78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- Speaker Matijevich: "The House will be in order and... House will be in order, and Speaker Madigan welcomes everybody to the July 2nd Session, and everybody will please rise. We are going to be led in the invocation this morning by one of our Members, Brother Rice."
- Rice: "Good morning. We will bow our heads. Dear Lord, we have gathered here this morning to partake in an important task, to care for the needs for the people of this great state. Although we represent various diversities and difference in people, we are gathered here for a common bond to do as You have guided us to do, and we ask this in His name. Amen."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you, Brother Rice. Please remain standing as we are led in the Pleage of Allegiance by Representative Gordon Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States

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

  Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for
  all."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Boll Call for Attendance. Roll Call.
  Somebody's pressing 'aye' buttons... those... Ethel, those
  should be 'present'. I think somebody had been hitting
  'aye' buttons. Take the record. There being 117 Members,
  the... we do have a quorum, and we're open for business.
  Agreed Resolutions. The Gentleman will read... One moment.
  Brother Rice, for what purpose do you... Oh. The Clerk
  will read the Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 460, Brummer; 461, Harris; 462,
  Ropp; 463, Curran Matijevich Terzich."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, on the...on the Agreed."
- Greiman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the adoption of

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the following Agreed Resolutions: 460, Teutopolis Fire Protection celebration of its 100th anniversary; 461, Rolling Meadows Park District celebrates its 25th anniversary; Eugene Mosbacher to retire; and 462 and 463, honoring Father Cernich for his ordination. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the Motion prevails, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 458, White."

Speaker Matijevich: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 70, Yourell, with respect to the memory of Mr. Silva of Oak Lawn: and House Resolution 459, Nash et al."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman moves..."

Clerk O'Brien: "... With respect to the memory of Mrs. (sic - Mr.) Coulolias."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the Death Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Madison, Jim McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal, and that Journals #29 through 68 be approved as read."

Speaker Matijevich: "You've heard the Motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the Motion is carried. On the Conference Committee Reports on the... page two of the Regular Calendar appears House Bill 320, Brunsvold. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. House Bill 1178, Breslin. Out of the record. House Bill 1257, Breslin. Out of the record.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

House Bill 1838, Capparelli. Out of the record. House Bill 1864, Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 1978. Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 2000, Giglio. of the record. Senate Bill 186. Bowman. Out of t he record. Senate Bill 310. Terzich. In the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
would like to wish everybody a happy good morning, but at
the same time, I move that we do not adopt Conference
Committee #1 to Senate Bill 310 and move that a Second
Conference Committee be called."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves that the House do not adopt Conference Committee... the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 310 and requests a Second Conference. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

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

Terzich: "Sure. Be more than happy to."

Piel: "Thank you. Good morning, Bob."

Terzich: "Good morning, Bob."

Piel: "Could you explain why you don't want to ... "

Terzich: "We didn't get enough votes in the Senate. We were a couple of votes short."

Piel: "Looks pretty good to me, though."

Terzich: "I think it's pretty good, but we still got a couple votes too short."

Piel: "They don't... The Senate doesn't like it? So, why don't we go to a Second Report?"

Terzich: "Naybe later today."

Piel: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves that the House do not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 310 and a Second Conference Committee be appointed. All in

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the Motion prevails. And the House does not ... moves that the House do not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 310. and a Second Conference Committee is requested and will Senate Bill 313. Slape. Out of the record. Senate Bill 434, Karpiel... or, Levin. Are you ready? Are you ready? Alright. The Gentleman from Cook. Representative Levin, on Senate Bill 434."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 434. This Conference Committee Report, which was adopted unanimously by the conferees, amends Condominium Property Act to do basically four things. Pirst of all, it clarifies various language in Condominium Act that has been the subject of litiga ... needless litigation. Secondly, it strengthens the rights of unit owners and clarifies the authority of condominium associations. Thirdly, it contains a double taxation provision. You may recall we passed House Bill 84 relating double taxation. Tha t Bill, unfortunately, does not cover condominiums. And fourthly, this condominium... this Report provides a mechanism for clearing up defective declarations. This proposal contains what was in a number of Bills which were considered in Committee and which, unfortunately, were just not called on the floor of the House which had been worked over at length by the Judiciary Committee. These include Senate Bills 418, 432, of course 436 and 671. This package has been endorsed by the Illinois Realtors' Association, the Homebuilders', the condominium associations. It's also been reviewed and okayed by Chicago Title and Trust Company and the mortgage bankers. As somebody who does, in fact. represent condominium associations, I think the ... what's included in

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

here are a number of reforms that are going to save money and are badly needed. I, at this point, urge the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "A Calendar announcement."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Levin has moved the adoption that we do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 434. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson... or, Representative Piel from Vinson's chair."

