. Cutbacks will occur in promotion programs, meat and poultry inspections and delays the soil erosion program, in which Illinois has taken

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

pride as the leader in protecting valuable farmland. But there is another story told in this budget which will be of profound consequence on the way government services are provided in Illinois, its impact on local units of government. In recent years, State Government has assumed the funding of services in a number of areas formally funded by local government. This trend has succeeded in easing some of the cost burden for local While sending a property taxpayers. signal to local officials of our willingness to work together as partners. This budget takes a step backward from the state-local partnership we ve created with towns and cities throughout Illinois and reduces revenue sharing funds to local government by 234 million dollars. Under the limits of this budget, the state simply can no longer afford continue underwriting many local services. In most cases. the only alternative may be an increase in local property Elimination of the General Assistance Program, for will put added pressure on local units example, government. Reduced state funding for drug units means that local agencies will have to find other resources. loss of state funding for local roads, bridges and highways will cause critical project delays. And cuts in Medicaid reimbursement means that county nursing homes will have to seek additional revenues from other sources. Now, you say to me, as some have that this General Assembly will never vote to eliminate the General Assistance Program local revenue sharing. You may well be right. as a political or legislative matter. But, if that is the ultimate decision, then other areas of the budget must come down again by almost half a billion dollars, for that is the price of just General Assistance and local revenue sharing alone, half a billion dollars. If we don't have

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

the money, and we don't, you must fund the cuts elsewhere. of these budget decisions will be felt Shile manv statewide, others will impact only certain segments of population. New admissions for veterans at the Quincy home year will be turned down. Low income working mothers who need day care centers to hold a job and hold the family together will find day care placements cut by 39 percent. Also gone next year will be nine state parks and conservation areas, as the result of a twelve and a half percent reduction in the Department of Conservation. Picnic areas, campgrounds, park concessions and trails will be shut down all together or managed on a part-time basis at some sites. Cutbacks also will be experienced at the state game farm, the fish hatchery and nursery operations. all deliberate. hard-fought and sometimes For the cantankerously won progress we have made to keep Illinois on firm footing and to move ahead, this budget reflects the most severe of the many rounds of budget cuts I have been forced to make and will set us back further than we could begin to measure. And, as you know, because of the complexities of the legislative process combined with inevitable future-inflated costs, failure to restore services now will result in double or triple the cost to regain a decent level of services in the future. My call today is for a higher standard of achievement than what is proposed in this budget, a standard that equalizes opportuities for citizens with unequal resources, one protects the health, safety and welfare of the individual and a standard that seeks stability in our economy and a level of security in our future. Since my state of the state address, you have had an opportunity to reflect my alternative plan for Illinois and discuss it with your constituents. In talking with citizens from around the

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

state, some questions are frequently raised with me about the four-year plan I have proposed, and I would like to raise them with you. The first question is, 'Why 1.6 billion in new taxes? Won't that just finance an awful lot of new spending? . First, as I reported to you last month, the State of Illinois has to meet more than 650 dollars in obligations before we can begin to contemplate restorations, let alone contemplate new spending. some of these obligations will be recurring, not addition. one time, including interest on unemployment insurance borrowings, funding for retirement systems, ending diversions from the road fund and debt service increases, Moreover, because of spending cuts already taken in critical budget areas, a first priority under new taxes to restore services such as education, mental health and public aid, and then to continue building programs for which we seek a higher commitment, children and senior citizens and those who cannot help themselves. Question number two, "If the recession is ending, won"t that help to make up the revenue shortfall without new taxes? . Even if recession is ending, and I believe that it is, Illinois traditionally is last in and last out. Our higher than average unemployment rate indicates that recovery will ease in more slowly. People who aren't working don't pay taxes in Illinois, so revenues will back slowly, not quickly. And by slowly, I mean over a course of several years, not over a course of several months. Question number three, "Why can't we just have a surtax to expire when recovery comes? ... We can, that is to be supported by that tax is one-year or one-time obligations. But, if we are to have permanent increases in education, then we need permanent revenues. If we are to have permanent increases in spending for corrections or law

15th Legislative Day

1

1

١

١

1

March 2, 1983

enforcement, then we need permanent revenues. If we are to plag the gap caused by permanent tax reform such as the elimination of the inheritance tax, then we need permanent alternative revenues. In just two areas, the abolition the inheritance tax and the new debt to the Federal Government for UI borrowing, we must account for a spending revenue shift of 250 million dollars each year, in just two If you look at the history of those states which have used the surtax, they have ended up becoming permanent taxes. Ohio, for example, which imposed a temporary one percent sales tax increase made it permanent in 1982 when revenues fell short, and their 25 percent surtax on the income tax enacted for 1982 just became a permanent percent increase. Minnesota, which called for a temporary sales tax increase from four to five percent made permanent in 1982 and then raised it to six. Currently before Michigan lawmakers is a proposal by the Governor to increase the state's 4.6 percent income tax to 6.35 for three to five years, evidently a surtax to coincide with the term of the Governor, and then let it drop thereafter back to 6.1 - some surtax. I don't think we can kid surtax may sound like a politically expediently way to answer state needs, but inevitably the real vote must be cast if real and permanent needs are to be answered. And not only is our own revenue picture uncertain, but the greatest threat to the economic health of this nation is the massive and looming out-year federal deficits now projected to be in the range of 200 to 300 billion dollars a year by 1988. Unchanged, these deficits threaten to choke-off any recovery of any size. So, unless federal spending and federal revenue can be brought into rough balance, real, long-term interest rates will increase and our economy will never be able to recover and many

