143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 10:00 having arrived, the House will now be in Session. Members will be in their seats.

 The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Saughneysy Small, Pastor of the Capitol City Church of God of Springfield. Reverend Small is a guest of Representatives Sylvester Rhem and Representative Michael Curran. Will the guests in the gallery please rise for the invocation?
- Reverend Small: "As we bow our heads, Oh Gracious God, we truly thank Thee as we come together. We ask that Thou might bless these Representatives, Merciful Father, as they deliberate today. God, we pray that their decisions that they're making, Merciful Pather, that they will always take God into account what they re doing. We just pray Thou might bless their endeavors, Merciful Father, for they represent we, the people, of Illinois. And we pray, God, that You might bless their deliberation. Merciful Father. in a special way. Give them their direction that You would have them to go in. We thank You, Lord God, for men and women who are so committed that they might stand and do the things that You would have us to do for this State of We thank You for them. We pray You bless them Illinois. in whatever area they stand in need of help. In Jesus' Holy Name, Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Ropp will lead us in the pledge to the flag."
- 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 Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Ms. Zwick, would you punch your button? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117

143rd Legislative Day

- June 29, 1984
- Members have answered to the Roll Call, and the House has a quorum. Message from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate, by Mr. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills 1484 and 1629, action taken by the Senate June 28, 1984. Kenneth Wright. Secretary. "
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Brookins and Representative

 Curran in the Chair."
- Brookins: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, we are here to honor Miss Black Springfield, Miss Bose Ann Pinn. We, Brookins, Alexander, LePlore and Curran offered Resolution 1127. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1127, offered by Representatives Brookins, Alexander, LeFlore and Curran. Whereas, the Members of this House are honored and delighted to recognize significant milestones in lives of citizens of this state; and whereas, Miss Rose Ann Pinn, at age 19, was crowned as the first Miss Black Springfield at a which was sponsored by H & H Productions; and whereas, Miss Pinn is the lovely daughter of Mr. Edward Pinn, Sr. and Mrs. Mary Pinn, both of whom must be very proud of their daughter: and whereas, Miss Pinn is a graduate of Lincoln Land Community College who plans to continue her education at Western Illinois University in the subject area of law enforcement administration and is also a member of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church; and whereas, her lovely personality, sense of commitment and tireless dedication to duty will all unite to ensure her a marvelous and productive future. and 1 ook forward to hearing of even greater accomplishments from this young Lady. Therefore,

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

resolved by the House of Representatives of the 83rd Assembly of the State of Illinois, that congratulate Miss Bose Ann Pinn on her being crowned Miss Springfield and commend her on her educational accomplishments and aspirations. And be it further resolved that we sincerely wish this fine. pauov tremendous success in her future endeavors and express our full confidence in her abilities and resourcefullness. And be it further resolved that a suitable copy of Preamble and Resolution be presented to Miss Bose Ann Pinn as a token of our warm regard and high esteem."

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brookins moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1127. All in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. And now, Miss Black Springfield, would you like to address the Assembly?"
- Rose Ann Pinn: "Thank you very much. This is an honor as well as
 a privilege for me to accept this Resolution on behalf of
 Hiss Black Springfield. I have made a solemn pledge to
 myself that I'd never let anything out of my hands that
 didn't represent the most sincere and earnest of my
 efforts. Thank you very much."
- ao n page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 1563. Mr. McGann? Out the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2296, Mr. Hallock. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2388, Mr. Ewing. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, on page seven... OB page three of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2600, Mr. Bullock. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, on page three of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2605, Mr. Stuffle. Out of the record. On the ... On page four of

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2775, Mr. Capparelli. 2775. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2775, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement agencies and locating lost, missing and runaway children, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2775 originally was the Missing Childs' Recovery Act. It went over to the There was a Bill identical that Mr. Rock had and this Bill, has been changed now, and provides for the statements for our... let's see... of economic interest because of a publicity brought forth by a much publicized article in Chicago. And this changes the economic interest What it does now, provides that a statement May 1st of each year. Now, it's April 30th. Provides the following procedure if a person required to file fails to file. The office with whom the statement was to be filed, the Secretary of State or the County Clerk, must notify the person via certified mail within seven days of the deadline, May 1st, of the failure... the failure There will be a 15 dollar file. late filing fee is imposed, and if the statement is not filed by May 15th. additional 100 dollar a day penalty is imposed. If the filed by is not 31st, May forfeiture OF ineligibility for the office shall result. I would ask for concurrence for the House Bill 2775."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2775. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2775?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this guestion there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2775. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3067. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Clson."
- Olson: "I'd like to take this out of the record at this time, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3083, Mr. Vinson. 3083. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3090, Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3091. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3091, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning business assistance, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Ryder."
- R vder: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. As you this Bill originally created a Business Assistance Office. One of the many duties was to recommend means by which paperwork could be cut. red tape cut. JCAR had the responsibility for this. Senate Amendment #1 simply changes their responsibility to placing the paperwork in their five year review cycle, further defines state forms

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- to include grant applications, licensing applications, but did not include books, pamphlets, newsletters, intra-agency forms, which don't affect persons outside of the government. I would move to concur."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Morgan moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3091. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, •Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1? All those in favor signify by voting *aye*, those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open, and this is final action. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3091. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Yes, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook. Mr. DiPrima. recognition?"
- DiPrima: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give a last minute notice that we're going to close the adjournment pool.

 Anybody wants to get in better get over here. And another thing, anybody wants a 4th of July speech, you better come over and get that. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Concurrence, on page five, appears House Joint Resolution 147. Mr. Kirkland. House Joint Resolution 147 on the Order of Concurrence. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 147, declares a major literacy initiative in Illinois, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland."
- Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur. This was a Resolution for an adult literacy week to be established in

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

September, and the Senate Amendment simply directs that the Resolution be delivered to various parties."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay. The Gentleman from Kane has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 147. Is there any discussion? There the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 147-Ladies and Gentlemen, your attention is directed to page eight of the Calendar. We have received eight Senate Joint Resolutions, and we require Sponsors before they can be dealt with. look at page eight of your Calendar under Speaker's Table and determine the Sponsorship of those Resolutions. Thank you. There is also one on page seven. It begins at the bottom of page seven with SJR 51 and those that follow. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1524. Mr. Stuffle. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, on page five, appears Senate Bill 1612. Out of the record. Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1629, Mr. Giorgi. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1746, Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1794, Ms. Topinka. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1844, Ms. Braun. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1853. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, page six of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1864, Mr. Vinson. Out of the record. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1870. Ms. Barnes. Mr. Clerk.

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

the... read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1870, a Bill for an Act to release highway easements and restore access rights to certain described lands, together with Senate Amend... House Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to not recede on Senate Bill 1870."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1870. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1870?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from Senate (sic House) Amendment #1. And the Lady requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1881, Mr. Hensel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1881, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Purchasing Act, together with House Amendment #1."
 Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... Thank you, Mr. Speaker,
 Members of the House. I'd like to recede and nonconcur
 with the Senate Bill 1881. Recede from Amendment #1.
 Bight."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House does recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1881.

 And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Panayotovich, please."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Panayotovich."

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

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Panayotovich: "Representative Hensel, was the structural steel language corrected?"

Hensel: "No. We're going to take that Amendment out of the Bill.

That's what I'm doing by receding. So..."

Panayotovich: "I understand that. But could we correct it? I'd

be advocable if you'd like to correct that."

Hensel: "Well, I don't know whether we're going to have time in this. Why don't we work on it, and get a good Amendment to it in the next Session, if that's agreeable with you."

Panayotovich: "I understand. Fine. Thank you very much."

Hensel: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton.

Purther discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1881?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Final action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1881. And this Fill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1911. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to community currency exchange and ambulatory currency exchanges, together with House Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we.. that the
House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 so that we
can put this Bill into a Conference Committee to resolve
what basically is a technical problem. The Bill itself

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

deals with the... the potential for bankruptcy of currency exchanges and the priority of treating the creditors upon such event. And the... the dispute that still exists is as to whom should have priority between individuals who have deposited money for license registration and individuals who have paid their utility bills at the currency exchange. And it's the intent to put this Bill into Conference Committee in such the way to make it clearer that those individuals who have paid their utilities bills would have... would have priority over the Secretary of State's Office in respect to the money paid for license fees. I would, therefore, respectfully ask the House to join me in refusing to recede from Amendment \$1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bil1 1911. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate (sic - House) Amendment #1... from House Amendment to Senate Bill 1911. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to Chair. recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1911 requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Order of Nonconcurrence, on page six of the Calendar. appears Senate Bill 1928. Mr. McCracken, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1928, a Bill for an Act relating to indemnification of certain public employees in certain civil lawsuits, together with House Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I move that the House not recede from its
Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1928. Those Amendments

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

took out Court of Claims supervision for these indemnification suits and also inserted the right αf volunteers under written contract with the state ŧο be subject to the Act. I move that the House not recede from Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage has moved that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments... from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1928. Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative McCracken, could you tell me, specifically with reference to Amendment #1, what that Amendment did?"

McCracken: "That Amendment would have required the Court of Claims to have reviewed all authorizations for indemnification prior to their being actually executed."

Cullerton: "Would that have required any appropriation?"

NcCracken: "No, that... the entire Bill, as it passed out, would have required the appropriation. Whether the Amendment was or was not on the Bill did not affect that."

Cullerton: "You're saying that Amendment #1 did not require an appropriation."

McCracken: "I don't believe so, no. The underlying Bill... The underlying Bill's intent was to create a new line item in Central Management Services. As I recall, Amendment #1 merely was the Court of Claims oversight."

Cullerton: "Well... (tape malfunction) few minutes, I'd like to defer to Representative Leverenz, because I think we defeated an appropriation that was... dealt with Amendment #1. With respect to Amendment #2, could you tell me what that Amendment did?"

McCracken: "Yes, that was the Attorney General Amendment which

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

allowed for volunteers under written contract with the state to be within the scope of the Indemnification Act."

- Cullerton: "I remember questioning you on... to how many volunteers this would be expanded to?"
- McCracken: "I don't know. I don't know how many volunteers would be within the scope of this Amendment."
- Cullerton: "And ... did not agree with these Amendments, is that correct?"
- McCracken: "That's correct. I don't... I don't know precisely why, but my understanding was that Senator Carroll wanted the Court of Claims oversight which was Amendment #1. Amendment #2, the Attorney General Amendment, was originally Senate Bill 1645, Senator Berman's Bill. That passed out, and we combined the two Bills onto Senate Bill 1928. So, I believe that Amendment #1 was... was the hangup in the Senate."
- Cullerton: "What is it that you want to do with a Conference Committee?"
- McCracken: "Go back and see if we can get Senator Carroll to change his mind."

Cullerton: "Okay. No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will"

- Leverenz: "We defeated the appropriation for 500,000 day before yesterday and now one of the Amendments would provide for the Court of Claims to review each case. Is that correct?

 Now you... What do you want to do with that?"
- McCracken: "Yes. The creation of the line item and the intent of the Bill, I believe, is not a part of Amendment #1.

 Amendment #1 would require oversight by the Court of Claims, approval by the proposed payouts prior to their execution."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Leverenz: "What's wrong with some oversight to payouts so that at least... would that provide not only the Court of Claims, but the Attorney General's Office to signoff on the claim?"
- McCracken: "No..."
- Leverenz: "Is that the intent of Amendment #1?"
- McCracken: "No, the Attorney General, under the Bill, has to signoff regardless of Amendment #1."
- Leverenz: "So, the Attorney General would still provide the oversight and..."
- McCracken: "That's correct. However..."
- Leverenz: "If you're taking out the part that provides for a separate line item, where..."
- McCracken: "I don't believe Amendment #1 would take out the separate line item. To be candid, I don't have it in front of me; but, as I recall, the Court of Claims oversight was Amendment #1..."
- Leverenz: "Well, I don't have anything in front of me either.

 I'm just..."
- McCracken: "The Court of Claims oversight was Amendment #1. The underlying Bill has in the line item, not Amendment #1."
- Leverenz: "And you're asking for nonconcurrence to push it to a Conference Committee?"
- McCracken: "Yes, Sir."
- Leverenz: "And what do you expect it will come back looking like?"
- McCracken: "I hope it comes back the way we passed it the first time."
- Leverenz: "And if we... If we kill it now, then we will never need the half a million dollar appropriation which we contend is nothing more than squirrelling money away, and it will work in a similar fashion as the Court of Claims.

 As each case is heard and decided and signed off by the Attorney General, then you can come in for the money when

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

we know exactly how much it is? Is that correct?"

- that's not correct. Even if you don't like the proposal, if you do not pass some Bill, there is authorization, because of that decision which the Court of Claims rendered last year, for them to authorize awards under the Indemnification Act. So. something has to be done. If you don't agree that it's not wise to delete Court of Claims oversight, then I welcome you to the Conference Committee, but we have to do something."
- Leverenz: "Isn't it... Well, I'd rather have my counsel Cullerton on the Conference Committee. But wouldn't it be just easier to get the Court of Claims to work faster and get the job done in the first place so you wouldn't have to put this secondary bogus operation together?"
- McCracken: "The Court of Claims has held that they don't have jurisdiction to authorize these awards, to make these awards."
- Leverenz: "I see. We'll go to the Conference, and we'll put it together our way. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2... excuse me, from House Amendments 2 to Senate Bill 1928? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In th€ opinion the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede to Senate... to House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1928 and requests the appointment of a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1939. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1939, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Illinois Health and Hazardous Substance Registry Act, together with House Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I refuse
 to recede from the Amendments and would request a
 Conference Committee. This Bill has dealt with the Cancer
 Registry Act, and the Senate Sponsor feels that it needs a
 little more refinement, and I agree with him."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1939. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1939?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1939 and requests the appointment of a Conference Committee. Alright. Now we will go to the top of the list again on nonconcurrences. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1524. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act relating to motor vehicles and motor fuel tax, together with House Amendments #3 and 4."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Stuffle."
- Stuffle: "I would move that the House refuse to recede from its

 Amendments and ask for a Committee on Conference."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Vermilion moves that House refuse to recede to House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1524. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1524? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair. the ayes. it, and the House does refuse to have recede from House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate and requests the appointment of a Conference Committee. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1794. Mr.

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1794, a Bill for an Act in relation to the offense of aggravated fleeing or attempting to elude a police officer, together with House Amendments #1 and 6."

 Speaker Grieman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Topinka."
- Topinka: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask at this time that... we refuse to concur with Senate (sic House) Amendments #1 and 6... recede from Senate (sic House) Amendments #1 and 6, and I ask for a Conference Committee to be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved the House do refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 6 to Senate Bill 1794. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Topinka, would you please yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she will."
- Cullerton: "This is very important. Does this Bill deal with fleeing?"
- Topinka: "Yes, this Bill deals with fleeing. We deal with a lot of dogs on this floor."
- Cullerton: "Does this Bill apply to the collar counties?"
- Topinka: "Yes, it applies to the collar counties."
- Cullerton: "And what did the Senate say about your Amendments?"
 Topinka: "They itched."
- Cullerton: "And what do you want to do in a Conference Committee?"
- Topinka: "I'd like to sit down and discuss with the Senate Sponsor exactly why, you know, they are kind of refusing to come along with us so that we can work out our differences."
- Cullerton: "Okay."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton, your bark was much worse than

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

your bite on that one. There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 6 to Senate Bill 1794?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 6 to Senate Bill 1794 and requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Ropp in the Chair. Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd like to have your attention for a moment for a presentation. As you may well know, for eleven consecutive years Southern Illinois Industrial Association has sponsored a tennis and a raquetball tournament. This year we all time record rookie winner who came to Springfield and Margie Parcells. won by a storm. Maggie, come on up here. Ιn less than two months, she's displayed her characteristics on the tennis court by winning with her partner, Jim Broadway, from the Illinois Hospital Association. On behalf of the Southern Illinois Industrial Association, I want to present to you with this first place and you can take one and give it to Jim, too. had another old-timer that is not that old, but he's probably one of the most handsomest tennis players around. Dave Harris was nosed out by, I think, one game coming second with Gary 'Coke' of the local governmental task Dave, if you'll come forth and pick up your second force. place trophy and then present it to Gary, Congratulations. Thank you all very much. The rest of the players that participated from the House just played well and hard, did not win. Good luck."