Piel: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he is... does. Proceed."

Piel: "Representative Levin, basically what the First Conference

Committee Report is doing is taking the package of the five

condominium Bills and putting them into the one Conference

Committee. Correct?"

Levin: "That's correct. The Bills, as they were amended on the floor of the House."

Piel: "Is there anything else besides those five or six... the five Bills in question?"

Levin: "Absolutely not."

Piel: "Now, I know that the... the realtors, you know, had some questions in reference to some of the Bills. What is their position on the Conference Committee Report right now?"

Levin: "The realtors... The Illinois Realtors' Association supports the Conference Committee Report. They have endorsed, you know, the underlying Bills. In fact, I have a leaflet right here in which they expressly endorsed, you know, each of the Bills that now makes up this part of the package; 418, 432, 434, 436 and 671."

Piel: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Levin has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 434. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage, and this requires 60 votes. Board is open. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 107 'ayes', no 'nays', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 434. Representative McPike.

McPike: "Change the Speaker to 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record the Speaker as 'present'. Take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 434. And this Bill, having a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 599. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur with the First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 599, with the Senate concurring in House Amendments 1 and 3. This Amendment provided that the State Fire Marshal's Office would continue the program for localities of less than 10,000, providing grants in case there was no federal money being provided to furnish fire equipment to communities that have been previously served by the Department of Conservation, and I would move that we concur with... "

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 599. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will. Proceed."

Mays: "Who's this going to go through? Didn't we have a... some questions as far as the Department of Conservation versus

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the Fire Marshal's Office, or ... "

Terzich: "The... There was a Bill that stipulated that there would be some monies paid regardless of whether there was any federal monies or not. There was a guestion whether or not that the federal grant would be continued, in compliance with the Fire Marshal's Office and also Members of the... the House, that this Amendment stipulated that the program would continue, provided that there is no federal monies being expended."

Mays: "And the Fire Marshal's Office, under this thing, would...
would run it?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Mays: "Are they currently doing that now, or..."

Terzich: "There is no program at the present time."

Mays: "Wasn't there a guestion as to whether the Department of Conservation should handle this or not?"

Terzich: "At the present time, the Department of Conservation is administering the federal grant money, but they... we do not have that program. This Bill will provide that if there isn't any federal grant, then the grant money would come from the State Fire Marshal's Office."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino, the Gentleman from Bureau."

Mautino: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, in support of adopting the Conference Committee on 599. Representative Mays, this is a protective provisions within this, in case that the federal dollars do not come We believe they will be coming down, but if they don't, this will be put into place. If they do, there's a possibility you could have two programs simultaneously, which is good anyway. I think it's a program, and I recommend an 'aye' vote on the Conference Committee."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 599. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires a three-fifths vote. The board is open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 103 'ayes', 5 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 599; and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Madority. is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 949, Reilly. Out of the record. Out of the record. Bill 1093, McCracken. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1222, Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill Out of the record. Senate Bill 1315, Brummer. Does Representative Brummer want to proceed on that? of the record. Senate Bill 1336, Kulas. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I move that the House accept Conference Committee Rouse. Report #1 on Senate Bill 1336. Conference Committee #1 recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment #2. which amended the County Police Alternative Retirement Formula Section of the Cook County Employees and Officers Benefit Annuity and Pund Article. It also ... Conference Committee recommends that the House recede on House Amendment #4. It also establishes an optional alternative retirement, disability and survivors formulas for the elected Cook County officials who participate in the Cook County Employees' Pension Fund. It provides for an increase in the contribution rate for them from 8 1/2 to 1/2 percent. The Bill also amends the General Assembly Retirement System Article, and it reduces from eight to six

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the number of years of service required for a Member to continue participation in this system with other restrictions included, after the Member leaves the General Assembly. It also amends the State Mandates Act to make the increased cost attributable to those provisions not reimbursable by the state, and I would move that the House do accept Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas has moved that the
House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on
Senate Bill 1336. The Gentleman from Harris,
Representative... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize that it's early in the morning. Will the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's been a rough two weeks."