15th Legislative Day

1

į

-

March 2, 1983

our people will never regain their employment. How can we put up a surtax against that kind of unpredictability? Question number four, 'Won't we bounce back because of the growth in high technology? . Yes, if we work hard at it, high-tech will make a significant contribution to Illinois' economic regrowth. But some say it will take 10 to 15 years to develop a substantial new base of high technology industry in Illinois. Cut that forecast in half. still take significant time for the expansion to add to our revenues. Moreover, our ability to capture and maintain high-tech expansion depends in part on how much we're willing to invest in new spending for education in this state and in how much we're willing to invest in the quality of life in this state, for high companies particularly, don't move to or stay in states with a poor quality of life. And high-tech and advanced education go hand-in-hand. That you know. Question number five, 'Once recession ends, why won't we see a return to the economy of the 70°s which had surplus years of growth in personal income and growth in revenue? . But, for the last year, for the last four years, we have had essentially flat real growth in this state and in much of the nation. growth we had was largely the product of inflation. Next year inflation is predicted to run about five percent. and hopefully will remain near at that level into the That's good news for consumers, but bad news for state revenues, because it will take down sales tax income tax receipts. In addition, our population base had changed. In the last ten years, we have lost hundreds of thousands of highly-skilled, highly-educated, highly-paid people and gained hundreds of thousands of low-educated. low-skilled and low-paid or no-paid people. The revenue base permanently changed. Though now the flight to the Sun

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Belt is fading, Houston has no jobs. And those demographics may not hold for the next decade, they are in place now and we have to take them into account in forecasting revenue from income and sales taxes. Cuestion number six, *Why not cut costs elsewhere? .. To answer a question with a question, where is elsewhere? with your approval, we have made significant cuts across the board and, on top of that, state spending just for education, public aid, corrections, mental health and children and family services, those five areas, public aid, education, mental health, corrections, children and family services account for 80 percent of this budget. Where is the elsewhere, and does the elsewhere have significant dollars for savings? The answer is no. For the first time in my administration, this year I've cut corrections and cut children and family services and cut law enforcement. I've never done that before. That ought to indicate to you that we've simply run out of other areas to cut, at least where there are large dollars left. Question number seven, •If business can cut back in recession, why can't qovernment? . The answer is that business cuts back in recession because the demand for their products is down, but the demand for governments products goes up in recession. When people go from the employment roles to the unemployment roles, public aid costs rise. When people cannot find work, many go to school, and educational costs We have cut like businesses cut. More than 5,000 employees have gone from the state payroll in the last two unlike business which can cut when demand drops, services to citizens don't drop, especially in times of little or no economic growth. Question number eight, "Why is there no tax relief?". There is, but not as much as some would like, mainly because we've already in the

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

last six years given our people more tax relief than in all the other administrations in the State of Illinois going back to 1818. With the help of you, the Members of the General Assembly, this administration is the first administration in the history of the state to cut taxes substantially and across the board. Half the food and drug sales tax is gone, almost a half a billion dollars worth of relief. Sales tax on business machinery and equipment is being phased out, abolished on farm machinery equipment. Gasohol has been exempted; alternate energy systems, exempted; tax on tax on utilities, abolished; farmland assessment, changed; investment tax credit, added: the rate ٥f the corporate personal property tax replacement, taken down. You cannot point to a state in the nation that's had more tax relief in the last six years and no tax increases, unless they're awash in gas and oil. And if they're awash in gas and oil, they may be in trouble in the years ahead. Question number nine, *Won*t proposed tax increase put Illinois in a poor competitive position with other states? . No. it won't. Even taxes increased to the level that I have suggested, it will still remain in the middle range of our neighboring states. both in individual and corporate taxes, and we will remain competitive with the other major industrial states. And many of those states will raise taxes again. The last question, "Mon"t this tax increase come at a time when it will stifle recovery? Why would you impose a tax increase just as we're coming out? Isn't that a poor time? .. I'm not proposing that we take 1.6 billion dollars out of our economy and put it in a drawer. And, while the revenues may be recirculated through the Illinois economy by different people and in different ways, they will be recirculated. In addition, some parts of the tax increase,