Speaker Greiman: "In case there's any question as far as the last

Bill that we dealt with, it was a refusal to recede from

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

Senate Bill 1794, 1794. Alright. We will return now to the Order of Concurrence, on page two of the Calendar, and go over some of the Bills that we skipped over in the absence of the Sponsor. On page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2296, Mr. Hallock. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2296, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois County Historic Preservation Act and amending the Illinois Municipal Code, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2296 as passed by the House established the Illinois County Historic Preservation Act. It is a permissive Bill which allows counties to establish, if they so choose, Acts of this type. Amendment #1 in the Senate was a technical one which made only those technical changes. Amendment #2 deleted the eminent domain power and put in a front-door referendum on the Bill. I would move to concur with both Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves that House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2296. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 2296? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye' ... no, 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2296. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, page two of

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

the Calendar, appears House Bill 2388. Mr. Ewing, do wish to proceed? Out of the record. Mr. Stuffle. Stuffle in... Mr. Stuffle, do you wish to proceed on 2605? On page five of the Calendar on the the record. Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3067. Mr. you wish to proceed? No, out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3083. Mr. Vinson, 3083? Do you wish to concur, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Oh, out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Let's stand at ease for a few moments. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Hicks, seek recognition?"

- Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for a purpose of an announcement. I'd

 like to say the Carson's Air Express scheduled for Saturday
 night needs to have final orders taken and all dollars
 available at that time. It could be picked up at this
 time, but final orders need to be given though in the next
 couple hours."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you for that valuable announcement.

 Since we are at ease, the TV light has been turned off so
 that TV and camera enthusiasts are admonished from taking
 pictures while we are at ease. The Gentleman from Cook,
 Mr. Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you be so kind as to enlighten the Body as to how long we're going to be at ease?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, a little while anyhow, Mr. Kulas, but we will give you a more definitive statement of the agenda for the day a little later on. The gentleman with the camera, would you come to the podium, please? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold, seek recognition?"
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wondered if the Republicans were going to go to Conference or Caucus so we

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

could go to lunch."

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, you know, Mr. Brunsvold, no real decent lunch can be had in less than a couple hours. I believe that. Certain... Certain way of life has to be maintained. So, we'll have to just see whether they're going to give us that kind of life today."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Brunsvold, who's concerned about lunch, the House will stand in recess until the hour of 1:00. I would suggest that Members be back here promptly at 1:00. We will begin business hopefully at that time."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk, do you have any Resolutions? Mr. Mulcahey. Mr. Mulcahey, was there anything that you wish to speak to?"
- Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to mention a couple things, but I sort of, after I thought about it for a while, I sort of felt like the father of a 16 year old daughter who came home at 3:00 in the morning with a 'Gidian' Bible under her arm. I have mixed emotions. So, maybe I had just better pass for now."
- Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Members who would have any items on either the concurrence or the nonconcurrence Calendar where they would wish to move to nonconcur? Are there any Members who have any matters where they would like to nonconcur? The Chair recognizes Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that... I refuse to recede..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi, please state the page on the Calendar where your matter appears."
- Giorgi: "The number is page five on the Calendar, 1629."
- Speaker Madigan: "What is your Motion?"
- Giorgi: "I move to not recede from House Amendments to Senate

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Bill 1629."

- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves that the House do not recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1629. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. Did you wish to ask for a Conference Committee?"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that a Conference Committee be formed to deliberate on Senate Bill 1629."
- Speaker Madigan: "Fine. And the Gentleman also requests a Conference Committee. Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. On page five of the Nonconcurrence Calendar, I refuse to recede to Senate Bill 833, and I ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann, could you hold that Motion temporarily?"
- McGann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Are there any other Members who wish to take a matter on the Order of Concurrence or Nonconcurrence where they wish to move to nonconcur? On page five of the Calendar, Mr. McGann has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendments to Senate Bill 833. Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Assembly. I
 will repeat, on page five, Senate Bill 833, that I refuse
 to recede, and I ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede and to ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. Are there any other Members who have matters on the Concurrence or Nonconcurrence Calendar where they wish to offer a Motion? Are there any Members who wish to take a matter on the Concurrence or the

143rd Legislative Day

- June 29, 1984
- Nonconcurrence Calendar? For what purpose does Mr. Hoffman seek recognition?"
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to your request, I would like to take Senate Bill 1612 and Senate Bill 1746 up on the Nonconcurrence Calendar."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page five of the Calendar there appears

 Senate Bill 1746. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On Senate Bill 1746, I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment #6 and call for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House... For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "That's fine, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make sure
 I understood what he was... what his Motion was. It was to
 recede..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman, could you restate your Motion?

 Mr. Hoffman."
- Cullerton: "Wish to recede from the Amendment #6?"
- Hoffman: "The Motion was that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #6."
- Cullerton: "Well, my understanding was he was going to recede from the Amendment. That's why I inquired. Can I ask him to take it out of the record?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. The matter shall be taken out of the record. For what purpose does Mr. Flinn seek recognition?"
- Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if Kelly Smith and company has a right to film out of the Speaker's gallery... or the permission, rather."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn, could you state your inquiry again?"
- Flinn: "I see there's a camera in the Speaker's gallery and normally there is not one there. I really don't care myself. I just wondered if they had permission to film out

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

of the Speaker's gallery."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn, the House rules provide that cameras

 can be positioned in any of the galleries. For what

 purpose does Mr. Greiman seek recognition?"
- Greiman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a matter on the Order of Nonconcurrence. I'd like to concur..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, if you could hold that, and if we could ask Representative Braun to come to the podium with her guest for the purpose of a special introduction."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I'd like to introduce to you today members of the world famous Staple Singers. We have with us today, on my right, Mavis Staples and Evon Staples, representing their family. And as we head into the hectic end of Session, I... we have just filed and hope to soon later on today a Resolution in honor of the Staple Singers in congratulating them for their good work and example that they make for the entire community. And I would like to read a copy of the Resolution. Whereas, this Body is greatly honored to welcome to its chamber the musically gifted and acclaimed Staple Singers, referred to as the first family of gospel: and 'Robuck and Oseolla' Staple and their children have been performing for enthusiastic and appreciative audiences for more than thirty years -I want to put a pin in this. These Ladies were only two when they started - and for what began as family entertainment soon grew into appearances in many Chicago area churches and has developed in to worldwide recognition and recording success; and whereas, as the Staple Singers have toured the globe, popularity has increased and they have naturally assumed the roles of Good Will ambassadors for the uplifting message and rich quality of their music transcend cultural

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

differences and overcome language barriers: and whereas. family times have always been the strength of the Staple Singers and 'Robuck and Oseolla' Staple recently celebrated their 50th anniversary of marital as well as musical harmony. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois that heartfelt welcome to the Staple Singers extend our commending this outstanding family upon a career which spanned three decades and has consistently reflected the dedication to the noble pursuits of the human spirit and that we also congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Staples upon the commemoration of their golden wedding anniversary. bak resolved that a suitable copy it further of this Resolution be presented to the Staple Singers. With Ladies and Gentleman, again I'd like to introduce and I'd like you to say ... both of you if you would say a few words to the Body."

- Mavis Staple: "Thank you. It is indeed a pleasure, as well as an honor, to be in your midst today. We appreciate all that has been done for us today. We've had a beautiful morning and the afternoon is going on with Representative Braun and all of you. It is a great pleasure and thank you."
- Evon Staple: "Mavis, and thank you Carol for that two year old.

 We was I think about two at that particular time. On
 behalf of the entire family, the Staple Singers, I'd like
 to say... thank all of you. And as mom and pop taught us,
 together we stand, divided we fall. And we are so glad to
 see you together and that we finally reached the turning
 point in our life, and there's no going back now."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of the Concurrence Calendar, on page two, there appears House Bill 1563. Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I would ask your attention for a few moments. I rise today

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

to plead for the education of the elementary and secondary students in the State of Illinois. I ask for a cooperative effort by both Republicans and Democrats in concurrence Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1563. legislation belongs to all of us because of a significant impact on the continuity of education in our state. a thorough discussion last Friday of what the Amendments do and will not do-The most important aspect we can... should consider today is the new approach to funding our schools through the Local School Fund by placing surcharge of 25 percent on the sale of Lottery tickets. There are those among us who cannot accept this new concept for the fear of diminishing sales. We have taken those persons into consideration in the safequard of Amendment which places the necessary powers with the State Lottery Board to suspend or rescind, by emergency rule. when sales are reduced by 15 percent. We have no other alternative on the horizon for funding of our schools, and is June 29. 1984. Before you on your desk is a memorandum noting the distribution of the new revenue bν Illinois Senate Districts. Senate Districts totally in the confines of the City of Chicago are generating most of our Lottery sales and will receive adequate funding for schools. Oh, yes, some districts will receive more than others; but, with this plan, the money is returned to where they were generated. This approach is fair. This is approach that's equitable. Please look at this memorandum. Note the amounts to be returned to your districts. you to please be cooperative, please think above all interests the children of the State of Illinois. vote would certainly be appreciated by all of them. Once there's nothing else before us. We cannot forget the schools in the State of Illinois. I will be very happy

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1563. If I could humbly suggest that we've already had a very healthy debate on this guestion and, in light of the earlier debate, if everyone could hold their remarks to a minimum, and the Governor's man, Mr. Dillard, would appreciate that also. Chair recognizes Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I appreciate your admonition, and I will certainly, as always, follow your admonition. I rise in opposition to this legislation. I don't think it's necessary for ... to me, to mention the fact to most of the people in this House that I've been involved in the issue of education all the 18 years that I ve been in this General Assembly, but I rise today to speak in opposition to this legislation as a faulty approach to the program of support for public I do this for two reasons. Number one, the education. fact of the matter is that the Lottery sales projected Bureau of the Budget's estimates of revenue this term have already dropped. They *ve dropped from 22 million 18... 19 million a week, which is going to leave us about a 75 million dollar hole. By putting the Lottery surcharge on, we're only going to reduce the take on that particular sale. As the Lottery drops down, that reduces the amount of money in the General Revenue Fund which reduces the amount of money available for ... schools. And for those two reasons, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in opposition to the Motion to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1563."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

this matter came up two weeks ago, I voted 'present', because I didn't believe this was necessarily the most logical way to fund public education in Illinois - through the Lottery surtax. Since that time, I've had discussions Mr. McGann and others, and I've become convinced that here at the last minute, June 29th, our schools need money, not only in Chicago, not only city schools - suburban schools and downstate schools as well, and that the plan from the Senate is the only real ballgame we have in town. way of doing something for our public schools. It does distribute money fairly in the suburban Cook County. the suburban Cook County portions of my district in New Trier, North Hill and Wheeling Townships. It's fair with Lake County, the other part of my district. receive money from this, not just Chicago. This just helps Mr. McGann and the City of Chicago public schools. It helps suburban schools, suburban Cook County schools, collar county schools and, I'm sure, downstate schools as well. And, therefore, having studied these figures, having discussed the matter with Mr. McGann in his most persuasive way, I'm convinced that concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 1563 that will provide funds for our public schools throughout the State of Illinois. And I, therefore, intend to change my vote from 'present' to an 'aye' vote, an enthusiastic 'aye' vote so that we don't go home tomorrow night or whenever we go home without having done anything to help fund public education in Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, in line with your, quote, 'humble suggestion', closed quote, could I humbly request the same

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Roll Call on the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "You... Naturally, Br. Vinson, you could make that request."

Vinson: "Just as I made the request to reserve Amendments 60 through 69 yesterday?"

Speaker Madigan: "We have appointed a Committee to develop a procedure to comply with your first request. That Committee is working..."

Vinson: "Will that Committee report on adjournment?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well, it's working very diligently, and I'm sure it will report in due time."

Vinson: "Well then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a question."

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Vinson: "Representative, the... my guestion would be are there any safeguards in your Bill so that within the individual school districts, the money would be expended in those neighborhoods which bought the most Lottery tickets?"

McGann: "Representative, I can only answer that, no."

Vinson: "I thought so. Thank you."

McGann: "It will go into those service region areas, and it will go in through the school districts in that immediate area where those Lottery sales were generated."

Vinson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in opposition to the Bill for the same reasons that I rose on a previous occasion. There are two fundamental flaws with the Bill. To the extent that the Bill is in any way successful in increasing money for education, it must necessarily take that money away from downstate and rural and suburban school districts to transfer that to urban school districts, particularly the City of Chicago School District. That is not a way to encourage a spirit of cooperation throughout this state to solve our school

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

problems throughout the State of Illinois. As the Speaker suggested yesterday, it's wrong to set one region of the state against another region of the state. And this proposal for funding education very clearly does that, because it would necessarily, if it were successful at all. take money away from some school districts to transfer to others. And finally, it's very likely to be totally counterproductive, because it's likelv to discourage Lottery receipts in general. For those reasons, it's a bad plenty of time to work out these proposal. There is problems before the next school year commences. Committees are... Conference Committees are in progress, and virtually every Conference Committee resolves to a discussion of this kind of issue. There is no reason to act on this Bill when it might have a very counterproductive effect on education, in general, and particularly on education downstate and the suburban areas of the state. For those reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote and request a verification should it appear to get the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I stand in opposition to Representative McGann's Motion. I appreciate his efforts towards education. history does not show that we are, in fact, moving the money towards education. The original Lottery Bill supposed to save education. It was still in trouble. We've gotten a lot of heat over that. The income tax passed last year did not save education. They're still in trouble. And now we have a third item, a surtax to save education again. It is not going to work. It saved a lot of other programs. It saved public aid. It saved mental health. It saved all these other programs that can't pass a tax increase. In the Governor's Mansion this spring on

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

the appropriation, the Governor, with 500 million dollars of extra money, only was going to allot 27 million dollars to education. This not... does not show me any effort towards funding education. This is not, in the end, going to fund education. It's going to fund a lot of other programs but not education. So, I would request a 'no' vote on Representative McGann's Motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Harris: "Representative McGann, you were very generous earlier and provided some information as to the distribution of the amount of funds which would be generated under this proposal and the distribution of those funds. From looking over the sheet, I notice that my district, outside of the City of Chicago, my district, receives more funds than any other district in the State of Illinois. Let me follow up on that by asking a couple of questions. If you would help me out, how were these figures arrived at? Is it a combination of Lottery sales, students? How does..."

McGann: "They were compiled from Lottery sales in the different regions, the districts. And you, no doubt, produce a lot of Lottery sales from your area. And the State Board of Education did the data work on this memorandum."

Harris: "Okay. The dollars which are returned specifically...

let say just specifically to my district which is an
entirely a Cook County district. How are... How do those
dollars get back to my school district?"

McGann: "According to your student enrollment, those monies will come back into that service area region."