Harris: "Will the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

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

Harris: "Representative Kulas, I noticed that this amends the General Assembly Article of the Pension Code, reducing eligibility, I guess, from eight years to six years. Is that correct?"

Kulas: "That's correct."

Harris: "And you indicated there were some other provisions that
we could stay in the system beyond that time. Would you
further explain?"

Kulas: "What it does is, if a Member leaves the General Assembly after six years of service, and he continues working for the state, he can participate... he can move his credits over to that other..."

Harris: "I see. Do you think that... I gather you think it's necessary to reduce the... the... make this reduction of two years, from eight to six?"

Kulas: "Well, I think it's a good idea, because there are certain

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

restrictions, like the other job that he has has to be comparable with the salary in the House, and so on."

Harris: "Thank you. Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Harris: "Just one... one comment. I trust every Member of the
House knows that they are indeed voting on their pension
Bill, and it is an increase in their pension benefit. I
would simply remind them of that as they cast their vote.
Thank you."

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

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Kulas, a question, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

McGann: "Representative Kulas, is this going to mean any kind of
a tax... real estate tax increase from the county or local
level?"

Kulas: "No, it doesn't, Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, it's an inquiry of the Chair. Since this is the last Bill on the call, are you going to go back through that list again?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. In fact, I'll call you next."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "We took yours out because you were working on appropriations last night, so we'll allow you to return to that."

Bowman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas has moved the... we do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1336. Representative Vinson, the Gentleman from DeWitt."

78th Legislative Day July 2, 1983

Vinson: "Yes. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, is the Republican analysis correct, that
this Conference Committee Report would amend the General
Assembly Article of the Pension Code to reduce from eight
to six the number of years of service required for
eligibility to remain in the system after leaving the
General Assembly?"

Kulas: "Yes, it is."

Vinson: "What is the... What is the actuarial liability for that?"

Kulas: "We don't have that information right now, but there...

Representative Harris was not correct. This does not increase any benefits to the General Assembly Pension."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. Would you... I didn't understand what you said."

Kulas: "I don't have the actuarial figures with me,
Representative Vinson. I was just trying to correct
Representative Harris when he said that this would increase
our benefits. It doesn't increase benefits at all."

Vinson: "It just makes it easier to be eligible for the benefits.

Is that correct?"

Kulas: "Yes, if you continue working for the state."

Vinson: "Do you have any idea what the increased annual appropriation would be?"

Kulas: "There is no increased appropriation for this."

Vinson: "Well, wouldn't there be people who are... would not not currently be eligible to participate in the retirement system who would be made eligible by this provision?"

Kulas: "Well, there probably are a few, but they would have to pay for it to get back in."

Vinson: "Are you saying that the way in which this functions is that the individual has to assume not only his liability,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

but the system's liability?"

Kulas: "No, the state still pays their guarter portion, but the participant would have to pay the other portion."

Vinson: "So, there would be... There would, then, in fact, be increased cost to the state."

Kulas: "There might be a slight increase, yes."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Vinson: "I don't believe that there's an enormous cost involved here, but I do believe that there is a very substantial matter of equity and a very substantial matter of perception involved here, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle, the Gentleman from Vermilion."

Stuffle: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Kulas, who suggested the change in the General Assembly Retirement Article that's contained in this Conference Report?"

Kulas: "The... That suggestion was brought up by the Senate Minority Leader, Senator Pate Philip."

Stuffle: "Thank you."

Representative Kulas has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1336.

Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Takes three-fifths. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 46 'ayes', 60 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. The Motion fails, and Representative Kulas asks for a Second Conference Committee. Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, the Chair will call

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

those reports that the Chair's been informed have been distributed and on the Members desks. House Bill 542, Is Representative Reilly in the chamber yet? Senate Bill 374, Dwight Friedrich. Is Dwight Friedrich Senate Bill 374? Senate Bill 378, Barnes. Representative Barnes here yet? Senate Bill... minute. That one's not distributed. We'd better not call that. Senate Bill 390, Woodyard. Senate Bill 390. Woodyard. According to my information, it has been. Yeah. 390 has been distributed. You want to run? Out of the record. 394, Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, on Senate Bill 394."