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

the transportation package, for example, are absolutely imperative to economic growth. Tax increases are never popular, but the restoration of confidence in our state is fundamental to improving our economic progress, stability and the advance of our educational systems and to securing the level of services which a compassionate society dictates. As always, you are free to alter the bottom or the...the middle lines of this budget, and you will. It's your job to determine the final appropriations of our resources, those which we have available. But no amount of shuffling or shiffling or reallocation will change the bottom line of this budget. The Economic and Fiscal Commission and the Bureau of the Budget are significantly a part on the new revenue which our present tax structure will generate in the next fiscal year. it is gloomy news indeed. If that is so, change the middle lines all you will, but the bottom line, I suggest to you, ought to be unacceptable to you and to your constituents. I *ve presented this budget, characterizing it unacceptable to a decent society, even as the book comes off the press, because I believe that you and the people of our state deserve to know what a budget without new tax resources means. When they and you understand what this budget contains in detail, then we can next focus on the opportunities which the tax plan that I suggested in my state of the state address provides. And I will provide my specific suggestions for allocating new tax revenues, and you will have your ideas as well, I am sure. Ultimately. our 1984 fiscal plan must continue working to rebuild, not tear down, our state, to bring real and sustained economic growth, not false hopes. The plan we define must be bipartisan in nature, with both sides of the aisles working together. It must be fair. Those who share in the

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

benefits must help share in the costs. It must be prudent, and it must be realistic without relying on hope alone, for hope has played cruel tricks in the past. Other states with far less going for them have already started down the path. So can we and so must we. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Madigan: "Would the Committee of Escort please form at the well to escort the Governor from the chamber? The Chair recognizes Senator Rock."
- President Bock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I move that the Joint Session do now arise."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying *no*. The Motion carries. The Joint Session has arisen. The House will remain in Session. Would House Members please remain in their chairs? #ill all unauthorized leave the floor? On the Order of House personnel please Bills Second Reading, there appears House Bill 68. This is the Bill that was under consideration at the time that we broke for the Joint Session. The Fill is sponsored by Mr. Preston. We had entertained some debate. and on the question of the Amendment, the Chair recognizes Mr. Ewing. Ewing. Would the Membership please qive attention to Mr. Ewing? For what purpose does Mr. Vinson seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, it has always been the practice in this Assembly in the past that when a Bill is taken out of the record that...and then if you choose to take that Bill up again, that the debate begins anew so that the Members have a chance to understand what is being considered."
- Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Mr. Preston, would you explain, once again to Mr. Vinson, the content of this Bill? For what purpose does Mr. Piel seek recognition?"
- Piel: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, it's on Second Reading. You were

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

hearing Representative Hawkinson's Amendment, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Mr. Preston, did you have anything to say to the Bill?"

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Hawkinson is going to present his Amendment, I would like to speak after he is finished."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Mr. Hawkinson on Amendment #2."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not repeat my earlier remarks, but I would only add that having heard the Governor's budget message and having heard of the cuts in general assistance and in education and in mental health that we're facing, that this Amendment raises the question of priorities. As I said earlier, I like the legislative scholarships. I*d like to have more. But this is a question of priorities. The Governor told us that *84, there will be 30,000 scholarships to our institutions of higher education that will go unfunded. I believe that it's unconscionable for we, as Legislators, to ask for increases in our perks to be able to control t he purse-strings on some 400 scholarships at a time when the merit and need scholarships will go unfunded to the number of 30,000. So, it's not a question of whether you like scholarships or not. It's a question of priorities and fundability, and I suggest in this Amendment that we give up one of our legislative perks and put that money into trying to fund some of those other 30,000 scholarships."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Preston on the Amendment."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not going to repeat my earlier comments. I just want to comment on the remarks that Mr. Hawkinson has just made. He has repeatedly referred to this program of legislative scholarships as our perks. I don't get anything from this scholarship program. My constituents get scholarships to state universities through this

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

program. Secondly, it is because of Mr. Thompson's message that we have just heard..."

- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Preston. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, rise?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, we are hearing debated a most important
 Bill with substantial fiscal impact. You have an
 obligation as the presiding officer in this chamber to
 restore some degree of order in the chamber so that the
 debate can be understood and listened to by those people
 who are trying to."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Vinson. Will the House be in order? Will the Members be in their chair and pay attention to this debate? Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. It is because of Mr. Thompson's budget message that we just heard that makes the legislative scholarship program all the more necessary. There are funds that are going to be cut under this proposal. Whether we raise taxes or fail to raise taxes. there are going to be funds cut from higher education budgets. Students in Illinois don't have increased but have decreased aid from the federal and state level. Because of this decreased aid in all areas of leq...of scholarship assistance in financial aid, there are students in my district and students in your district who have nowhere else to go if they want to go to college but to seek these legislative scholarships. We have to... This is no time to start cutting out the kind of higher education opportunities that will tell their tale later Illinois' reduced ability to keep up in the high-tech areas, by our reduced ability to prepare people to deal with mental health problems, with physical health problems. All of that takes higher education. йe need this legislative scholarship program, and I would urge you to