Harris: "Through what mechanism? Where do.."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

McGann: "Through the school... the School Fund that will be set up. This is not going back into the regular Lottery Fund where they put 40 percent... 41 percent into the General Revenue Fund to fund education. This will be handled in this School Lottery Fund."

Harris: "Is the ... "

McGann: "It will be distributed from there."

Harris: "Is the Regional Superintendent of Schools involved in this in any way?"

McGann: "He will most definitely be involved in the distribution.

Definitely."

Harris: "It's very difficult for me to look at the numbers which you have put out and say, as much as I want to fund education, that I would not support this Motion. However, when you mention the Regional Superintendent of Schools in my area and the school districts in my area, talking about the Regional Superintendent of Schools, despite the large dollars that are involved here, they may never see those dollars if it has to go through that office. But I appreciate your answering my questions. Thank you."

McGann: ""Representative, I just want to add to your guestions if

I may there... You will receive in your district
approximately eight million dollars for the education of
your school children in elementary and secondary schools.
Eight million will be going in there. Now, I don't know
how you're going to rationalize this, but no one else has
come up with any better idea but; yet, at the same time, we
don't ever want to try something new. I... If I was going
to get eight million dollars into my district, I'd be
really overwhelmingly in support of it. I get a million
some thousand in my district."

Harris: "Well..."

McGann: "Think it over, Representative."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Harris: "I appreciate your comment, Representative McGann, that the ... I have school districts which are most. blessed in terms of other school districts in this state. My high school district sits on a reserve of 25 million dollars. My one elementary school district would just as soon not take any funds, because they have the highest school district, elementary school district in the state. Not that I want to turn away eight million dollars. but I'd rather see that eight million dollars not necessarily come back all to my district, but perhaps go to other districts in the state which might be a little bit more worthy.

McGann: "Well, I would suggest, Representative, that you receive that eight mill... Vote for this riece of legislation, receive that eight million dollars and then turn it back in to the use in those areas that are needed. That would be the thing to do."

Harris: "And I'll tell my school superintendents to do that.

They'll love the idea."

McGann: "And some of that 25 million also."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well, we'd be glad to take that money if he sends back, but we hope it comes a different way. Frankly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's a difference of this Bill, but I think the difference of opinion QΠ opinion, being legitimate, there are clear reasons to vote 'no' on the Bill. Many people have risen here who have supported public education to the nth degree year after year, and I think I've been one of them, along with Representative Hoffman and with Representative McGann. It's no accident that the largest teacher organization in the state that fights hard for education also does not support this. The clear fact is what's left out of

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

speaking about distribution is that the first part of the distribution is not enrollment. It's sales. And those sales in areas are sales of Lottery tickets. That's pie in each region is developed and then through enrollment. That places over three quarters of the and that's even unfair when you get into ESR, downstate areas with what part of the pie they get. Ιf you're in our area, you have three times as many sales basically in one part as the other, because you've hundreds of people daily coming in from Indiana. And there's no relationship between those sales and the needs back in those districts. The point is the Governor will veto the Bill, too. The point is the 15 percent floor The drop is going to appreciable. The point is that there are alternatives that have been cited on There are alternatives that have been in the House floor. works that I've looked at and the Chairman Committee, Representative Hoffman and Senator Berman and others, day after day, to look at the issue. Now, thev produce the kind of revenue this does, but no one is going to produce the kind of revenue this does. because this is going to fail. There's a proposal to produce 50 million through a tax on soft drinks, a proposal to produce 50 million through dealing with... to 70 million with car sales and three or four other proposals that would generate realistic revenue. And those proposals also suggest that that money ought to be driven above the Governor's level and the House level through the formula. If we believe that the formula is fair, then why not apply it here? Why apply this distribution method that's unfair? And, as I say, the bottom line is, this game is ridiculous. Governor will veto this Bill as clear as the sun came up today. If you want to put your vote on it and pass

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

you've gotten nothing in the bargain. You will pushed back all the efforts to do some alternative that may work. You will have nothing above the Governor's level to go home with, and we know that today. And I say that with all due respect to my good friend who working hard for public education, Representative McGann. We need to defeat this Bill and this Motion today and come back and look at the other alternatives and be fair to the districts of this state, whether they're Chicago or downstate, whether the schools are black or white or whatever they happen to be. This is a bad idea. the Governor knows it, and we know he's going to veto And he's right this time, and I'd say that's rare from my prospective."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. We've heard enough of this. I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Mr. McGann is recognized to close."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. It just shocks me unbelievable. And actually almost bringing tears to my eyes to listen to this nonsense have heard from the opponents of this piece of legislation. First of all, if we had complied with the intent of the law, as far as the Lottery tax was concerned, we would not have any problem in funding education because they would have had the 100 percent instead of drib drab that's taken out of it and used in other agencies of the state. That's number one. Number two, if this most concerned Governor that we're talking ... giving such ... to today would fund according to the mandate of the State of Illinois, we would not be in this problem. We would not

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

have this problem because we would be having almost 300 dollars more from the 38 percent to 50 percent to take care of the children in the State of Illinois. all of you who've come around, you've all got good ideas. and I respect everyone of you and I respect you haven't come up with one this time. Now it's almost at the end of the Session. Our schools are dangling out there wondering what we're going to do, and we've got to have the guts to forget what the Governor's but going to veto do what we're supposed to do on this House floor. I ask you - there is no relevancy to previous speakers' thoughts about the surcharge in interfering with any other part of the funding, whatsoever. Ιf it goes down in 15 percent and we lose money, we stop it. Monies are returning from whence This legislation is not unfair. It's not taking away from one region and giving to another. It is going back to where those 25 cents are earned. This is the only solution we have at this late date, outside of raising real estate sales or income tax. It is truly the only turn available. Ιf you vote against this legislation, prepared to defend your vote. When our institutions witness financial chaos this fall, be prepared people you didn't want eight million, you tell those didn't want four million, three million. I ask you, for the children of Illinois, to give me an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1563?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Nelson, to explain her vote."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not the way to fund education in this

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

state. The Lottery is an unpredictable, erratic source of funding - not what we need for the school children. It is absolutely, as Representative Stuffle said, correct that another plan is still possible at this point, and I'm glad that the House seems to be defeating this, which proposal is self-defeating in the first place, for another time. People who buy Lottery tickets in this state, buy five dollars a week's worth or fifty dollars a week's worth, and they will continue to buy at that rate, no matter what the price of an individual'sticket is, or they will quit buying tickets because they will begin to perceive this as a regressive tax on those who can least afford it. I'm happy to see that all those red votes are up there."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative O'Connell, to explain his vote." O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to respond some of the comments that were made in this debate. the comments was that this is not the intent of the Lottery. Well, I wasn't around when the Lottery was enacted several years ago, but I have heard of the purposes for which the Lottery was intended. And the specific purpose for which it passed was that it was to be a funding tool for education. Now Representative McGann presented us with that tool for education, and the same people that were probably voting for the Lottery at time for that reason are voting against the Bill now. Secondly, there was some talk about promises made and promises broken. This has no relevance to that. The promise is being made that the 25 percent of the investment for a Lottery ticket is going to go to education. promise. That's a quarantee. It will be embedded into a state statute that will require that that money to education. I just cannot understand, when we are looking at so many alternatives that no one has come

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

with, we come up with a rational, realistic approach and we get all those 'no' votes up there. As Representative McGann indicated, someone's going to have to defend this proposal, this vote, when they go back to their districts next week."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Ropp, to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Because of the fact that we have some three or four Committees that are studying this very earnestly and will be coming up with their conclusions before long, it would be unwise to support this Bill. In supporting this Eill, it's somewhat like paving a road to help education with quicksand."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I happen to have handled the Lottery Bill.

In 1972, when the Lottery was first passed, half of proceeds were to go for education, but the Lottery only passed the House. In 1973, when the Lottery Bill enacted into law, when the Bill left the House, there were four Amendments on it - 25 percent to go to schools, 25 percent to go to scholarships, 25 percent for elderly programs and 25 percent to municipalities and counties and townships - and that did not get out of the Senate. Governor Walker, in 1972, vowed that he would veto the if it was ever enacted. After he was elected, he took a poll of his own throughout the State of Illinois and found that 80 percent of the people favored the Lottery. The only reason the Lottery was enacted, and I'm ashamed to admit it here, was because the BTA needed 70 million dollars. And because they were going to give the RTA 70 million dollars, Governor Walker thought the Lottery could replenish that 70 million dollars we were going to take out of the General Revenue Fund to enact the Lottery. that's the facts. If you go into your newspaper morgue,

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

you'll find that what I'm telling you is the truth. I was... Walker signed the Bill in Rockford dubbing me the father of the Lottery. And I should be doing something about this, but I'll vote 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative McAuliffe, to explain his vote." McAuliffe: "Very briefly, I'm going to vote for Mr. Speaker. this Bill, although I know if it passes, next year Chicago Board of Education will be back down here asking for another 100 million dollars. The people that are running Board of Education in Chicago don't know what they're It's a gigantic rat hole that sucks up a11 taxpayers' monies. In the twelve years that I've been down here, every Session it's the same thing. The last two or three days we've got to bail them out because they affairs manage their properly. And to pa v the Superintendent of Schools in Chicago a 125,000 dollars year and have her come down here and ask for money is a crime. But in the interest of the taxpayers of Chicago, I will vote for this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'aye' and supporting this measure because I know that I am acting in accordance with the long-held common belief of the voters and taxpayers in Chicago that this money was to be used for education. I agree with some of the critics who say that we'll only be doing this next year. If you'll recall, last year we gave the Board of Education 190 million dollars, and we are still down here. And the reason for that is because I think it's a euphemism, Ladies and Gentlemen, to say that we are saving education. We are not saving education. What we are doing is looking after the welfare of the Chicago's Teachers' Union who have gotten 90 percent of the 190 million dollars

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

we gave them last year. It doesn't take a great wizard to that the monies that we are giving is not helping the children of Chicago. A hundred and ninety dollars, Ladies and Gentlemen, last year, not one dime of it went for the curriculum betterment. No. . . kids are still using books that were published in 1948. What we need to do is find a new way to structure our schools, one in which the unions don't have such dominance in. I mean this seriously, Ladies and Gentlemen. The report that we got from the National Commission Ωħ Education is a real serious recognition of the educational in this - not only Chicago but the whole nation. two million people out of work. who structurally out of work, meaning they're never going to go to. work. And we need to realize that we're in a global competition with foreign countries who have as their number one priority, Ladies and Gentlemen, education. realize that fact and stop playing games. If the Governor wants to tell the people one thing and something else with the money, that's his business. But T think the Legislature has the responsibility to tell Governor that he can't regard the revenues from the Lottery as his own personal possession. And, let me finish this, 80% of the total revenues that constitute the ... Lottery comes from Cook County. Think about that."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Zwick to explain her vote."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that last time this Bill was up I called it a masguerade, and I certainly haven't changed my mind since then. I believe that education deserves a much more serious approach than simply tagging a surtax on the Lottery. That is simply not going to do it in the long run. Education is a much too serious issue, something that is going to effect all of our lives

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

far too importantly in the future to be dealt with on a basis of being dependent on a 25% surtax on the Lottery, which may not even help. Ιf you are serious about education, look at making a serious commitment towards education and voting on straight appropriation Bills and on the State of Illinois saying to the people of the state that we are serious about education - not a Lottery surtax, an appropriation, money, funding of education, reform, some of the serious things that we should be looking at. not it. I wish it were, but it's not. Thank you. can't cover your votes by voting for this and saying you're for education. It won't do it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Marzuki to explain his vote."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen οf I think that Representative McGann, and myself and other people have been up the route of making some suggestions for the funding of education. These have not I think that Representative McGann come to pass. about trying to get money for education. serious The Lottery, in the minds of most people, was put into purpose. Yes, I think I would agree that we for that should do this. When it comes to funding education, ought to be serious about it. We ought to provide the We ought to provide what the Constitution revenue for it. We haven't done it, and this is a scheme that would bring six million dollars to my district. I doubt very much if I'm going to get it in any other way. I would be very hopeful that all of you people who have made the promise that if this goes down in defeat that that money will come to us from other sources. I, for one, will all of you to those promises."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Oblinger to explain her vote."
Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

want to say just three things very briefly. Number one. I am in support of this Bill although I have a red light. voted for the income tax so that you could have money for education. I Cosponsored with Representative Ralph Amendment that was killed which would have quaranteed that education would be getting at least 50% of its funding from the State of Illinois. My concern is, I want this to go to a Conference Committee so I know whether it's going to the distributive fund or to the categorical fund, and I think that's very important for all of us who are dealing in education. That's why I'm voting 'no', so there'll be a nonconcurrence, and we can get that straightened out. I am in favor of the concept."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Shaw to explain his vote."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen You know, I see an awful lot of red lights up on House. that board there, and everybody talks about being fair what's fair to their district. Well yesterday, 1 introduced an Amendment to extend the income tax. Ιf you want a fair method, that would be fair to all of the people of this state. And those of you who have that red vote up on... red light up on that board, you should be willing vote for the income tax, for the extension of an income tax but you're not willing to do that. All you want to do is sit there and play to the press and the public about what you are doing down here. Bite the Extend the half of a percent in income tax and you bullet. can have enough money for education all over this and ٧e won't have to worry about that. But soon as that Bill... you have a Bill in place, 833, Mr. Speaker, and Т hope that you would attach my Amendment on 833 and let's see how many of those red lights would get on extending the income tax. You'll go back to your respective districts

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

and tell people what you've done for education. You don't want to fund education. You're not trying to just delaying this Session. But what you really should do, and the people... I said the other day, people will hold you accountable when the schools in September in many districts throughout this state will closing down - striking all over this state. Teachers are not getting any money. Children can't go to school. Parents can't go to work. But yet you talk about you represent the people, and you will not vote for this method. You should be supportive of this method. It's the only method before you, and I think it's a good Bill. I think the money should go for education. YOU don't want to do that, put an Amendment on it and send all of the money to education like it was supposed to be in the first place."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House -The red votes on that board indicate very clearly where the Governor is on this issue. And I have to ask, if the Governor is against using Lottery proceeds to fund education, what is he for? Is he for the children? if he is, he's been cutting education, and we have now fallen to the lowest percentage state contribution to education that we have seen in recent memory. Is he for his constitutional responsibility? Well, the Constitution provides that it's his duty, our duty, to provide for funding of education. and that ve have primary responsibility for the funding of education. Thirty-eight of the state's education Bill is hardly full funding, and we are hardly discharging our constitutional responsibility with the education budget which is passed out of this General Assembly. Is the Governor for fair

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

taxation policy because there was a lot of discussion of whether or not a Lottery tax was fair. Well, the fairest part of our tax structure, the income tax, is going to... part of it is going to lapse, and without the extension income tax, it's very clear that education in this state will suffer a tremendous blow, a cut. inability to raise the money to keep these school systems open. It's not just the Chicago schools, Representative McAuliffe. The Chicago schools are in trouble, but so are the schools in every other school district in this state. and the superintendents came down here to tell us that. It is not just the Chicago schools ... are fat either because all the school districts in this state have cut their hudgets. And under the Freedom of Information Act, Representative, you're entitled to go look and see what they've done. them have cut their budgets. They have cut their budgets to the bone. They are now reaching into marrow. and there's not a nickel in this budget to provide for keeping the schools open. I've got to ask the question, what is the Governor for? If he's not for this, then where is he on the income tax extension? I'd like to see the Bill before this Legislature adjourns."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane to explain his vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we have to look at Keane: this in a straight economic place ... in a position of economics. A lot of people are saying that if this twenty-five cents goes on the, especially the dollar Lotto, that we'll kill the Lotto. kill... The other parts of the Lottery aren't paying that much. The real moneymaker is the Lotto. It would be different if we were raising the price of a package of cigarettes from a dollar to a dollar twenty-five, because someone's getting twenty cigarettes for that amount of money. When you are betting, as

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

in Lotto, if ... when you are betting on an eight to sixteen million dollar game and you're going to put out a dollar. and you're hoping to get back eight or two or five million. you're not going to have much of a difference between putting out one dollar and putting out a dollar and a quarter. People are betting the Lotto game to millions. The two bits that the Sponsor is attempting to add onto the dollar ticket will make very, very little difference. The Sponsor also pointed out that there is a trigger. If the ... If, and I'm sure they're not, but if in fact the Lotto sales go down, if they go down kick off. I think it's... he's given as much as he can. and I think the benefits far outweigh, far outweigh And I don't think there will be a loss. possible loss. They far outweigh the chances of the Lottery having reduced revenues. I would appreciate your green votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bonan to explain his vote."