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Barnes: "ME. Speaker, Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 394 is the safety category - Criminal Justice, Emergency Services, Fire Marshal, Law Enforcement, Police Training Board, Military and Naval, Nuclear Safety, Corrections, Prison Review Board. As introduced, it was 342,578,000.3. As revised, it is 380,135,000.7. The change for those total budgets is 37,557.4. These budgets have discussed quite thoroughly on the House floor, and at this point, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved that the...

that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee
Report on Senate Bill 394. On that, the Chairman of the
Appropriations II Committee, Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Lady's Motion. I'd like to point out for the Membership that the difference between the original Bills and the Conference Committee Report is a mere \$37,000. We have hewed very closely to the line of the available resources. We spent a considerable amount of time and anguish on this floor in the last days, fashioning

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the tax package, and we were very concerned that we hew close to the line. We did not wish to add in unnecessarily just because we have new taxes. The distributions that people have seen before the tax package was adopted are almost right on the button with what we are asking you to adopt at this time, and so, I do rise in support of the Lady's Motion to adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jane Barnes has moved that the House do adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 394. There being no further discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting This is final action and requires 71 votes. all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will this question, there are 109 'ayes', 2 the record. On 'nays', 1 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority, is declared passed. I think Representative Karpiel's light button is on. and so is Representative Richmond. light button is on, and I'm not sure if you're seeking recognition or not. No. Okay. Senate Bill 481. Representative Nash in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 714, Representative Satterthwaite. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Capital Development projects for the year. It really not something that I'm expert on, but perhaps Representative Leverenz can give us some better insight there are questions as to what is currently in this have not gotten an package. Ι analysis yet to шy knowledge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you moving to adopt?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Satterthwaite: "I move do adopt on Senate... Conference Committee

Report #1 to Senate Bill 714."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Satterthwaite has moved 'do adopt' on House Conference Committee... on the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 714. Those in... Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "... till we get the analysis?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record for a moment. I see
Representative Reilly is here. House Bill 542. Gentleman
from Morgan, Representative Reilly. Out of the record.
Representative Nash, are you ready with Senate Bill 481?
Senate Bill 481?"

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

I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1
to Senate Bill 481."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 481."

Nash: "That's the appropriations for the Court of Claims."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nash has moved that we do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 481. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed. Proceed."

Ropp: "Does this include that Amendment we did not amend in the House, plus all those that we did in the House? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nash moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. This is final passage and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, wish? there are 81 vote... 'ayes', 26 'nos', 3 answering The House does adopt the First Conference 'present'.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Committee Report on Senate Bill 481, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority. hereby declared passed. Leave for Saltsman to be voted 'aye' on this last Bill. Leave. We didn't go to the next Bill yet. On the Regular Calendar, page three. Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 186. The Gentleman from Cook. Woods Representative Bowman?"

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Pirst Conference Committee Report to Senate 186 deals with the Casual Deficit Act, which provided the... which is an 1897 law and provided the basis for the short term note that the Governor picked up to help us get through the Fiscal Year '83 before we were able to pass the tax package. Now, this is an 1897 law, and it really does need be updated. That is the purpose of Senate Bill to 186. Senate Bill 186, as embodied in this Conference Committee Report, does put the General Assembly into the process more fully, whereby we must authorize in advance a line of credit, and then we must make appropriations for repayment. And it is something that I believe represents a real step forward, a modernization of this 19th century law, and I now move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 186."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Woods Bowman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 186. There being no discussion, all those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 186, and

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brunsvold, are you ready on House Bill 320? Out of the record. Representative Brunmer, are you ready on Senate Bill 1315? Senate Bill 1315, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brunmer."

Brummer: "Yes, Senate Bill 1315 as it left the House addressed a problem in Jim Rea's district. The 'Joppa' Power Plant authorized that facility to issue bonds for working capital The... The only item that has been added in the purposes. Conference Committee is increasing the number οf commissioners on the Illinois Commerce Commission from five to seven."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate There being no discussion, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 76 'ayes', 36 and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1315; and this Bill, having received Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is herehv declared passed. On Supplemental... On the Regular page three, is Senate Bill 1226, Representative Calendar, Currie. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The
First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1226
leaves the Bill exactly as it was when it first left this
chamber. The Bill itself - the Katie Beckett Bill permits the Department of Public Aid to pay for in-home
health care costs of financially eligible children so as to
leave those children in the care and security of their
family when that works and so as to save ultimately the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

taxpayers the dollars that would have been involved in an extensive, lengthy hospital stay. I urge support of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1226."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Currie has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1226. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will. Proceed."

Vinson: "Representative, does the Conference Committee Report contain the additional provisions that led the Department of Public Aid and the Governor's Office to reverse their opposition?"