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

please defeat this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Rep...Thank you. Representative Davis on the Amendment."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in support of the Amendment, the House. because I think there will never be a better time to get rid of this most onerous provision in the law granted to Legislators. I don't know how all of you handle it. We all do it somewhat differently, I suppose, and if you're in a city district, maybe it's not as visible that you have those things to offer. I had 300... In 1981 I had 392 applications for eight one-year scholarships, and that politically even, there were eight winners and 384 losers. And that, for any politician sitting in this room, is not a very good numbers game to be playing despite the fact that a committee...scholarship committee awards them around me. I don't even know who gets them for the But. of that 392, to the Sponsor of the Bill who spoke so eloquently, that there's no other way to fund constituents in his district, over the last four years, I sent through counselling of almost all of the people who come to see me, I*ve sent 122 people into the armed services of their country to serve their country in the armed services, in return, with the most adequate and full scholarship benefits that are possible. And I think is...there's no better time. The fiscal impact of the budget message you just heard, there's absolutely no better time to get rid of this monkey off of our back, those of us that don't like it, to get the monkey off of our back, to show the citizens of Illinois that we're willing to turn what fiscal resources we have back to the higher education universities themselves, to the Scholarship Commission, to the elementary and secondary area and to save a million

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

four hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Speaker, this is a very good Amendment, and I can tell you that I would like a Roll Call on this Amendment, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, stand in opposition to Amendment #2. following the remarks of my learned colleague from the other side of the aisle, I submit to you that those individual students who are in the lower economic scale and their families fall in that category are benefitted by the *PELL* Grant System as well as the Illinois State Scholarship system. The students and the parents of the higher income families in this state have the opportunity to their...through their own resources to send their children to school. The tuition waivers, which there is no dollar amount instituted by this General Assembly for, has the opportunity through its membership to at least give a break to those students of families in the middle income bracket, that bracket that now pays the majority of taxes in this state. Those individuals whose family income is above 18,000 dollars and who have more than one student in school, in 95 percent of the cases by the Members of this General Assembly, are those individuals we are helping to further their education. If, in fact, any individual on this floor can submit to me the line item that is used for the General Assembly tuition waiver, please present it, because there is none, Ladies and Gentlemen. This proposal is ridiculous as it is presented here in Amendment #2, and I submit to you it should be soundly defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker,
Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since 1967, when I
first came to the General Assembly, I have...I have opposed

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

the expansion of the scholarship program, and I supported the elimination of the scholarship program. There's no reason for Legislators to be involved in granting of tuition waivers. That isn't and shouldn't be part of our business. As you've listened to some of tortured logic and opposition to this Amendment, I would remind you that last year, the Scholarship Commission distributed over 100 million dollars to students in need, not only to public, but also to private institutions in this state. In the time in which we find ourselves, it would appear to me that it ill behooves those of us who must make some very difficult decisions to continue to dispense scholarships to our own constituents. T think that if, in fact, this is a new day and this is a new era, that we need to rise to the occasion, and this is our first opportunity to do that. And I would ask you to join with Representative Hawkinson, myself and others who will support this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Representative Bullock."
Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed signify by saying *nay*. All those in favor of the previous question signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed voting nay. All right. There being 67 votes 'aye', 45 vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 67 votes 'aye'. 45 votes 'nay'. The Motion fails. Now, on the original Amendment, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it seems odd that logic on this side is always tortured when it comes to the remarks of the Gentleman from DuPage County. It seems to me that Representative Mautino is right on point with this particular argument today. We have only one thing that we

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

can give to the middle class in terms of scholarships, and that's the program that we have that costs the state nothing. I don't know who's suggesting that there's a line item. There is...as Representative Mautino said, there isn't. This is a tuition waiver. If I look at the I have apply for this, I don't like the program either. because there aren't enough to give out. hundreds ο£ people who apply for eight vears scholarships each year. But those happen to be in virtually every case, I'm sure, in my district and in yours, those people who are unable to get financial assistance from other forms and other sources. They fail to get the federal program money. They fail to meet the needs criteria of the state program. They re right in the They re not the very poor who qualify federally. They re not the very rich who can pay their way. They re those who don't, otherwise, go. And if we can only take care of eight, let's continue to take care of those eight. Let's not make this into a political ball game about money that's being spent that isn't being spent, because there is no line, as Representative Mautino said. Every year we go through this logic and this battle and this political garbage from the other side about this political program and that political program, and that's the only thing we've got left here. And we ought to kill this Amendment for those reasons."

- Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from...Representative Ewing arise?"
- Ewing: "I've had my light on quite a while. I wanted to speak on the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "I've been going back and forth, Mr. Ewing.

 I....Unless you have some special point, I thank you for
 that and I...the Chair now recognizes Representative

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, thank you, Representative Ewing and Mr. Speaker.

In response to the last speaker, you know, it's..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Ebbesen. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne arise?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to have a parliamentary inquiry as to what the meaning of moving the previous question is if you're not going to cut off debate?"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Van Duyne, under the rules, it requires two-thirds of those voting in order to close debate, and we...the vote was 67 to 45, which is not two-thirds. So, the Motion lost, Sir."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Sorry, Representative Ethesen, continue."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Represent...Relevant to the previous speaker, Representative Stuffle, was saying, that reminds me of..it's not going to cost government a thing because the taxpayers are going to pay for it because it's a tuition waiver. Well, I think if it's not going to cost anything, then I think what we ought to do is issue tuition waiver to 100 percent of the ... everybody in higher education. It's not going to cost anything. It...It sounds to me like he's got this particular Bill on the elimination of the General Assembly waivers confused with some of the pension rationale that he used in passing some very poor pension legislation. But, I would just say, I have supported the elimination of these tuition waivers for I introduced legislation maybe six or seven years ago, and it was quietly put off into a non-working subcommittee, and that's the last I saw of it. It's the first opportunity I've had in several years to support this proposal on the House floor, and I certainly would