Ronan: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have mixed emotions about this piece of legislation because I think this is the worst way to fund education. But let's We don't have to be geniuses. pay attention. It was a year ago that we stood on the floor of the House and had Republican Leadership rammed down our throat a bad tax package, and I voted for that bad tax package because the only game in town. They mandated that we need a year income tax increase and all our problems were going to go away. They mandated it. They rammed it down our throat, now we're back one and year later without sufficient revenues to fund... to fund the vital programs that we need here in the State of Illinois. And because of that bad Leadership last year, we're here using gimmicks and games trying to fund education. The solution to education problems is the same solution to all of our

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

problems - a permanent income tax increase: however. find a lot of support from Leadership on don't seem to either side of the aisle or either chamber for that kind of plan so we come in with the games. Well this is the only I'm sorry to say I have to say that almost game in town. ever speech I give around here. It's June 29th. the only way we're going to fund education. There's 90 million dollars for the Chicago system and 140 million dollars plus for the other systems. Let's get of our ... our irresponsible votes. Let's get on the right path, let's fund education. This is not the right way to do it, but it's the only way to do it. And again, I'll condemn the Republican Leadership just like I did last year. They didn't do the job. They hoodwinked the people. misled the voters. They misled the press. Now we're back having to pay the piper. This isn't the best way to do it. but it's the only way to do it. I urge more 'aye' votes on this bad Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this certainly isn't a cure-all. It is certainly not guarantee that we are going to have enough money to fund our schools, but I think that we have built in safeguards so that it is not going to lose money for the state or any of the programs funded from the current Lottery. And at the same time, it provides us with a little diversity in regard to how we raise local money for our local school districts. This is not state money. This will be money generated at the local level, distributed back at the local level and going directly to those who given their money to help to support education at the local level. We have for too long restricted our

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

school districts to raising their taxes in only one way, by real estate tax. We know that the real estate tax is one of the most onerous for our constituents, and so I think we deserve to give our constituents an alternative route to give local funding to their local districts. Ιt does not excuse us at the state level from providing them with additional money, whether it be through used car sales, cigarette tax, liquor tax, any other kind of tax that you can think of for collecting at the state level and getting that back to the local districts. But is one way where it can be pinpointed directly to its region of origin and where it can broaden the base of in the kinds of ways that money can be raised for taxation our local schools, not a cure-all, just one tiny drop in helping the local school district help itself."

Representative Madigan: "Representative DeJaegher to explain his vote."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Contrary to what Mr. says, this is not the only game in town. We still have an opportunity to restore funding for education, and I'm willing to stay as long as that's necessary to do this. But when we talk about doing something for education pertaining to Lottery what we have to realize is this, in the event that particular fund should diminish, going to happen to Public Aid? What's going to happen to the Senior Citizens' Program? What's going to be happening to Disability Assistance Programs? What's going to happening to the Mental Health Program? These are the things that we have to look forward to in the event this particular program diminishes. And you think that that quarter is not going to make a difference. Let me give you a classic example. When you're approached on the corner by some individual, and that individual asks you for

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

a dollar contribution, you're going to give that person that dollar and think nothing of it. But when that person you for a dollar and a quarter, you're going to think twice about contributing. Believe me, once the Lottery starts diminishing you will never restore it to its present accountability. As Mr. Hoffman has iust aot. saying, 'It's already diminished by three million dollars in one week's time. What type of effect will this have? This is not the way to fund education. We must turn this Bill down_"

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brookins to explain his vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just point out to you Brookins: that we're... have talked for years and years concerning uр by your boot straps. I have heard that all of my life. This is an opportunity to pull up by our straps because I submit to you that in the districts where the Lottery is played is in the district where the public schools needs the funds the most. I've heard that you say that you want to fund the social programs. the mental the jails, out of the Lottery money. I submit to you that if we were fair, we need to abolish the altogether and for it out of the income tax that it pa y should come from. The Lottery is draining communities that needs the services most, and we're talking about not allowing the Lottery to pay for the folks to go to school that need to go the most. I'm amazed to hear people talk about how interested they are in education and do not want to provide not one dime toward that goal. has always amazed me. There should be more green votes And you who talk about education, I'm sure that you want it only for yourself - me, mine and no more. Forget the others. That should not be the way the game is

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

played."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 55 'ayes', and 58 'nos'. Mr. McGann requests a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Krska and Saltsman."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Becord me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Saltsman as 'aye'. For what purpose does Mr. Panayotovich seek recognition?"

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on, and I wanted to explain my vote, if that's alright."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Panayotovich: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a former school teacher both in southern Cook County and the Chicago Board of Education, we used to have it a policy in the schools we taught to have our students learn about their elected officials; to learn who their Governor was, their Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Comptroller, Treasurer, their State Senator, their State Representative, their Mayor, their elected officials locally. And I just think that after this Bill, if it does happen to go down, we should go back to these schools and have a list made of all the people that closed the schools throughout the state."

- Speaker Madigan: "We had just completed a Poll of the Absentees, and Mr. Clerk, what is the count? On this question, there are 56 'aye', 58 'no'. The Motion fails. Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I
 would now move for nonconcurrence with Senate Fill... House
 Bill 1563."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann moves that the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1563. Those

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in the Senate Amendments. The Chair recognizes Mr. Giglio for the purposes of an announcement."

Giglio: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Hopefully we won't be here on July the 6th, and we're privileged to have with us today and he'd like to share some of that good food with us, but Representative Panayotovich will be a comfortable 38 next week. And we've got cake and coffee in Representative Greiman's Office for Members of the House. Please join us."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, would you come to the Chair?"

Speaker Greiman: "Messages from the Senate."

- Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. *Mr. I'm directed to inform Speaker, the House Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with House in the adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills 1743, 1841, 1943. Like for Senate Bills 1538, 1547 and 1541, action taken Message by the Senate June 29th, 1984. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. ""
- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Concurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3110. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3110 amends an Act in relationship to regulation of business and vocational schools together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 3110 deals with the question of reform of the trade
 schools in Illinois. The House previously passed
 legislation which would streamline the regulatory
 procedures and better equip the State Board of Education to

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

regulate in this area and better equip that Agency to move quickly and expeditiously against institutions which are found to be in violation of the regulatory law. The Senate Amendment provides that there would be a clarification in the area of the educational institutions to be regulated by the Bill. I would move for the Bouse to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3110."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3110. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote "no". Voting is now open. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3110. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed_ Representative Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "On page six of the Calendar, on the Order of
Total Vetoes there appears House Fill 1399. The Chair
recognizes Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies..."

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

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1399 amends the Illinois Abortion Law."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was before us a couple of months ago in the form of a Conference Committee Report, which this House and, of course, the Senate also adopted and was unfortunately this week vetoed by Governor Thompson. I come before you now with a Motion to override his veto so

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

that the Illinois Abortion Act may be brought into conformance with recent Federal Court decisions and be held constitutional in its entirety. I now move the override of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pullen has moved that House Bill 1399 become law, not... despite the veto of the Governor.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Abortion Bills are not like fine wine. They do not get better with time. I said on this floor, as did others. that this Bill was unconstitutional, that it violated the many, many cases, and that it had been before the Pederal District Court in this District, the Federal District Court in... the Federal Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States. The Governor veto message has similarly outlined the unconstitutionality of it. He has suggested, as a matter of fact, that his own attitude in terms of the ethics or ethos or, as he calls it, the morality of abortion may have changed but not his commitment to a constitutional government and to constitutional process. And so... And I quote from the Governor's message. He says, 'I think it is wrong of the General Assembly to continue to pass abortion Bills clearly unconstitutional on their face. practice not only mocks the Constitution, but falsely and cruelly raises the hopes and emotions of people to whom abortion is anathema only to have them dashed by actions of governors and Judges who are bound under the Constitution to uphold the law. This Bill is no more constitutional today then it was when we passed it, then it was when the Governor vetoed it. So why vote for unconstitutional legislation? Everyone in this room knows that this passed, will be in the courts Monday morning: that this

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Bill, if passed, will be enjoined by Monday afternoon; that this Bill, if passed, will be held unconstitutional in the Circuit Court, in the District Court, in the United States So why? The reasons then must be politics. Supreme Court. So I want to just talk for a minute, not about this but about the politics of abortion. I hear Members say. 'Oh, you know, I don't really care about the issue but district, you know, the voters. I tell you within the next decade we will see an end to abortion as an issue is ending. Two million American politics. Ιt American women that come of age each year, they will say 'no' to the politics of abortion. And what of the politics in Have we ever had a springtime - a primary that Illinois? weren t clearly stated the politics of abortion? pro-choice. He's voted in the Senate pro-choice. takes him on, gets destroyed in the Republican primary. Ιn the Democratic primary, four candidates, three are Three say they re pro-choice. One, one candidate is pro-life. You would suppose that al1 the and all the fury and all the fire of the pro-life hotbed, forces would rally behind and do it for him. And he up in an unenviable position in that battle, although he is... was a fine candidate and is a good Member of General Assembly, because the politics of abortion are in your mind - not in the streets, not in the homes of this but in your minds. Free yourself. Free yourselves, and vote for constitutional government and vote in this case with the Governor to sustain his veto. you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think that in order to follow on Representative Greiman's thoughts, because they were so well said, there's not much

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

more that can be added, so that I don't want to really speak to you as someone who is pro-choice speaking against this Bill, even though I am. That's not the issue How many times has this Bill been before us? It is clearly unconstitutional. ıΙ these last few days of legislative Session. we're sitting here wrestling with money for education, very serious issues, things that we should be here considering seriously. To consider an override on a clearly unconstitutional Bill simply because we... we want to make a point about some pro-choice versus pro-life issue. this is not the people's business that we should be carrying on down here. We shouldn't be sitting fighting this silly battle over whether it's constitutional or not, trying to win our people at home for us because we're standing up making a silly argument either pro-abortion or anti-abortion when that not the issue. The issue is, do we want to spend money to go back to court to fight another battle over a Bill that been ruled repeatedly unconstitutional? Whether pro-choice or pro-life or whatever your feeling is on the issue, that's not what we're voting on here What we're voting on is how long you want to carry on this charade, how long you think that you can ... you can here and vote for Bills that are unconstitutional so that the people at home will think you're pro-life. just a... It's a silly thing to be doing. It's not what we're supposed to be doing down here right now. Let's get on to the serious business at hand. Let's deal with the issues that we can really affect. We don't have any effect by voting on this Bill. It's unconstitutional. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative O'Connell to explain his vote."
O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. Is it to explain my

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

vote or to talk on the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, you said to explain my vote. We haven't voted yet."

Speaker Madigan: "Is that your point, Mr. O'Connell?"

O'Connell: "May I proceed? May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Please."

O'Connell: "Thank you. I am not going to speak on substantive issue of whether the Bill... whether you should be pro-life or pro-choice. I'm going to speak strictly to the constitutional question that's been raised by several of the previous speakers. The reason why House Bill 1399 was tendered this Session is because House Bill 521, of which I was the Sponsor, was vetoed by the Governor. Unfortunately because this General Assembly was not in Session for the requisite period of time after which the General Assembly would override or take action on the override of a veto, the Bill left vetced. Consequently, House Bill 521, which was designed to address potential constitutional defects in House Bill 520, which was enacted into law, was never enacted. The constitutional defects. which was the subject of the recent court case was never incorporated into the abortion law. House Bill 1399 just the attempt to incorporate into the existing law those potential defects particularly with parental notification of abortion into the existing law of the State of Illinois. In that regard, all the arguments before this, as to whether we should waste time and money expended to enact unconstitutional laws, should go unheeded because this precisely that. In the Governor's veto... message, he doesn't address what provisions of 1399 he feels will constitutionally defective. That's because House Bill 1399

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

is not constitutionally defective. It is addressed precisely to correct those defects which were attempted to correct... be corrected in previous legislation and which because of procedural difficulties was never enacted. I'd ask you to vote to make our laws constitutional and vote for the override of the Governor's veto of House Bill 1399."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen With all due respect to my colleague, of the House. Representative Pullen, I rise in opposition to this Motion to override the Governor's veto. One of my biggest concerns... I'm not going to address the question of constitutionality - unconstitutionality because I think that the Governor spells that out fairly clearly in his veto message. But one of my concerns about this kind of activity is the fact that we will expend resources on both sides as we go to litigation on this and that it, in fact, tendency to raise the hopes of those people who are... are opposed to this particular position that somehow something which in reality has been judged unconstitutional It's for these reasons, can become law. more than any other, that I urge you to vote to sustain the Governor's veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a shame that the State of Illinois has spent as much on the judicial system as we have, when we have found on our floor of the House many, many judicial experts who are constantly telling us when a Bill doesn't suit their idea of what the Bill should say that the Bill is unconstitutional. We also have a Governor, who came out of the judicial system or came out of the legal system at least, and he also has become an

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

expert in telling us what's constitutional and what is constitutional. Ι think we've all seen a trend in recent years or since the present federal administration taken... has had an influence on the U.S. Supreme Court, that the Court is becoming more conservative Representative O'Connell used previous judicial decisions to show that this Bill, as it went to the Governor, was indeed constitutional. I think that the fear of those who are opposing this legislation is that it will be found constitutional. So the great bugaboo that one cries as a reason for not passing a Pill such as this and the Governor for not signing a Bill such as this is is that it's not constitutional. Let the Bill go forward. Let it go to the judicial system, and let's have a pronunciation on it by the judicial system. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

There is no one who takes the pro-choice position that is for abortion, but what we recognize is that this is a country with many diverse religious and philosophical views and that this is a very, very private decision that ought to be left up to the individual. Fecause I believe most people have their minds made up on this issue, I would only like to ask that in case this vote receives the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Currie: "Representative Pullen, over the last 11 years this
General Assembly has passed many abortion Bills that have
later been held unconstitutional by the courts. Could you
give us an idea as to how much money it has cost the

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

taxpayers of this state to defend this General Assembly against those Bills later found unconstitutional?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully consider that question to be rhetorical and respectfully will not answer it."