Currie: "Yes. It is exactly as it was when you last asked that question, so I assume that the appropriate answer is 'yes'."

Vinson: "It's in the same form as when it passed the House."

Currie: "When it passed. Exactly the same form, Representative."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Vinson: "I would rise in support of the Lady's Motion. The Bill is in a form that might conceivably save money and certainly will not cost... an increase in cost."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Topinka. The Lady from Cook, Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Currie's done a fine job in a good cost-saving effort and also helping the needy at the same time. I rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Currie has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1226. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes', 3 'nays', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1226. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Supplemental Calendar #2, Senate Bill 557. Is Representative Nash here? Representative Nash on Senate Bill 557."

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

  Senate Bill 557 is the same way we passed it out of the House and sent it to the Senate with the Amendment that was put on to take care of a situation where a Member resigns or leaves office, the person that succeeds him will have adequate funding for his district office. I ask for an adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nash has moved that the House do adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 557. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "I'd request that the Sponsor... that the Sponsor take this out of the record at this time, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Is Representative Reilly ready to proceed on House Bill 542, Supplemental Calendar #1? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly, Spokesman Appropriations II Committee. House Bill 542. Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we have done by agreement between both sides of the aisle in terms of appropriations is group the appropriations into overall subject matter areas, and there are, I believe it's a total of 10 Bills that will contain the budget. The... House Bill 542 contains those appropriations for the regulatory agencies. That includes Banks and Trusts. Board of Elections. **Financial** Institutions, Commerce Commission, Insurance,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Control Commission. Racing Board. Registration and Education, and Savings and Loan. The total for these agencies is... total general revenue for these agencies is \$2.122.300. Most of these agencies, for example, the financial institutions, the banks, the insurance, are basically supported by fees from those that they regulate. I'd be glad to answer questions. Otherwise, I would for a favorable Roll Call on the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 542."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 542. The Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, Representative Ted Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Conference Committee Report 1 on House... House Bill 542. The Gentleman has explained it exactly. I think all of the concerns have been dealt with, and I would hope for the adoption and your green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dwight Friedrich, the Gentleman from Marion."

Friedrich: "I just wanted to ask the Sponsor... "

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Priedrich: "Is the level of appropriations for the Commissioner of Banks the same as it was when it went out of here?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 542. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires Three-Fifths Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

there are 97 'ayes', 11 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 542. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Dwight Priedrich ready with Senate Bill 374? Senate Bill 374, the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would you hold that for a minute, please?"

- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Is Representative Woodyard ready with Senate Bill 390? Ι don't see Out of the record. Do Do we have the We . . . analysis yet on 714... Senate Bill... we took that out the record. You do have the analysis? Senate Bill 714. the Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite. understand the analysis has been distributed. from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move for acceptance of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 714. It contains the Capital Development projects both new appropriations and reappropriations."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, we don't seem to have the analysis on 714 back here."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, it seems as though some have it and some don't. There's so much paper on your desk, I think it may be there, Sam. Mautino's got it way in the back, and Brookins has it way in the front. And none of the Republicans have it. So, we've got to take it out of the record. Out of the record. Representative Friedrich, are you ready to proceed on...?"
- Friedrich: "I would like to yield to Representative Reilly on 374."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Friedrich yields to the Spokesman on Appropriations II, Representative Reilly, on Senate Bill 374."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 374 deals with the subject matter of education. It contains the budgets for the Board of Education, Board of Higher Education, the U of I, Southern, Board of Regents, Board of Governors, Community Colleges, Scholarship Commission, Purchase Care Review and University Civil Service. The total appropriation - GRF appropriation - is \$3,134,044,600. I would be glad to answer questions. Otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call on the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 374."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the
House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on
Senate Bill 374. Representative Stuffle, the Gentleman
from Vermilion."

Stuffle: "Would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

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

Stuffle: "Representative, I hadn't had a chance to read this in the analysis. I have read the Bill in some detail. Let me ask you - on page 23 and page 24 of the Conference Report, it appears from lines 15 down..."

Reilly: "Hold on. Let us get to the page. Okay?"

Stuffle: "I'm sorry. Page 23, Representative."

Reilly: "What line?"

Stuffle: "Lines 15 down the entirety of the page, and then the remaining item that goes over to page 24. It's my understanding that all of that, over \$3,000,000 is new appropriations for projects not now in the budget, that's never been in the budget before."