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

encourage everyone to support it. It's good legislation, and this Amendment ought to be adopted."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, now."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm almost speechless. There has been a lot of garbage and a lot of misconception and a lot of misstatements about this Amendment. First of all, I have found in my own personal experience, that many of those people who have these scholarships could or would have other scholarship help. If I didn't require them to expose that, they would have one or two scholarships. And the Sponsor keeps saying there's no place else for these people to go. Well, maybe they don*t deserve scholarship, then. If there is no criteria for giving out these scholarships, what makes us think we should give scholarships, and what else are we giving them out on then besides political favor, if they don't qualify for another scholarship or have the criteria to judge them on? Ladies and Gentlemen, this scholarship does cost us money. There may not be a line item for it, but I can assure you that the universities who take those students have costs, that comes out of their budgets. This is a perk. I don't care what they say on the other side of the aisle. It is a perk and one we ought to do away with in these tight times. We can give that money to the scholarship...Illinois Scholarship Fund. It will be used a lot better than by political elected officers."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Van Duyne on the Amendment? No.

Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for fear of being totally banished by this side of the aisle, there is some talk about how people handle their scholarships, and I'll tell you one thing, on my application it doesn't say, 'Are

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

you a Republican or are you a Democrat? . But, on my application, it says, 'What have you done in terms of providing leadership in your school, in your community and your church?*. And those scholarships are given out based on those young people who have leadership potential. And these are the kinds of people that are going around trying to find additional dollars. the people It's not that...that have been stated that are needy, that do not have the money that are seeking scholarships. potential and outstanding leaders who have developed and have shown by example what they can do in their communities and in their school districts and in their 4-H clubs and FFA programs and PTA and so forth. And these are the kinds people that I'm trying to support and help. I would say, in terms of this Amendment, if it was drafted to maintain the current program, that would be, in effect, somewhat of a reduction. But, in this Amendment to totally eliminate scholarships in total after the ones that are force are fully utilized, I say that's something else. And I can't, in good faith, support a kind of a program that is totally going to eliminate the program that is not being used in any political manner in any way, particularly in my area. And I'm sure that there are other...other ways that we will be able to find that are innovative and just as satisfactory in order to reduce state dollars to find ways to pay for the budget that the Governor has proposed rather than to eliminate this particular program. Ιf program that comes out that has some cost-effectiveness, not only in terms of human life, but leadership, if we're going to say no, then I don't think we are, in fact, doing our citizens justice at all, either." Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Representative Ropp. The Gentleman

from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying Bill that we're dealing with here is Bill that would double the number of legislative scholarships that a Member can give away. Now, I wonder how that's going to be paid for. There is no free lunch anywhere. There is no free lunch in this program. you're going to have this kind of a program, you've got to pay for it. You could take money away from education to pay for it. You could take money away from schools to pay for it. You could take money away from mental health to pay for this kind of a program, but you have to take money from someplace. Ferhaps, instead of taking it away from those places, your proposal is to pay taxes, increase taxes to pay for increased legislative But that's what you're asking for when you ask for this kind of program. You can't have it both ways. You cannot continue to ignore the realities of the state fiscal situation. They come home to roost on this particular one. If you're going to be a professional giver, you have to be a professional taxer. And I would respectfully suggest that the Members of this chamber ought not go on record as being professional professional taxers, particularly for the purpose increasing this kind of program. I believe we ought reject this program, and I believe the quickest and the most effective way to do it is to adopt this Amendment. doubt you'll ever see the Bill called if you adopt this kind of Amendment. For those reasons, I rise in support of the Amendment and urge everyone to vote 'yes' Bill...on the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, too, rise in

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

support of the Amendment. I've been here 15 years. We've had separate Bills on occasion to eliminate the legislative scholarship. I've supported those. I know what the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle is saying, that it give the Members of the General Assembly an opportunity to spread scholarships around to those who cannot get financial aid. But I see no rationale to qiving the Members of the General Assembly two legislative scholarships a year. Any more rationale than the...if we adopt that attitude we ought to give the Lieutenant Governor, the Governor, the Treasurer, the Comptroller, the Secretary of State, the Aide to the Speaker, the Parliamentarian, the minority staff members an opportunity to distribute financial aid to students in need. see ... have seen no rationale. I think the best way is to eliminate it entirely, and therefore, I support the Amendment wholeheartedly."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Hawkinson to close."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the only valid argument raised against this Amendment is the flexibility argument which was also raised before the Committee, and that argument is an a...is an attack upon our general scholarship program saying that only those without means can get them and those with means can afford higher education, and somehow there's this wast group in the middle that can't afford them. I would not quarrel quite as much as my colleague with that concept. However, if that's the problem, we ought to get at it and reform the general scholarship business instead of this method of legislative patronage. And I urge your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 68. All those in

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

favor signify by saying 'aye', a11 those opposed sig...Gentleman...are you joined by four other people in request? Well, it appears that that you All...Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 68. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative McPike, would you do me a 'no', please. The Clerk will take the roll. On Amendment #2, the...there are 44 'ayes', 65 voting 'no', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?" Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Freston, amends House Bill 68 as amended."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Preston, the Gentleman from Cook."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 makes technical changes in the Bill in accordances with promises I gave in Committee. It doesn't change the Bill at all. It just makes language changes."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook (sic - DeWitt), Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman indicates be will."