Currie: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Clearly it's cost the taxpayers a bundle. Year after year, this General Assembly has passed Bills patently unconstitutional in the area of choice. The Governor of the State, the present Governor of the State, has consistently vetoed unconstitutional abortion Bills, and he has consistently, in the face of override by this General Assembly, turned out to have been On House Bill 1399, the Governor's veto message right. assures us that this Bill does not meet the constitutional requirements imposed by the courts of this land. on the basis of his track record rather than on our own, we would be well advised to accept his statement to down this Motion and to save the taxpayers of this state money that might better bе spent someplace else-Representative O'Connell wonders precisely wherein this Bill might still be unconstitutional. Let me suggest a few items. First, we show no legitimate state interest in the inflexible 24 hour waiting period. The notification requirement in the Bill may well have the same deterrent effect as the ... consent statutes that have been prohibited action. bγ court There's no specific procedure guarantee anonymity at trial and on appeal. There's no... way of knowing what the definition of reckless conduct with respect to a physician might be. Those are a few items for the General Assembly to consider. Obviously, the Governor considered those items when he said he vetoed this Bill because it is on its face unconstitutional. The wise course for us, whatever our individual positions on the topic that is the subject of House Bill 1399, the wise and

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

responsible action for us is to... is to vote 'no' on the Lady's Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The
'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved. The Chair
recognizes Representative Pullen to close."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. It is touching to know the concern of certain of my colleagues over the hopes and aspirations of those who wish to protect life in this state. I'm sure those people will be glad to know that they have expressed those concerns about their hopes and aspirations. The fact is that there is a law on our statute books that does in some small. seek to limit and restrict abortions in terms of protecting the woman involved and in terms of protecting babies that are clearly capable of sustaining life outside of the That law has been challenged in court and certain Sections of it have been enjoined. That law still books, however, and to suggest that we should not seek to amend those Sections that have been enjoined in order to make them stand before the court and the courts own unique logic is to suggest that we should not have any law on the books restricting abortion at all to the point where we should simply allow abortion on demand anywhere, anyplace for any reason, and I reject that sort of thinking. And I think the majority of people, the strong majority of people in this House reject that sort of thinking. You see, this Bill is not an attempt to pass constant... provisions that have been ruled unconstitutional. It is rather an attempt to be certain

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

that our abortion statute will meet the court tests of constitutionality. It is unfortunate that some of the people on this House floor clearly have not read this in the context of the recent Supreme Court decisions last June, because a year ago, the Supreme Court upheld certain provisions of laws in Akron, Ohio and in Missouri. 5 n d those provisions are written into our law through this Bill_ Those provisions were upheld by the Supreme Court. and the last I saw, the Supreme Court is above the District Court in Chicago or any other court in this land. provisions have been upheld a year ago. Why should we not avail ourselves of the opportunity to have those protections in our law when those have been ruled permissible for any other state. This Bill. Ladies Gentlemen, is an effort, a comprehensive one, several pages detailed to clean up our Abortion Act, if you will, to bring it into conformity with recent Federal Court decisions, to update it, to say in 1984 it is the will of the General Assembly that this is the way it should read regardless of how it has read in the past, so that there may be protections. It is a responsible Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no matter how it has characterized by others, and it is well worth passing. There are lives at stake, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and what cost can be put on those lives. There every reason to believe that this Bill will be effective and will stand. And if the National Organization for Women says it's unconstitutional that does not make it adoption of this Motion to override the veto of urge the House Bill 1399. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1399 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' This will be a final action Roll Call. Those in favor will signify by

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Johnson to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Just ... Just an observation, Mr. Speaker and Members of House. The last speaker in opposition to this Bill on the other side of the aisle, and I think some of the arguments were made on this side of the aisle, was the same speaker when we were debating a seat belt Bill who made some really interesting points. One of the points she made in this debate was, it's unconstitutional. The seat helt and the People versus 'Prys' was absolutely... the absolute case right on point was also unconstitutional. about personal freedom and personal liberty, and yet you're willing to tell a person that doesn't wear a seat they re a criminal for taking care of their own Talk about the cost of enforcement and yet everybody life. agreed that to try to put three million people in under the seat belt Bill would be absolutely ludicrous. When you talk about protecting life and how important life so forth when you talk about the seat belt Bill. when people have a conscious decision to make on their own. and yet you turn around in the situation where somebody has absolutely no choice, an unborn child. and concerned about that life. I find those interesting arguments and an interesting contrast. Ι have mixed emotions about the Bill, but I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann to explain his vote."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I have before me a publication from today's Chicago Sun - Times, and I would like to have read into the record.

'Bernardin Asked Override of Antiabortion Eill Vetoed.

Cardinal Joseph Bernardin yesterday called for a legislative override of Governor Thompson's veto of a Bill prohibiting abortions based on the sex of the fetus.

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Bernardin also opposed a Section of the vetoed Bill requiring two doctors to be present during the abortion of a live birth. The Catholic position on abortion is not based on what is legal or illegal from a constitutional point of view but what is ethical or unethical from a moral viewpoint. Bernardin made this statement through a prepared statement, and I urge a lot of green votes. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Alexander to explain her vote." Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very sad day that when we permit our thinkings to channel us to to fund monev into an area that is unconstitutional, draining the public funds. I think it's sad when we allow that thinking to... flow that we cannot see with the recent Bill that just went down with regards to the 25% surtax which would bring about education for our children, which would bring about an intelligence about parenting and how to take care of themselves, that we would put that many green votes up there for a cause that has already been declared unconstitutional by the Governor this state and those of us who realize that it is unconstitutional. It's a sad day for this General Assembly."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Shaw to explain his vote."

- Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No. In case this get the number of votes required, I would ask for a verification."
- Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. For what purpose does Representative Nelson seek recognition?"
- Nelson: "Mr. Speaker, I had asked for a verification earlier, you may recall."
- Speaker Madigan: "There are 76 'ayes' and 31 'nos'.

 Representative Pullen requests a Poll of the Absentees.

143rd Legislative Day June 29, 1984

Proceed with the Poll of the Absentees."

- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Huff. Roman and Taylor.

 No further."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson requests a verification.

 Would the Members please be in their chairs? Would the

 Members please be in their chairs? And the Clerk shall

 proceed to read the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Vitek."

Vitek: "Could I be verified now, Sir?"

- Speaker Hadigan: "Representative Nelson. Mr. Vitek is verified.
 Mr. Van Duyne. Representative Nelson, would you verify Mr.
 Van Duyne? Mr. Van Duyne is verified. Representative
 Nelson, would you verify Mr. Christensen? Mr. Christensen
 is verified. Representative Nelson, would you verify
 that... so Mr. Hastert is verified and Mr. Harris is
 verified, and Representative Barnes is verified, and
 Representative McMaster, and Mr. Vinson. Representative
 Nelson, in the center aisle, would you verify Mr. Bea?
 And the Clerk shall now proceed to a verification."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Barger. Barnes. Berrios. Breslin. Brummer. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen. Churchill. Curran. Daniels. Davis. DeJaegher. DiFrima. Domico. Dovle. Ralph Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Giglio. Giorgi. Hannig. Harris. Hastert. Hawkinson. Hensel. Homer. Johnson. Karpiel. Keane. Koehler. Krska_ Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Matijevich. Mautino. Mays. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McMaster. Mulcahev. Nash. Neff. Oblinger. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Bernard Pedersen. William Piel. Pullen. Peterson. Preston. R∈a. Byder. Saltsman. Slape. Stuffle. Tate. Terzich. Topinka. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. Winchester. Wojcik. Wolf. McNamara. And Mr. Speaker."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nelson, would you verify Br.

Brunsvold? Are there any questions?"

Nelson: "Just a few, Mr. Speaker. Representative LeFlore."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. LeFlore. Is Mr. LeFlore in the chamber?

How is Mr. LeFlore recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. LeFlore. Representative Nelson,

would you verify Representative Nash? Representative

Nelson, would you verify Mr. Capparelli in front?"

Nelson: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there further questions?"

Nelson: "Representative Tate."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tate is in the chamber."

Nelson: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Taylor recorded?"

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

Nelson: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giglio is in his chair."

Nelson: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz. Is Mr. Leverenz in the chamber?

How is Mr. Leverenz recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Leverenz."

Nelson: "Representative Preston."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Preston. How is Mr. Preston recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Preston is in the aisle. Are there further questions?"

Nelson: "Representative DeJaegher."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DeJaegher is in the chamber."

Nelson: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Laurino is in his chair."

Nelson: "No more questions, Mr. Speaker."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Speaker Madigan: "On this question, there are 74 'aves', 31 This Motion. having received а Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. notwithstanding the ... notwithstanding the veto of the The House would just stand at ease for a couple Governor. of minutes. On page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1893. Mr. Clerk, what is the next Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1893 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #59, Daniels."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman. Mr. Greiman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment... On Amendment 59, the Gentlemen from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to table Amendments 59 through 92."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage has moved to table...

 The Gentleman from DuPage has moved to table Amendments 59
 through 92. And on that, is there any discussion? The
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I join Mr. Daniels in supporting this Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau,
 Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, about an hour and a half ago I filed Amendment #94 to this legislation.

 I am not certain whether 90 is the last Amendment on the desks. I would like to have information concerning the Amendment #94 that was filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino, 94 has not been distributed. It's in the process of being printed, Sir."
- Mautino: "And then I'm assuming that you're saying that 94...

 Amendment 94 will have the opportunity to be presented on

 Senate Bill 1893. Is that correct?"

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "Well, we are at... we are on a Motion that covers 59 through 92. When we get to that Order of Business and that Motion we will address it."
- Mautino: "Are there any Amendments on anyone's desk then for Amendment 93? Is that on anyone's desk?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, point of order. The Motion before
 us by the Minority Leader is on 59 through 92. The Motion
 is... in supported by the Majority Leader. I think if we
 can dispense with this Motion, perhaps we could then
 entertain questions and query on subsequent Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Your point is well taken, Mr. Bullock. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham on the Motion, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, the Motion is to table 59 through what number?" Speaker Greiman: "92."

- Brummer: "Well, I quess it seems to me that it's reasonable to attempt to address Representative Mautino's question or possibly we want to divide the question with regard to this And I think that would be in order. Motion. I do think that it would be fair that the ... the maker of the would indicate what ... what he plans he do and what is planned between and among Leadership should this prevail. a Motion to table 60... 33 Amendments here, and obviously, there is some deal been cut with at least some of the Leadership. That may ... That may be a good idea, and I may agree with it, but I think it's reasonable that we be advised as to what is intended prior to being asked to vote. Could the ... Could the maker of the Motion indicate what he plans to do should this prevail?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, the Gentleman from Effingham has asked for division of the... of the question. Yes, Mr. Brummer."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Brummer: "No, I did not ask for a division of the question. I...

I indicated that was one other alternative to provide some time for the Representative from Eureau to have his Amendment distributed. But what I did specifically ask the maker of the Motion what the... what the plans were after this Motion prevailed, if in fact it does prevail. I think it's fair that the Membership know what's... what's going to occur subsequently in making a decision as to whether or not to support this Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, you may certainly ask him if he chooses to yield, Mr. Brummer. That's within your right."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he'll yield."

Brummer: "Will you now answer the question?"

Daniels: "The question is, what do I plan to do next?"

Brummer: "Should this Motion prevail."

Daniels: "I'm not sure. Okay. I had... I hope that you will join me in supporting this Motion so that the Amendments that have been filed now, I believe, 94 can be dealt with in an expeditious manner, so that we can move forward with considering the question as to whether or not, would like to have in the State of Illinois an aggressive tourism program which would include very exciting and interesting provisions for the State of Illinois from our southern, to central to northern parts, as well as a program which would provide for the potential of having a very exciting World's Fair in the year 1992. Now, I say potential, Mr. Brummer, because it appears that there are forces up north that are working against that and we want monitor those ourselves. And then thirdly, to assist the City of Chicago in its expansion program of McCormick Place."

Brummer: "Is it the maker of the Motion's intention to offer

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Amendment #93 and support that?"

Daniels: "Yes. Sir."

Brummer: "And I trust at that point this issue would go to a Conference Committee."

Daniels: "That would be my suggestion to the Body."

Brummer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."

Stuffle: "Am I to understand then that... I heard part of that.
You're to proceed with 93, I understand. We're to go to
Conference. But with regard to 94, it's your intention to
also support that particular Amendment? It's not your
intention. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My guestion was parliamentary in nature. You are eliminating... or withdrawing those Amendments to 92. You are addressing 93. 94 has been submitted to the Clerk. As a Nember of this House, I would appreciate having Amendment 94 considered by this Body and appreciate the opportunity to present a program, which in my estimation, is an excellent approach to the problem of a statewide financing tourism, conservation, World's Fair, McCormick Place..."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr... Mr. Mautino..."

Mautino: "I would like to have..."

Speaker Greiman: "...I have not cut you off because I understand your... strong feelings of the matter, but that's not quite a parliamentary inquiry, Sir."

Mautino: "Well, then ... "

Speaker Greiman: "But when we get there, if we are in a posture to consider that, we will consider it."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Mautino: "Well, I guess that what we're saying at this time then is... is whether or not the Amendment will be distributed in time. But most importantly, whether or not the two Leaders have decided that after 93 the Fill will be voted upon. If that is the case, then I would have to oppose the Motion to withdraw all of those Amendments which are not on my desk between the numbers of 59 and 93."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, on the Motion."
- Winchester: "Well, it's always been, I think, courtesy of the
 Membership and the Speaker of the House that he would
 extend to Members who have Amendments that are... been
 filed, and being printed and waiting to be circulated to be
 considered. Now, in order for me and a lot of other
 downstate Republican and Democrats to understand what we're
 doing here, if we table up to Amendment #90, then we're not
 going to be given the opportunity to discuss Amendment #94.
 Is that your understanding, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Greiman: "My response to Mr. Mautino is that when we get to that point, then we will see where we are. The Amendment may be here. It may not be. The maker of the... The Sponsor... has a right to ask at that point for tabling if the Bill (sic Amendment) is not ready to be heard, and I'm... I'm not going to... I'm not prepared to give you an advisory opinion. But... listen to you and to give you every courtesy, Mr. Winchester."
- Winchester: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, because you've always been courteous, and you've always been very helpful. But I would like to say that this is a very important Amendment to downstate Illinois that I think could jeopardize a lot of other programs that's being considered on this House floor and will be considered future on this House floor. And I think that a lot of

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

people need to give serious consideration to what's going on here. And this is an important program to a lot of people. And I would hope that we're given that opportunity to discuss the issues that's outlined in Amendment #94."

- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- Nash: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Are we debating
 Amendment 94 or Mr. Daniels' Motion?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, the Gentleman has concluded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berrios."
- Berrios: "I move the previous..."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendments #59 through 92 inclusive be tabled?'

 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendments are tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #93, Daniels Madigan, amends

 Senate Bill 1893 by deleting everything after the enacting

 clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #93 is an effort to continue the regarding the question of a downstate Tourism Fund, an aggressive program in conservation, recreation and I had endorsed yesterday, which was contained in Amendments #73 and 74, coupled with the expansion of the very important facility in Chicago called McCormick Place for the benefit of the people of Chicago, all the people of Chicago, as well as, I think, the people of Illinois, and lastly coupled with the question of whether or not we, as a General Assembly, would like to continue the question of the World's Fair under our discussion process. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse, Amendment #3...