Preston: "Mr. Vinson, the Bill, as originally drafted, doubled the number of legislative scholarships that each Member of the General Assembly has. It doesn't number...it doesn't double the entire number because, by wirtue of the cutback Amendment there are fewer Members in the General Assembly today then there were last year. The Amendment does exactly that, the same thing that the original Bill does, but the language with which that is done is somewhat different in the Amendment because one of the Members of the Committee suggested that we go follow the Amendment to the...of the language of the original law rather than

15th Legislative Day

March 2. 1983

changing the language which is exactly what this Amendment does. If the Bill without this Amendment passed, it would have the same impact as the Bill with this Amendment, but the language accomplishing that end would be different and the language in Amendment #3 follows the language of the law as it stands today."

Speaker Greiman: "Does that conclude your remarks, Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "So the Gentlemen is representing to the Assembly that this does not have any substantive change on the Bill that's introduced."

Preston: "That is correct."

Vinson: "But this, in the final form the Bill will double the number of legislative scholarships the Members are allowed to give."

Preston: "That is correct."

Vinson: "And the number of perks."

Preston: "But of...might I just say Mr. Vinson, if this Bill is defeated...if this Amendment rather, is defeated, the Bill in its final form will do exactly that as well. Just the language to accomplish that is changed by this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think everybody ought to take a good look at this Amendment because it's frankly quite shocking. If you look at the language, it refers to, on line 10 and 11, annually four persons from his district. This a blatantly sexist Bill. What if the legislator is not a he. Now how can somebody say like, Barbara Currie possibly go along with a Bill like this or even use the scholarships, when it refers to his and not his or hers. I would remind the Sponsor of the Bill, that it was just last year that Representative

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Terzich had an enlightened Bill that actually removed the word mankind from the statute and changed it to personkind. I just don't understand how an Amendment, a blatantly sexist Amendment like this, could be introduced. I would warn the Sponsor of the Bill Representative Preston, that he's likely to find his office picketed, and to advise him to beware of Members of NOW wielding tire irons. He may very well be in line for that. I think it's a terrible Amendment on those grounds, and urge everyone to vote against it."

- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The her from Champaign,
 Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. It was at my request, I believe, that the Sponsor choose to have this Amendment drafted. I regret the use of the pronoun which seems to have some discriminatory aspect, but other than that, I do believe that the form of this Amendment is a more appropriate form for the change which he wishes to make, and so in order to accommodate the Sponsor's desire to have the Bill in a form that I think is more consistent, I would support this Amendment; although, I will also add that I will vote against the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Hoffman, the Gentlemen from ${\tt DuPage}_\bullet{\tt "}$
- Hoffman "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would appear to me than...

 that in effect, this Amendment will become the Bill, and if
 we're opposed to the Bill, we should be opposed to the
 Amendment. If the Amendment is defeated, the Bill can be
 proposed in its present form and we can defeat it twice.

 So therefore, I...would seem to me that a 'no' vote on this
 Amendment is the appropriate vote."

Speaker Greiman "Bepresentative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'd have a

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

tendency to agree with the last speaker, and I really...although I admire the Sponsor of this Amendment greatly, I think at this time with the economic conditions brought forth, the idea of jacking up the number of scholarships is way out of line. I voted to keep the system as it is at present. But this is going a little to far, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, this Amendment merely puts the Bill in the order in which I would like it presented to the floor. I was somewhat taken aback by the comments of one of the previous speakers from the other side of the aisle. I thought that he would go along with any Bill that had sexist overtones to it based on some of his previous votes, but I guess this one just went a bit to far, and I would urge you to adopt this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 68. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed signify by saying 'no'. The ayes' have it. Well...and...and the Motion is adopted. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of House Bills Second Reading, there appears House Bill 93. Mr. Ropp, do wish to call your Bill? Mr. Ropp, do you wish to call House Bill 93? House Bill 97, Mr. Matijevich do you wish to call that Bill? House Bill 213, Representative Wojcik, do you wish to call that Bill. House Bill 225, Mr. McAuliffe, do wish to call that Bill? House Bill 327. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 327, a Bill for an Act to Amend the
Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Amendments from the floor. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of House Bills Third Reading. Mr.

Ropp, do wish to call House Bill 62? We have now called

every Bill on the Calendar. Is there any further business
to come before the House? Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 28 Amendment has been distributed, and I would like to hear that Bill on Second Reading if I could."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of House Bills Second Reading, there appears House Bill 28. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 28, a Bill for an Act to Amend

Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading

of the Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed.

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O*Brien: "Amendment #2 and 3, were withdrawn in Committee,
 Amendment 4, lost in Committee. Floor Amendment #5,
 Cullerton — Ereslin."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a technical Amendment. The purpose of the Bill is to...one of the purposes is to change the title of a preliminary examination to preliminary hearing. We in advertently forgot to do that on line 29, of page 2 of the Bill and that's what the Amendment does to strike the words or examination and rename a preliminary hearing. So I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentlemen moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion. The question is. Shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying *no*. The ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills Second Reading, there appears House Bill 93. Mr. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 93, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions relative to Amendment #12#

Clerk O'Brien: "No Hotions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I would like to remind the Members of the Financial Institution Committee. that we will be meeting in room 122 B, shortly after adjournment and we have only one Bill. If we can get the Members there and get a quorum there, I am sure we will move right out."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further business to come before the House? Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to remind the Members of the House, that the Counties and Townships Committee meeting originally scheduled for this afternoon has been cancelled."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further business to come before

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

the House? Mr. Farley."

- Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ... To remind the Members of the House, Labor and Commerce Committee that we will be meeting immediately after the adjournment in room 114."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Farley. Mr. Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Just one quick reminder of the Energy Environment and

 Natural Resources Committee will be in 114 at 4 o'clock."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff."
- Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make the announcement that the Select Committee on School Districts Reorganization, which is schedule to meet today at 4 p.m., will meet one half hour later."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Christensen."
- Christensen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everybody,
 that the Committee on Aging will meet immediately after we
 adjourn."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further business to come before the House? Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Republicans, there will be a House Republican Conference, Room 118 at 8 o'clock in the morning. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask Mr. Van Duyne a question, if

 I may. He announced... Energy Committee meeting at 4, in
 114, and we have a Labor and Commerce in 114, and I believe
 it's going to take more than an hour, because we got quite
 a few Bills of some import...consider."
- Speaker Madigan: "Might the Chair ask Bepresentative Farley to estimate how much time will be needed for your Committee meeting."
- Farley: "Less than an hour."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose is Mr. Tuerk's recognition?"
- Tuerk: "Well I...I would disagree with that wholeheartily,

- 15th Legislative Day

 March 2, 1983

 there's is a couple of Bills in there that's going to take

 some time."
- Speaker Madigan" "For what purpose does Mr. Pouncey seek recognition?"
- Pouncey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. There will be no meeting of the Election this afternoon it has been postponed for one week."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Pouncey. Is there any further business to come before the House? The Chair is prepared to adjourn. The Clerk would like to address the Membership relative to some announcments. Would the Membership please give their attention to the Clerk. These announcements affect the Members. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "All Members who have not had their picture taken for their identification card, may do so immediately upon adjournment, on the first floor at the Clerk's office.

 Also, those Members, who have signed up for surplus property at the State Fairground for your district office, you have until March 15, to pick-up your surplus property and remove it from the Fairgrounds. After the 15th, they will put it out again as surplus property. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Just in away of an inquiry, Mr. Speaker, regarding a Committee meeting. Is the Committee on the Assignments of Bills going to meet?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman. Mr. Vinson has asked if the Committee on Assignment will meet."
- Greiman: "I am glad you asked that guestion, Representative
 Vinson, Yes, we meet in the room out here everyday after
 Session. We have a standing notice, and I do hope you will
 join us one of these days."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

- Vinson: "I wonder than, Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk ought not carry that on the Calendar."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk informs me that, he sees no reasons
 why that could not be done. Thank you, Mr. Vinson. Agreed
 Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolutions 71, DiPrima et al, 72,
 Yourell, 73, Pouncey, 74, Yourell, 75, Topinka, and 78,
 Tate Mays, and House Joint Resolution 15, DiPrima et
 al."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Giorgi."

- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, DiPrima's 71, honors veteran leaders; 72, by Yourell, approves an Eagle Scout Award; 73, by Pouncey, congratulates Harold Washington's nomination for Mayor; 74, by Yourell records the Knights of Columbus contributions towards the Queen of Martyrs Council; Topinka, wants the Stone Eagle Award; with Resolution 75, and Representative Tate, wants cheaper natural gas prices. I move for the...and I will. House Resolution 15, heralds the voice of an American Contact and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentlemen moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", all those opposed by saying 'no' and the opinion of the Chair, the ayes' have it. The Motion carries. The Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 77, Diprima et al."
- Speaker Madigan: "Committee on Assignment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Death Resolutions. House Resolution 76, DiPrima et al, with repect to the memory of Mr. Lou Loeffler."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi, there was an additional Agreed

 Resolution. Bouse Resolution 76."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Death Resolution, with the respect to the memory of Mr. Lou Loeffler."