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

basically deletes the Bill, passes the Bill back to the Senate in a shell form so that the matter can be put Conference Committee to further discuss the issues. The difficulty that I perceived in Amendment \$73 and 74. which contained the items in Amendment #94, as I understand it, was that those Amendments would have taken 71 votes to have passed the Bill if the Bill were to have passed this General Assembly on Third Reading. As I perceive the discussions that currently going on, there's a division the Members of this House and all parts of the hetween state and primarily in the City of Chicago as to: or not they want a World's Fair by the articulated sounds from today's news stories and the visits by the aldermen and New Orleans: two, as to the question as to whether or not some Members wish to support the expansion of McCormick Place: and third, whether or not this state will support an aggressive park program. ar. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I personally support the programs that have been enunciated previously, but until such time as we can reach an agreement with Members in Senate. with Members in the House and with his... his Excellency, the Governor, then I think that we and General Assembly right now are not proceeding in the proper For that reason I have offered Amendment #93 for fashion. your consideration. I am suggesting that you adopt it. would hope that we could pass the Bill back to the Senate. request a Conference Committee where our conferees can meet, continue to discuss this issue and bring back to you, hopefully, in a period of time a resolution of the question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage has moved for the adoption of Amendment #93 to Senate Bill 1893. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

143rd Legislative Day
Madigan."

June 29. 1984

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I support the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau,
 Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the edification of Membership. Amendment 93 will in effect make Amendment 94 out of order. I think that was the intention of 93 to make sure that nothing would come afterwards. I... At least I think that's what the determination will be if 93 goes on. I quess what 93 is is well is the shell Bill that puts it the Conference Committee where the Leadership will decide on what is best for all of the Membership. I happen to agree with that particular position on this most important issue. I think that Amendment #94 does address those issues for the rest of the State of Illinois and should be debated and considered in this public forum House as opposed to a program put together on a Conference Committee by only the Leadership. Therefore, I stand in opposition to Amendment #93 to Senate Bill 1893."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #93 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 93 is adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #94, Mautino Winchester, amends Senate
 Bill 1893 as amended."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino. Yes,
 the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, for what purpose do
 you seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, just to inquire of the Chair as to whether or not the Amendment has been distributed."
- Speaker Greiman: "It has not been distributed, Mr. Cullerton.
 Mr. Nash."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Nash: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, is this Amendment in order?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We've had a preliminary opinion already on that issue. Mr. Nash, as far as your inquiry is concerned...

 The Amendment is in order, Mr. Nash. Yes, Mr. Bullock, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Bullock: "Did you originally respond to Representative

 Cullerton's inquiry?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Pardon, Mr..."
- Bullock: "Did you respond to Representative Cullerton's inquiry?"
- Speaker Greiman: "I responded to Mr. Cullerton's, and now let me go back to Mr. Nash. Mr. Nash, the Sponsor of the Bill."
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #94."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, moves to table Amendment 94 to Senate Eill 1893. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to table my Amendment. It's an interesting concept that... that I believe is rather unusual when the Member that is presenting the Amendment has another individual attempt to table that Amendment. I believe that this Body should have the opportunity to make a determination on the ideas that are provided in 94, and I am opposed to the Gentleman's Motion to table the Amendment without even having him evaluate it in general and in total."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion..."
- Mautino: "And I ask for a Boll Call on that Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "A Roll Call, certainly. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that no matter what

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

happens, whether 94 gets on or not, it*11 end up in Conference Committee. But I think that 94 ought to be one the things to discuss in Conference Committee and adopting the Amendment will not prevent that. We have been engaged in the last several weeks in discussing how we can bring... better the economy in Illinois, particularly the area of out-of-state dollars, tourism, McCormick Place, and the Fair for Chicago, tourism for downstate, upgrading the parks and everything else. This is part of the package. and I think that the Conference Committee should have the opportunity of taking a look at this Amendment along with the other one. I think it's going to go to Conference Committee, and I think... I think everybody else here thinks that. But I don't see any harm in putting this on there for their consideration."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester." Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with Representative Friedrich. A lot of hard work has gone into putting together the ... all the total aspects of Amendment #94, which basically downstate program for... convention centers, for conservation park rehabilitation and lodge rehabilitation. all in conjunction, all contiguous with the World's Fair in the State of Illinois. I think we ought to be given that... that privilege of having that consider. Uр until this point that program was considered the hottest item that we've had all year. A well put together, thought out program that needed to be done. I don't know who, where, what caused it to break down and fall apart. I certainly think that the people, the Legislators and Members, that represent downstate Illincis on both sides of this aisle should stand behind Representative Mautino and I in this issue. I would certainly appreciate

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

It's very important to downstate. This will be the only issue that downstate Illinois will be able to walk away with after probably, when the smoke clears, a massive rip-off by certain other areas of this state."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just voted to table a lot of Amendments. And I don't know some of those Amendments that I tabled had some merit, and maybe those individual Sponsors wanted their voices to be heard. But we tabled those Motions (sic - Amendments) because we heard both the Leaders in this ... House say that the Bill should go in Conference Committee for further study to come up with a compromise. On that basis, I voted to table, and I think that any further Amendments should be tabled too so that we get to that point. It's nothing against downstate. It's nothing against Bich Mautino. It's just the decision I have made and I think other should make that we come to a Committee and come up with a reasonable Conference compromise."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't come from downstate, nor do I come from the City of Chicago. But I do think that we should consider legislation that affects the entire State of Illinois, and I understand Amendment 94 does do that. Since we're talking about going to Conference Committee, this Amendment, if it were to be adopted, would still force this Bill to go to Conference Committee, would still give our Leaders on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to... to articulate our concerns on our behalf plus their concerns. So I stand in support of Amendment 94, because I know the Sponsors on both sides of the aisle from downstate have spent many hours trying to work out

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

something for their area, plus for the northern part and for the City of Chicago. So though I'm not part of either of them, I do wish them success in trying to keep the dialogue going on these important issues, and I do ask for your favorable vote on 94."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was the Sponsor of, oh, any number of the Amendments that the subject of the earlier tabling Motion on Senate Bill I looked forward to lively discussion and debate on each of those, but I supported, nevertheless, that tabling Although I would look forward to a lively and interesting discussion of the merits of Amendment 94, I am convinced that those ... that that Amendment ... the subject of that Amendment will be the subject of lively exciting debate in the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1893. I hope the Sponsor of this Motion, which I strongly support, will tell all of us in what room the Conference Committee for Senate Bill 1893 will meet so that we can all be part of that exciting discussion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. No one has worked any harder on the downstate park proposal than the Minority Leader of this House. idea was first brought to him, he began working on it. He devote staff resources to it, numerous conferences with the Governor, with the Department involved, with Members to try to craft this into a good proposal. I believe that if you will follow his lead, you will ultimately see this realized. But to walk away from somebody, who has worked as hard on a proposal as he has worked on this proposal, and actually begun to crystalize real discussion on it... of it on the floor would be a mistake. We ought to support

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

his Motion in regard to this Amendment and trust to him to ultimately deliver these goodies. I support his Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rice."

Rice: "Would you move the previous question, Sir?"

Speaker Greiman: "Fortunately no one else is seeking recognition.

The question is, 'Shall Amendment #94 be tabled?' All
those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote
'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 7
voting 'present', and Amendment 94 is tabled. Further
Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to suspend Rule 37(c) so that Senate Bill 1893 may be advanced to Third Reading and immediately considered."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, has moved that we suspend Rule 37(c) so that the Eill may be considered at this time. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "No, Mr... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I didn't have my light on to speak to this particular Motion. I've had my light on for the last fifteen minutes. I think you better see a new optometrist or an ophthalmologist whichever you prefer."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall... the House suspend Rule 37(c) so that Senate Bill 1893 may be considered at this time?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

143rd Legislative Day

- June 29, 1984
- voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting "aye", 30 voting "no", none voting "present", and the Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1893, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Tourism Fund in the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, I defer to my Cosponsor, Mr. Bullock,
 Representative Bullock."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1893, as amended, I submit to you is a Bill that will come back this way again. The Minority Leader and Majority Leader have sponsored Amendment 93 to this legislation. As previously indicated, this would in effect set up a Tourism Fund in the State of Illinois, hopefully for the purpose of expanding economic development in the state. I think most of us are familiar with the provisions of the legislation, and I would respectfully urge an "aye" vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1893. Is there any discussion? There being... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."
- Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 I'll be very succinct in my remarks. I'm... I'm voting on
 this issue which now covers only tourism, and if this Bill
 comes back from the Senate with the Fair and the McCormick
 Place expansion on it, I'll think we'll be in the same
 posture we were in yesterday, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action on the

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

Bill. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, explaining my 'aye' vote, I wish to explain that I am supporting the passage of this Bill to the Senate, so that Bill can be put into a Conference Committee where we can begin to negotiate with the Senate Leaders and with the Governor concerning a total package for tourism in Illinois. My opposition to the Bill, which was sent to us by the Senate, was based primarily upon my opposition imposition of a food tax in Chicago only. I remain opposed to that tax, and I plan to go to the Conference to advance the idea that the imposition of a food tax in Chicago only should be replaced with the imposition of a cigarette tax in Cook County as a substitute to support the entire program."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, one minute to explain his vote, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Parliamentary inquiry, Sir."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "How many votes does it take to pass this Bill since we are addressing in a portion of the original Bill bonding authority, if I remember correctly."

Speaker Greiman: "60 votes, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, one minute to explain your vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is kind of a sad moment here. A lot of Members of the House and Senate have served for two or three months trying to gut together something that would help the whole State of Illinois. Actually Chicago is a big beneficiary because they've got McCormick Place. They were going to get the Fair. They were going

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

to get most of the tourism money. And who blocked the Bill finally? The people from Chicago. What they're trying to do is figure out a way to milk the rest of the state so Chicago can have all the benefits and none of the tax, and that's where we are right now. I'm voting 'aye' just in the hope that something can come out of this. But believe me, a lot of hard work and negotiation has gone down the drain for a bunch of selfish interests."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "By golly, that was a fast examination. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm going to rise and reluctantly support this Bill at this point. But it's unfortunate in many ways why the previous Amendment was ruled out of order, because frankly I don't think out of order and could have been, you know, debated in the full House, because many of the things in that Amendment were certainly salutary for the whole State of Illinois. It's unfortunate that the Motion to table prevailed. stand in support of this Bill, but I want to make sure that when it gets to Conference Committee that many of the things that those of us from downstate object to and those things that many of us from downstate support are certainly considered in the Bill. And I'd reserve the right then at that stage to make a judgment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I reluctantly cast a 'no' vote in regard to this proposal.

We had a very good Amendment and a fine compromise Amendment in Amendment #59. The western half of Cook County is becoming very disenfranchised by taxes that are placed on them constantly. We have RTA taxes, empty buses.

We have automobile taxation. We have got liquor taxation.

Now we hear talk of a cigarette tax. I think it's about

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

time that the people of Chicago and those that live in Chicago realize that the western suburbs and all the suburbs of Cook County are tired of paying the taxes for Chicago's problems. So reluctantly I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the T * m not voting reluctantly 'no'. I'm voting very enthusiastically 'no' for part of the reason that Representative Wojcik brings up. There is a part of Cook County that is outside of Chicago. I happen to represent and we are being taxed constantly and really for very little benefit. What does concern me that does come back from a Conference Committee and none of us are going to be participating, as people from suburban Cook County never seem to do, we're going to wind up with damn Fair again. And that is the single biggest boondoggle I've ever seen, and it's been studied to death. anything you put on it does not cover up the smell. And I you can perfume it till the cows come home, and it's still going to stink. And it's still going to have no benefit for suburb Cook County, or DuPage, or central Illinois, or southern Illinois or for that matter Chicago. It is a carry over from the Byrne administration. It was born stillborn. It's been OΠ respirator, and I think we ought to end it now."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 76 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order... On Supplemental Calendar #1... Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Nonconcurrence - Nonappropriation Eills appears Senate Bill 1743. Mr. Terzich, are you prepared on that? Mr. Clerk,

143rd Legislative Day
read the Bill."

June 29, 1984

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1743 amends an Act in relationship to compensation and emoluments of Members of the General Assembly, together with House Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't include the World's

 Fair, but I would make a Motion that we decline to recede

 from Amendments #1 and 2 and request a Conference

 Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves that the House refuses to recede from Arendments #1 Senate Bill 1743. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede Senate... from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1743? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from Senate... from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Pill 1743 and asks that a Conference Committee bе appointed. On the... On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1841. Mr. Keane. 1841. prepared, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1841 amends an Act in relationship to parole, together with Bouse Amendment #5."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede from Amendment #5 and would ask for a... that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, moves that
 the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment... from
 House Amendment \$5 to Senate Bill 1841. There being no
 discussion, the question is, "Shall the House refuse to
 recede from House Amendment \$5 to Senate Bill 1841?" All

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #5 and asks for the appointment of a Conference Committee. On page five of the Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1217. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1217 amends the Election... Code, together with House Amendments #1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I refuse to recede from Amendments 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed on Senate Bill 1217."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, has moved that the House refuse to recede from Senate Bill... from House Amendments 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the guestion is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 to Senate Bill 1217 and asks that a Conference Committee be appointed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, on page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1746. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1746 amends the School Code, together with House Amendment #6."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House not recede from Amendment #6 and nonconcur in Senate Bill 1746. This has been discussed earlier, and I would move we nonconcur and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 6 to Senate Bill

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

1746. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendment #6?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from Amendment #6 to Senate... to Senate Bill 1746 and requests the appointment of a Conference Committee. Do any Members who have Bills on the Order of Nonconcurrence desire to proceed with their Bill? Mr. Ewing, do you wish to proceed on that?"

- Ewing: "I would like to move to nonconcur on House Bill 2388.

 It's on concurrences."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Alright. Hr. Ewing, we will accommodate you on that. Alright. On the Order of Concurrence, on page two of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2388. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Ladies Gentlemen, there is a state mandate..."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. That may be applicable here. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Bouse Bill 2388 amends the Revenue Act, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 and for the appointment of a Conference Committee on this piece of legislation."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2388.

 There being... Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2388?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2388. On page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, nonappropriation, appears Senate Bill 1733. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1733, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to toll highways.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "And on that, Mr. Vinson, the Gentleman from DeWitt."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This is the expansion of the tollway. legislation that would create a tollway corridor. T+ everybody's Amendment on it who's ever offered an Amendment the subject. It includes the skyway. It includes the language that the environmentalists have requested. offered an Amendment got their Amendment on Everybody who this Bill. Obviously in the final analysis this may not entirely work out in this structure. What this will occasion is a Conference Committee whereby everybody will have a chance to rework this measure. I would request favorable passage of Senate Bill 1733."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1733. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I plan to support the Gentleman's Motion that this Bill pass because the Bill will be put into a Conference Committee where it will become subject to negotiation relative to the provisions of the Bill. I am not supportive of the Bill at this time. There were several Amendments offered to the Bill. I supported several of those Amendments; however, at this time I am prepared to support the passage of the Bill so that it can move to a Conference Committee with the

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Senate."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I agree with what the Speaker said. There's several items that need to be discussed. This would end up in Conference Committee. That's the purpose of the support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will. Nr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Well, maybe it might be a parliamentary inquiry or at least something of information. Was Amendment #2 addressed in this Bill? 22. Did I say 2? I'm sorry. Amendment #22, was it adopted onto this Bill?"

Speaker Greiman: "We'll check with that and see in a second."

Van Duyne: "Well, it's important to me because..."

Speaker Greiman: "No, 22 was not adopted."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

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

Speaker Greiman: "No one's seeking recognition. The question...

The question is, 'Shall this Eill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 76 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Yes, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Markette."

Markette: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the last Bill that was just recorded, let the record show that I am voting "no"."

Speaker Greiman: "The Clerk will journalize Ms. Markette's vote.

Veronica 'Lynch' will you come to the podium? Agreed

veronica Lynch will you come to the podium? Agreed

Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1142, Currie; 1143, Ropp; 1145, Woodyard and Stuffle. House Joint Resolution 176, Vinson and Giorgi. House Resolution 1147, Gigli. And Senate

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Joint Resolution 115, Mays."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Currie's 1142 congratulates 'Billie'
 Treganza; 1143, by Ropp, notes the Ropp family reunion, the
 80th reunion for the Ropp family; 1145, by Woodyard, honors
 Pine Grove Community Club; 176, House Joint, by Winson Giorgi, asks that the Lottery Control Foard report on the
 studies of the games in the field; 115, by Mays,
 promulgates rules for the disposal of surplus property,
 and..."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves the adoption of the Agreed Besolutions. Oh, one more, alright."
- Giorgi: "1147, is it? 1147 honors one of our colleagues. Is someone going to read that Besolution? Is someone going to read it or are we just going to adopt it? Just adopt the... I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say "aye", opposed "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 171, David... Davis Hastert. Senate Joint Resolution 69, Marzuki McGann.
 Senate Joint Resolution 103, Barnes. Senate Joint
 Resolution 104, Hoffman. Senate Joint Resolution 113,
 Capparelli Terzich."
- Speaker Greiman: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1144, by Representative Rea, with respect to the memory of John D. Douglas. House Resolution 1146, offered by Representative Bowman et al, with respect to the memory of Mrs. Tobey Prinz. House Resolution 1148, offered by Representative Shaw, with

143rd Legislative Day

- June 29, 1984
- respect to the memory of Mrs. Willia B. Hamilton. And House Resolution 1149, offered by Bepresentative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Mrs. Bertha Jackson."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'no". In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Besolutions are adopted.

 On page five of the Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1522. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Chicago World's Pair 1992 Authority Act, together with
 Senate... with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the House refuse to recede from our Amendments to Senate Bill 1522."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3... I'm sorry, from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1522. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."
- Piel: "Yes, would she please explain those Amendments and what they do?"
- Currie: "These are... The underlying... The underlying Bill,

 Representative Piel, is the Bill that would require..."
- Piel: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I cannot hear her."
- Currie: "The underlying Bill is a Bill that would require public disclosure of beneficiaries of secret land trusts if there are sale or lease arrangements by the World's Fair Authority with respect to any of those undisclosed beneficiaries. We added some Amendments. In fact one, I believe, was suggested by Representative 'Frederick' to tighten the Bill as it came to us from the Senate. Unfortunately there were typographical... some uncertain

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

errors in the Amendments we did adopt. The Senate Sponsor refused to concur in our Amendments. And the only way to cure the problem... She did not refuse to concur on substantive grounds, but in order to make the technical changes that will make Representative 'Frederick' and other suggestions work, we need to put this Bill in a Conference Committee."

Piel: "Will the Lady take this out of the record for a moment, please?"

Currie: "Happy to, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Out of the record. Alright. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1522. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill again."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago World's Fair 1992 Authority Act, together with House Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Ms. Currie, we'll take that out of the record for a few minutes again, and we'll let the Clerk call it again so he gets it right. Page five of the Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1522. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago World's Fair 1992 Authority Act, together with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3. Third Reading of this nonconcurrence."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move
the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3
to Senate Bill 1522 so that a Conference Committee may be
appointed. I would explain to the Members of the House
that the reason for the Conference Committee is to make
technical changes in those Amendments we adopted. It is

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

- not the intent of the Sponsors of this Eill, either in the House or in the Senate, to see any other changes but technical ones occur in that Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House do not recede from Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3... to House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1522. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."
- Piel: "Will the Lady take... No, never mind, never mind. Would she... Basically I have gathered that this is going to be used as... this Bill will be used strictly as a vehicle as far as the land trust. Is that true?"
- Currie: "I would prefer not to consider it a vehicle Bill at all. It is a Bill having to do with disclosure of beneficiaries of secret land trusts if those land trusts own leased or sold, to the World's Fair Authority. The Bill was improved, tightened in the House. It is no intention to use the Bill for any other purpose than the substantive items that are already part of Senate Bill 1522 with the House Amendments. The only point of the Conference Committee is to make technical changes so the Bill would be in good shape when we send it to the Governor."
- Piel: "As long as we have the assurance this will be used as a

 Bill dealing with the land trusts and nothing else, I have
 no problem. Thank you."
- Currie: "That's exactly right. And the best way to protect it being... from being used for any other purpose is to appoint the Conference Committee and move it quickly out of the House and Senate."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I rise in support of Representative Currie's
 Motion. The Lady has adequately explained the procedure

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

for this particular legislation. I certainly think that she has given us her word and commitment that it will be used only for technical and clarifying language. And with that in mind, I'd urge an 'aye' vote on the Motion that the House do not recede on Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I... I think the Sponsor has given assurance. I was afraid we was going to get another five million dollars more in here for the Mayor. That seems to be what's bogging things down around here. We were going to give them the Fair, McCormick Place, most of the tourism money and then they needed another five million dollars. I just want to be sure there's not another five million in the Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "The Sponsor shakes her head 'no'. There being no further discussion, the guestion is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments... from House Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to Senate Fill 1522?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1522 and requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. Mr. Hicks, would you come to the podium, please? Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "Yes... leave of the Body, I'd ask to put House Bill 2049 on the Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Greiman: "You're the... You're the Sponsor of 2049?"

Johnson: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Champaign asks leave of the
House to place House Bill 2049 on the Interim Study
Calendar. Of what Committee, Mr..."

Johnson: "Transportation."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "Of Transportation Committee. Leave is granted.
- Mr. DeJaegher, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- DeJaegher: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Body, I'd like to have
 House Bill 3136 put in Interim Study, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island asks leave of the House to place House Bill 3136 in the Interim Study Calendar. Of what Committee?"
- DeJaegher: "Elementary and Secondary Education."
- Speaker Greiman: "Elementary and Secondary... and Secondary

 Education. The Gentleman have leave? You have leave, and
 the Bill is committed to the Interim Study Calendar.

 Ladies and Gentlemen, let us come to order for a few
 moments. For what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Ms.

 Barnes, seek recognition?"
- Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting before in Representative Daniels' Office, and I have a parliamentary inquiry. Representative DeJaegher, at that time, asked leave for House Bill 3136 to be committed to Interim Study, and I question whether the Sponsor's request was in order and whether he had the right to commit the Bill to Interim Study."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, before I address that, there are many people who do not have access to the floor We have been at ease during the afternoon, and it's understandable that they would be on the floor. Wе are now about to begin doing business on the floor, so I would ask those who do not have access to the floor to please retire, and I would like to not make that request again. if you do not have access to the floor, please retire at this time. The ... The Lady from Cook. Ms. has made a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair. Barnes, Earlier in the afternoon, Representative DeJaegher, who is the original Sponsor of House Bill 3136 asked leave of the

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

House that the Bill be placed in the Interim Study Calendar of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee. was granted; however, under our rules, a Sponsor may matter of right commit a Bill to Interim Study at any time prior to the beginning of debate on Third Reading. that time, a Sponsor must obtain leave of the House to place the Bill into the Interim Study Committee. However, this Bill at the time of the making of the Motion was in a Conference Committee. When a Bill is in a Conference Committee, it is not within the control of this House, just as if the Bill were in the Senate. If the Bill were in the Senate, it could not be placed in the Interim Study Calendar of the House. Accordingly, the Chair... the House did not have jurisdiction of the Bill, and the Motion. therefore, and leave that was granted is 'annulity'. And the Bill is wherever it was. Alright. Yes. Mr... the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Mr. Speaker, as you are aware of, I introduced this Bill originally. Hy problem is this, even though as you stated I no longer have control of this particular Bill, I was not even given the privilege of being assigned to the Conference Committee pertaining to that particular Bill. What's happened with this particular Bill, there are a number of controversies surrounding that Bill. That Bill originally was asked for by a constituent of mine that resides in my particular area. It was really a harmless Bill, a Bill that I felt that I could introduce into legislation that would be addressing the needs that she felt we should have as far as... qcinq the State of Illinois. This is the problem that I have. It seems like even though I'm a freshman Legislator, I may not know some of the rules and ramifications of certain legislation that takes place. But as this Bill progressed and as this

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

was passed, there was also an Amendment putting on it... put on there by the Christian Science Association. And at this particular time this is why I objected to this particular Bill, because I did receive communication religious groups pertaining to this Amendment. I asked for this Fill to then a٥ Conference Committee to see if we could iron out this problem that we have. It's a shame that once person sponsors a particular Bill that that person has no longer control of it. I realize I must abide by the wishes of the Chair, but I did want to make my point, and I thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. DeJaegher. On page two, on the Order of Concurrence Appropriations, and for that, Mr. Leverenz, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will try not to give a speech as long as Howie Carroll did in the Senate. I move now to nonconcur in the following House Bills to all Senate Amendments to those Bills: House Bill 2546, 2547, 2637, 2638, 2640, 2664 and 2785, together."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook asks leave of the House that these Bills may be heard together. The Gentleman...

 Does the Gentleman have leave? On that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I rise in support of the Gentleman's request."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Could be please repeat those numbers?"

Speaker Greiman: "The numbers are 25... Bouse Bill 2546, 2547, 2637, 2638, 2640, 2664 and 2785."

Karpiel: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Motion of Mr. Leverenz is to nonconcur with these Bills, nonconcur. Alright, the Gentleman has asked

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

leave of the House that these Bills be heard in one... on one Motion, and the Gentleman has leave. Accordingly... Is there any discussion? There being none, the guestion is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in the Senate Amendments adopted by the Senate on House Bills 2546, 2547, 2637, 2638, 2640, 2664 and 2785?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with those Bills. Now on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2530, Mr. Olson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2530 is an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Elections, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson."

- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen οf the to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to the House. I move Board of Elections appropriations Bill, House Bill Senate Amendment #1 has deleted 124,114 dollars by taking out 100,000 of the Governor's Election Reform Commission, 24,114 dollars out of the General Revenue Funds, which in essence will make the budget at 4,371,998 dollars. represents slightly less than the 5.7% increase over fiscal and I would move for the adoption of concurrence in House Bill 2530."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lee moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2530. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is the intentions of this side of the aisle to concur in all of the House Bills that we will read off in a group here, and I just will not stand and repeat that to save time."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2530? **A11** those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open. This is final action. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take... Mr. Clerk, take the record. Сn this question. there are 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting *present*, and this Bill... and the House does concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2530. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2610. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2610..."

Speaker Greiman: "Oh, is Mrs. Barnes... Is Ms. Barnes with us?

Alright, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2610 is an Act making appropriations for
the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of
Nuclear Safety, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 2610 deals with the Department of Nuclear Safety
appropriation for fiscal year *85. It is seven million six
hundred and forty-three thousand point four dollars. It is
a 4.3 percentage change over fiscal year *84."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate
Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2610. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Representative yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Leverenz: "You indicated seven million six forty-three, that's as introduced. We are concurring with the Senate Amendment bringing it up to eleven four one four? I'm trying to help."

Barnes: "I wasn't prepared because it was my understanding that we were going to do all of these on one Boll Call. Just a

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

second, please."

Leverenz: "No problem."

Barnes: "Alright. Eleven million four hundred and fourteen thousand four hundred dollars as it came over from the Senate. Is that your question?"

Leverenz: "And we concur. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Eill 2610? 111 i n favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting *aye*, 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Fill 2610. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2624. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2624 is an Act making certain reappropriations to the Department of Transportation, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Let me.."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Ms. Barnes. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I would now move that the House concur in all Senate Amendments to the following Bills. As the Lady indicated, maybe we will try that. House Bill 2624, 2631, 2633, 2636, 2639, 2642, 2643, 2645, 2647, 2648, 2650, 2654, 2663, 2729, 2765, 2769 and 2776 and ask leave of the House that we take these in one Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has asked... has moved that the House consider these Bills, a number of Bills, on a single Roll Call. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

Bowman: "Thank you. I believe this would save the time of the
House. However, we are suppose to have duplicate lists,
and I think maybe one of these has been missed. I'd
appreciate it if the Chair could read the list again."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Well, I ask for a division of the question."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. I think on that note, Mr. Leverenz will withdraw his Motion. Mr. Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "I yield a minute of my time to Representative Barnes."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Barnes, on 20...."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what I would like to explain to the Membership that as these Bills developed through the House, each one was described in great detail by myself and by Bepresentative Leverenz.

Now, what we did this afternoon, we had a meeting with the Senate, and the Bill... nothing was changed. Everything is just like it passed out of this House, and..."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Ms. Barnes, it is apparently the will of the House that we proceed on these on... singly, and so I am recognizing you on House Eill 2624. But, first, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I withdraw the Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Barnes, proceed on House Bill 2624. Mr. Clerk, have you read that Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "The Bill has been read."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. If the Bill has been read, then Ms. Barnes, on 2624."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 2624 deals with the reappropriation for the Department
of Transportation. It reappropriates 2,012,937,571 dollars
for the Fiscal Year *85 ordinary and contingent expenses.
As it passed out of the Senate, it was one billion, nine
hundred and thirty nine thousand... million, three hundred

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

and thirty eight thousand, point nine. The concurrences were seventy three million, five hundred and ninety eight, point six dollars."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 2624. being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 262471 A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote ·no. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take On this question there are 108 voting *aye*, the record. none voting *no* and none voting *present*, and the does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2624. this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2631. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2631 is an Act making appropriations to the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Training Board, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes. Ms. Barnes."

 Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House

 Bill 2631 provides for the Local Governmental Law

 Bnforcement:Officers budget and I would agree with Senate

 Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment \$2. As it came out of the

 Senate, it is 5.968,500 dollars."
- Speaker Greiman: "Okay. The Lady from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2631. The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2631?" All in favor say "aye"... vote "aye", those opposed vote "no". Voting is now open. This is final action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting "aye", 1 voting "no", none voting "present", and the House does

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Bouse Bill 2631.

This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House... of Concurrence appears House Bill 2633. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2633, an Act making appropriations to
the Illinois Labor Relations Board, together with Senate
Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 2633 appropriates 1,500,000 dollars from General
Revenue Fund for the ordinary and contingent expenses of
the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board. Senate
Amendment #1 and #2 affect no dollar change. They just
reallocate line item appropriations."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 84 voting *aye*, 24 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2633. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2636. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2636, an Act making appropriations to the Department of Human Rights, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

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

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- House. Senate Bill 2636 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights. Senate Amendment #1 cut 95,800 dollars out of the budget. It's a 2.4% decrease. I ask for its... Affirmative Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to Bouse Bill 2636. being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2636? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open, and this is final action. voted who ... Have all voted who wish? Have all woted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2636. And this Bill. having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2639. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2639 is an Act making appropriations to the Human Rights Commission, together with Senate Amendment
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2639 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Senate Amendment #1 is an increase in 2,100 dollars in GRF Punds. I ask for concurrence to Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2639.

 There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Bill... in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2639?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Voting is now open. This

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2639. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2642. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2642, an Act making appropriations to the Department of Registration and Education, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes. Mr. Hastert, on 2642."
- Hastert: "...leave to handle this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, the Calendar shows Ms. Barnes, but Mr.