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi moves for the adoption of House Resolution 76. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. The ayes' have it. The Motion carries the Resolution as adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative McPike for the adjournments Motion."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the House stands adjourned until tomorrow of the hour of 12 noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentlemen moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, March 3, at 12 noon providing 10 minutes for Perfunctory Session to permit the Introduction of Bills. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", all those opposed by saying "no". The ayes" have it. We stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 noon."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills. Bill 475. Johnson - Tate, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Farm Development Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 476, McGann - et al, a Bill for an Act setting for certain rights which are to quaranteed to law enforcement officers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 477, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 478, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 479, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 480, Matijevich -Pangle, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an relation to State Finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 481, Stuffle - Woodyard, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 482, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act establishing in the Illinois

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Department of Public Health a program with the care of persons suffering from Hemophilia. First Beading of the House Bill 483, Capparelli - Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 484, Ronan - White -McAuliffe - Giglio, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation of the Department of Public Health. First Beading of the Bill. House Bill 485, McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Humane Care for Animals Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bouse Bill 486, Diprima et al. a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning rights of medical patients. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 487, DiPrima - McAuliffe - Cowlishaw - et al. a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Personnel Pirst Reading of the Bill. House Bill 488, Bea, a Bill for an Act to provide for Berrin Exhibition Auditorium and office building authority in Williamson County. First Reading of the Bill. Bouse 489, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Beading of the Bill. Bill 490, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the House Bill 491, O'Connell, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 492. Brummer, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 493, Birkinbine, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the House Bill 494, Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill. local governments in Alternate Fnergy Systems. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 495, Bowman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Child Care Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 496, White - Levin, a Bill for an

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Section IV. This Article shall be inoperative, unless it have been ratified as an Amendment to shall the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.": therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that such proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further resolved, the certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Illinois in the Congress of the United States. The First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 7, adopted by the Senate March 2, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.1 Further business? The House now stands adjourned until 12 noon, March 3.

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

MARCH 02, 1983

PAGE 1

HB-0020	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	42
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND BEADING	PAGE	26
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4.3
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	5
	SECOND BEADING	PAGE	42
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
		PAGE	3
	FIRST READING		3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	
	FIRST BEADING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0468		PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0470	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0471	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0472	FIRST BEADING	PAGE	4
HB-0473	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0474	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
HB-0475	FIRST BEADING	PAGE	47
HB-0476	FIRST BEADING	PAGE	47
HB-0477	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
HB-0478	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
HB-0479	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
HB-0480	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIBST READING	PAGE	48
	FIBST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
			48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	
HJR-0014		PAGE	3 49
	FIRST READING	PAGE	
JSR-0002	ADOPTED	PAGE	9

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER PETER MASCARI	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4
JOINT SESSION - CONVENE	PAGE	9
EUDGET MESSAGE - GOVERNOR THOMPSON	PAGE	10
JOINT SESSION - ADJOUENMENT	PAGE	26
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	26

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

MARCH 02, 1983

PAGE 2

REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	28	
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	41	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	46	
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	46	
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	46	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	47	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	47	
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	49	
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	50	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	50	

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Committee Report. Representative Mulcahey, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 2, 1983, reported the same •do pass back with the following recommendation: amended House Bill 233, 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill Introduction and First Reading of Constitution Amendments. House Joint Resolution Constitution Amendment #8, Bullock - Madigan - McPike - Slape and Alexander, whereas the 95th Congress of the United States of America, at its second Session, in both Houses, by a Constitution Majority of two-thirds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America: House Joint Resolution. Resolved, Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled two-thirds of each House concurring therein, that the following Article is proposed in the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress: Article. Section I. For purposes of representation in the Congress, election of the President and Vice-President, and Article IV of this Constitution, the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall be treated were a State. Section II. The exercise of the rights and powers conferred under this Article shall be by the people of the District constituting the seat of Government, as shall be provided by the Congress. Section III. twenty-third Article of the Amendment Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

15th Legislative Day

March 2, 1983

Section IV. This Article shall be inoperative, unless it shall have been ratified as an Amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."; therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that such proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further resolved, the certified copy of this Besolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Illinois in the Congress of the United States. The First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. *Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Bouse of Representatives, to wit; Senate Joint Resolution 7, adopted by the Senate March 2, 1983. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Further business? The House now stands adjourned until 12 ncon, March 3.

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

PAGE 1

MARCH 02, 1983

	MARCH U2, 1983		
HB-0020	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0028	SECOND READING	PAGE	42
HB-0057	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
нв-0068	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-0068	SECOND READING	PAGE	26
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	43
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	5
	SECOND BEADING	PAGE	42
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
***	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	ų.
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	ù
	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
	FIRST READING	PAGE	ů.
	FIRST READING	PAGE	ü
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	PIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
	FIRST READING	PAGE	48
HJR-0014		PAGE	3
	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
JSR-0002		PAGE	9
038.0002	U DOT I DD	2002	,

COMOR DO ORDER AREAUTO MARTANI	D1.0D	•
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MADIGAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER PETER MASCARI	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	4
JOINT SESSION - CONVENE	PAGE	9
EUDGET MESSAGE - GOVERNOR THOMPSON	PAGE	10
JOINT SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	26
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	26

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

MARCH 02, 1983

PAGE

2

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY	71.45	20	
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	28	
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	41	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	46	
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	46	
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	46	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	47	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	47	
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	49	
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	50	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	50	