 Hastert, you have leave to proceed on that Bill. Leave."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2642 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Registration and Education. Move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, which is an increase. Senate Amendment #1 is an increase of 30,300 dollars, and Senate Amendment #2 is an increase of 91,200 dollars from General Revenue Funds. It increases personnel service and retirement lines. Ask for concurrence in that."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 2642. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Just to tidy up that presentation, Senate Amendment #1

 reduced the FY'85 request by two hundred and thirty-nine
 thousand, and I would move to concur also."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2642? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 5 voting *no*, 1 voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2642. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2643. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2643, an Act making appropriations to the Department of Veteran Affairs, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Br. Hastert. Br. Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2643 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses... appropriation for the Department of Veterans Affairs. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #1 cuts 111,700 dollars according to the Senate formula, and Amendment #2 is a 500,000 dollar transfer in a line item. Move to concur in both Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bi11 264371 All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 question, there are 111 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2643. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2644. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2644, an Act making appropriations to the Department of Labor, together with Senate Amendments \$1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
House Bill 2644 appropriates money for the fiscal year '85
ordinary and contingent... expenses of the Department of
Labor including the Bureau of Employment Security, and I
would move to accept Amendment \$1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
from the Senate."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 2644? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. On this question, there are 109 voting take the record. 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 House Bill 2644. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Eill 2645. Mr. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2645 is an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Governor, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2645 appropriates money for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the... Office of the Governor. I accept Senate Amendment #1, #2, #3, #4 and #6."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 2645-There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 2645? All in favor signify by voting 'ave'. those opposed vote *no*. Voting is now open. This Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting "aye", 2 voting 'no', none voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate 2, З, 4 and 6 to House Bill 2645. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2647. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2647 is an Act making appropriations to the Liquor Control Commission, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 2647 appropriates 1,026,900 dollars for the fiscal
 year '85 ordinary and contingent expenses for the Liquor
 Control Commission. I move to accept Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2647. There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2647?" All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2647. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2648. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2648 is an Act making appropriations to
the Illinois Commerce Commission, together with Senate
Amendment #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2648 appropriates money from the Public Utility Fund and the Motor Vehicle Fund for the fiscal year *85 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. I accept Senate Amendment \$1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2648. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2648. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2650. Mr. Clerk, read the Eill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2650 is an Act making appropriations to
the Military and Naval Department, together with Senate
Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

Bill 2650 appropriates the funding for the fiscal year *85 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Military and Naval I accept Senate Amendment #1, #2, #3 and #4." Department. Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2650. There being no discussion, the question is, the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4? All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2650. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2654. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2654 is an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Historical Library, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rendall, Mr. Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to Bouse Bill 2654, which is the ordinary and contingent expense for the State Historical Library... Senate #1 is a cut for 73,193 dollars according to the Senate guidelines. Senate Amendment #2 is an addition of 4,100 dollars. I move to concur in both Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2654. There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no".

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

open. This is final Voting is now action. Amendments 1 and 2. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Hr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2654. And this received a Constitutional Majority, having is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2663. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2663 is an Act making appropriations to
 the Supreme Court, together with Senate Amendment #1."

 Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Bouse
 Bill 2663 appropriates the General Revenue Fund to the
 Supreme Court for grants for probation services in
 Illinois. Senate Amendment #1 is a total reduction of four
 hundred thousand thirty-nine dollars, and I move to concur
 to Senate Amendment 1 to Bouse Bill 2663."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill There being no discussion, the question is. *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to Bouse Bill All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open. This is final action. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2663. And this having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby On the Order of Concurrence appears declared passed. House Bill 2729. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2729 is an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State, together with Senate Amendments #1

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

and 2."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Mr. Woodyard."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the appropriation by 3,326,000. Amendment #2 adds back in 1,884,000 for a total now of 169,091,000. I move for concurrence."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Edgar has moved for concurrence to Senate Amendments #1 and 2. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2729?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2729. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2765. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2765 is an Act making reappropriations
 to the Capital Development Board and Southern Illinois
 University, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2765 approp... reappropriates money to complete capital improvement projects for which funds were previously appropriated. I accept Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2765.

 There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2765. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2769. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2769 is an Act making appropriations to
 the Office of State Appellate Defender, together with
 Senate Amendments #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Prummer. Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz asks leave of the House to handle House Bill 2769. And we are in Session at this time, and I would admonish people not entitled to the floor to leave the floor. Mr. Leverenz, proceed."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur with the Senate Amendment. Would reduce 103,000 dollars from this budget. It's for the State Appellate Defender's Office. The new amount will be four million two ninety. I so move that we accept the Senate Amendment with the concurrence."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 2769-There being no discussion, the question is, *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #120 A11 favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2769. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Alright, on the Order of Concurrence

- 143rd Legislative Day

 June 29, 1984

 appears House Bill 2776. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2776, an Act making appropriations to the Department of Law Enforcement for ISEABCH Program, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Capparelli yields to Mr.

 Leverenz for the purpose of presenting this Bill. The

 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We will accept the technical Amendment made in the Senate. It is identical now to the House Bill that we passed at 1,858,000 dollars. I now move to concur. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 2776_ There being no discussion, the question is, *Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2776?* Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open, and this is final action. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting *aye*, none voting *no*, none voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Message from the Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of
 Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with
 the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the
 following Bills: Senate Bills 1733 and 1893, action taken
 by the Senate June 29th, 1984. Kenneth Wright,
 Secretary."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Leverenz, are you prepared to proceed? On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of

- 143rd Legislative Day

 Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1541. Mr. Clerk, read
 the... read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1541, an Act making appropriations to the various legislative support agencies and legislative Commissions, together with House Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I would move to... that the House refuse to recede
 to House Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1541."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the House refused to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Ri 11 1541. There being no discussion, the question is. 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Senate... from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 15417* All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed *no*. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1541 and requests the appointment of Conference Committee. On the Order of Monconcurrence, Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Bill 1547-Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1547, an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly, together with House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, with leave of the House to handle this Eill. Mr. Leverenz, proceed."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House refuse to recede in Senate... in House Amendment, rather, #1 to Senate Bill 1547 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, has moved that the House refuse to recede from Senate... from

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1547. There being no discussion, the question is, "Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1?" All in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1547 and requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Bill 1548. Hr. Leverenz, the Gentleman... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1548, an Act making appropriations to certain expenses of the General Assembly, together with House Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Sr. Leverenz. Leave of the House to handle this Bill. Proceed."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the House refuse to recede in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1548 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1548. There being no discussion, question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2?* All in favor signify bу those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair. the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Fill 1548 and requests that a Conference Committee be appointed. On page five of the Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1612. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, Senate Bill 1612."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1612 amends an Act in relationship to civic centers, together with House Amendments #2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. moved that the House refuse to recede from Senate... from House Amendments #2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10. All in favor signify by voting *aye*, those opposed vote *no*. No. I*m We don't need that. sorry. Clear that. All those favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 2. 4. and 10 to Senate Bill 1612 and requests the appointment of a Conference Committee. Alright. the Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Motions appears House Resolution 1141. Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the would move to bypass Committee and place on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration House Resolution 1141. Resolution deals with the guestion of Social Security Disability. You may remember earlier in the Session we had House Bill 2838. And this Resolution, I think, concensus position that's come out of discussions with the Department of Rehabilitative Services, and I think it's something that all the Members of the House can support. We are... all concerned about it. Our constituents have had serious problems. There are many people who have been denied benefits, and we all know that the reversal rates on the denials has been in excess of 85%. The Resolution calls for the Advisory Council of the Department to back by November 1st as far as the Department's activities in terms of coming up with rules and regs to try to

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

overcome the problems that we're all concerned about. If there are any questions, you know, be happy to answer them, but at this point I would move that we do bypass Committee so we can consider this Agreed Resolution."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, has moved to bypass Committee with respect to House Resolution 1141 and place the same on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion and to congratulate him and the other Members who were Sponsors of this Resolution as well as the administration of the Department of Behabilitative Services and AFSCME 2000 for their participation in this cooperative agreement... cooperative Agreed Resolution. And I support it, and I think it's a good idea... ask for an "aye" vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."
- Ewing: "Where is this on our Calendar, Br. Speaker?"
- Speaker Greiman: "It's on Supplemental Calendar #1 on the Order of Motions."
- Bwing: "I wonder if ... Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. There being no further discussion, does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Alright, the Gentleman has leave. Alright, the Gentleman has leave apparently. Now on the Order... On the Speaker's Table pursuant to the Motion that we have just passed appears House Resolution 1141. And on that, the Chair recognizes Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Okay, let me open and Representative O'Connell close.

 This Resolution recognizes the problems that many of our constituents have had as far as being found not to qualify

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

for social security disability and the extremely high reversal rate that has occurred on these denials once they have gotten to the administrative law Judges. What it does is to call on the Governor's Advisory Council to the Bureau Disability and Adjudicative Services of the Department of Rehabilitative Services to report back to the General Assembly by November 1st with respect to the activities of the Bureau of Disability and Adjudicative Services to overcome the ... this problem. I know that the Department has begun a dialogue with many of those who are involved in the field, with Legal Assistance Poundation. And. in fact. we'll be meeting next week with the staff of the Committee on Administrative Bules to discuss adopting rules doing many of the things that were proposed in reas. House Bill 2838. This, I think, gets us started as far coming up with a solution. There was a concern that we would be out of conformity with any proposed federal legislation. This certainly gives the Department the ability to see what goes on in the Congress and to act in accordance with what ... what happens in the next few months Washington... but to begin to address what I think is a concern of many, many people."

Speaker Greiman: "Purther discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "To close, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Ladies and Gentlemen, give the... give Gentleman your attention. This is a matter of significance. Please. Proceed."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd simply ask that there be a favorable adoption of this Besolution. It will go a long way toward preventing needy people who are truly disabled to acquire their federal Social Security benefits. I might add it would also go a long way in... in saving the State

143rd Legislative Day

June 29. 1984

of Illinois the expenditures of funds through its public aid and other state programs where as genuinely an obligation on the part of the federal Social Security Program for so many people that are truly disabled but have not been given a proper criteria for determining their disability. I'd simply ask that there he a favorable adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr... Mr. Clerk, would you like to announce..."

Clerk Leone: "House... House Calendar Supplemental 2 is now being distributed."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none. the question is, 'Shall House Besolution 1141 be adopted?' A11 favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. and the Amendment... Would you like a Roll Ca 11? Alright. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. I'm sorry. Mr. Hastert to explain his vote."

Hastert: "Well, Representative or Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to explain my vote You know, we've had some hearings on this this winter, and we had a great deal of people before uр in Chicago on this issue. After extensive question most of the people that we had questioned already had their disability benefits. I think it is important that we try to put people on these... and qualify people and our agencies qualify people and screen people to put them on this benefits, but I think it is also very important that we are able to screen those people and to make sure that there is people there that don't belong And, you know, it's a very, I there. quess. politically attractive type of Resolution to plan here, but

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

the reality is we have to have checks and balances. I think the real evil in this situation are the lawyers who hire these... are hired by these people to represent them and then take their disability benefits away from them."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question, there are ... Mr. McCracken, are you having some kind of a fit there? Alright,

McCracken votes 'no'."

McCracken: "No"

- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. On this guestion, there are 104 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does adopt House Resolution 1141. Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #2."
- Clerk Leone: "There is a printing error on Supplemental Calendar
 #2 under Senate Bill 1893. It should read House Amendments
 #16 and 93 instead of 23."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. On Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1733. Nr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1733 amends certain Acts in relationship to toll highways together with House Amendments #1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 16."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I move that the House refuse to recede in the House Amendments to Senate Eill 1733 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed with the Senate."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 16 to Senate Bill 1733. There being no discussion... I am sorry. The question... Mr. Bowman. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Does that mean he is supporting the Skyway?"

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon, Mr. Bowman."

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

- Bowman: "Does that mean he is supporting the Skyway? Oh, that's okay. I'll support the Gentleman in his Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bowman, thank you. The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 162° All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from those Amendments and request that a Conference Committee be appointed. On the... On Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Monconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1893. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1893 amends an Act creating the Tourism

 Fund in the State Treasury, together with House Amendments

 #16 and 93."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash."
- Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I refuse... I move to refuse to recede from House Amendment

 16 and 93 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 16 and 93 to Senate Bill 1893. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to..."
 Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Vinson."
- Speaker Greiman: "The guestion is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 16 and 93 to Senate Bill 1893?" All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 16 and 93 to Senate Bill 1893 and request that a Conference

- 143rd Legislative Day

 Committee be appointed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

 Cullerton, on a Motion."
- Cullerton: you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies Thank and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we would extend the deadline on the following Senate Bills till tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 midnight. That would be June 30th. Midnight, June 30th. Senate Bill 1889 dealing Compensation Review Board; Senate Fill 1850 dealing with the issue of Commissions and Senate Bill 1562, which deals with an appropriation to the Department of - it pronounced either Insurance or Ensurance."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves that the House deadline... that the rules deadline be suspended with respect to Senate Bills 1562, 1850 and 1889 until 12:00 midnight, tomorrow night. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "I support the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Do the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave. Alright, leave is granted, and the Motion carries. Yes, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, seek recognition?"
- Leverenz: "I have an inquiry of the Chair. Could you tell me the deadline and what it was extended to to Senate Bill 1450?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We are checking that at this very moment, Mr.

 Leverenz. Yes, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, if there is a hangup on that issue, I made the Motion the night before last on Senate Bill 1450, 1609, 1610 that the deadline be the end of the Session of the Spring Session."
- Speaker Greiman: "That is our recollection as well, Mr.
 Matijevich, and they re just checking just to make double
 sure. Mr. Matijevich, you are correct. Senate Bills 1450,

143rd Legislative Day

June 29, 1984

1609 and 1610 indeed were suspended until the end of the spring term, and apparently, you have guite a following out there. Sometimes wrong but never in doubt. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, for a pleasant Besolution... Motion."

- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Before we do that Notion I would tell the Body that we will begin the Conference Committees promptly, so I would suggest that you all be here promptly. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves that the House stands adjourned until the hour of 10:00 tomorrow. All in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does stand adjourned."

10/01/84 11:49

STATE OF ILLINOIS 8 3RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 29, 1984

HB-1399	VETO MESSAGE	PAGE	50
HB- 1563	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
HB-2049		PAGE	90
HB-2296	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	83
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	94
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
	CONCURRENCE		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
		PAGE	95
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	96
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	99
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	99
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
HB-2639	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
HB-2640	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
HB-2642	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-2643	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	102
HB-2644	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-2645	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-2647	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	104
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	105
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	105
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	106
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
-	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	93
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	108
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	109
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	110
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
	CONCUBRENCE	PAGE	49
HB-3136		PAGE	91
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
SB-1217	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	82
SB-1522	NON-CONCURBENCE	PAGE	87
SB- 1524	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
SB- 1541	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	111
SB-1547	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	111
SB-1548	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
SB-1562	MOTION	PAGE	119
SB-1612	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
SB-1629	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
SB-1733	THIRD READING	PAGE	84
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	81
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	82
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
	NON-CONCURBENCE	PAGE	81
SB- 1850		PAGE	119
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
	NON-CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	8
SB-1889		PAGE	119
	SECOND READING	PAGE	64
	THIRD READING	PAGE	77
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	118
SB-1893		PAGE	76
SB-1911		PAGE	9
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
SB-1939		PAGE	14
HR-1127		PAGE	2
HR-1141	MOTION	PAGE	113

10/01/84 11:49

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

HR-1141 ADOPTED HJR-0147 CONCURRENCE PAGE 2

PAGE 114 PAGE 6

JUNE 29, 1984

SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND SAUGHNEYSY SMALL	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	2
RECESS	PAGE	20
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	20
INTRODUCTION OF STAPLE SINGERS	PAGE	23
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	49
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	49
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	50
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	64
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	85
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	86
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	86
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	110
A DJOURN MENT	PAGE	120