Reilly: "There are... There are a couple of items that have been added by the Senate, but the largest item, the education

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

for technology employment, a million dollars, was in the state board budget. The master teacher program, \$637,500, was also in the state board budget."

Stuffle: "I... Rephrase that. They may have been in their recommendations. They've never been items that we've appropriated for in prior years."

Reilly: "They're new programs. Yes."

Stuffle: "And those total over \$3,000,000 with the inclusion of the \$47,800 to... to once again study the school aid formula."

Reilly: "Well, that is a... As you know, there were... they began a three year project two years ago. This is the third year. It seems to me, at least, kind of foolish to fund it for two years, have it be nearly complete, and then to cut off the funding at that point."

Stuffle: "Okay. Let me ask you. What level of appropriation is contained for the three types of grants to the community colleges, the credit hour grants, equalization and disadvantage compared to last year?"

Reilly: "Credit hours, I am informed, are slightly lower."

Stuffle: "Lower than last year."

Reilly: "That... Lower than last year's appropriation, yes."

Stuffle: "Okay, thank you. To the Conference Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Stuffle: "I have mixed emotions. I voted against the tax increase because I didn't think the allocation was fair. I think this allocation's rather silly, that we can cut the area just mentioned below last year, raise others areas in higher ed, elementary, and take \$3,000,000 for programs that have never been appropriated before, at the same time we drive down basic categoricals well below the funding level requested some 92 percent. I think that if we're realistic, and I know this is the last day and the last

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Bill and this is it, but to go back to the district and tell them that you cut the basic community college grants at the same time you jacked up others, you cut basic categoricals for the handicapped at the same time you put \$3,000,000 in for new programs, is kind of silly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't intend to take a lot of time on many of these Bills, but I would like to have the opportunity from time to time on some of these to explain my vote, since we got little chance to discuss these in Committee or on the floor. intend to vote against this Bill, send it back. 1 I'm... cannot vote for a Bill that includes a teacher program in there, when we do not have enough money to fund some of the basic educational programs that we agree with Representative Stuffle. Some of this Ι stuff is absolutely silly, and certainly, none of it should be included under the tax proposal that we approved in this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

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

Tuerk: "I noticed in the analysis that the budget... this appropriation Bill is 196 million lower than introduced? Could you just capsule the reason? For example, Board of Education, I noticed, is down 154; University of Illinois, 13, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Just... Just give me some sort of a feel regarding the introduction level versus the revised level."

Reilly: "Well, the Bills for those are introduced by the Board of Higher Education and by the Board of Education, so they don't go through the... the regular budget process, so

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

they introduce what amounts to their wish list. Ι mean. it's not like a regular department that gets cut down to whatever the Governor thinks can be allocated in the place. So the answer is, they asked for more than they re getting, but ... For example, the Board of... Board Education. where it almost exact... They were asked to allocate the funds that the Governor offered them with tax increase, with his big tax increase, and we're at almost exactly that level. We didn't cut below that level very much at all. And the same with the Board of Higher Education. They both came in with... you know. always do, with very high increases, and we always cut them down substantially when we begin to put their budget together with, you know, the other areas o f state spending."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Chairman of Appropriations, Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. r • a just like to elaborate briefly on what Representative Reilly said. In this case. very substantial amount of that reduction that Representative Tuerk spoke of, is retirement, because part agreement that was struck over the tax proposal set the retirement appropriations at 60 percent οf payout. that's across the board. Not only in elementary and secondary and in higher education. but state employees, everybody takes that kind of a hit. Now, laying the retirement question aside, in terms of the programmatic request, I think Representative Reilly hit it right on the button. We gave the State Board of Education almost exactly what they had requested, and we gave the Board of Higher Education very close to what they requested.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

And so, I think, programmatically, education comes out very, very well. I would also add that we spent a lot of time on this particular budget. It is very, very close to the agreed upon bottom line. I think out of a couple billion dollars, we're off by maybe only a million of the allocation that everybody had seen before the Conference Committees met, and I think that's really remarkable, because in my tenure in the Legislature, I've never seen a budget that big come out right... so close to the mark."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hensel. Representative Hensel."

Hensel: "Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Hensel: "Representative, could you just tell me what the... the appropriated, as revised, in comparison to the expenses for the previous year? Is this more or less?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly."

Hensel: "In other words, will they receive more money?"

Reilly: "Yeah. They will both... Both areas, elementary and secondary, and higher ed will receive more. Higher ed, as I recall, receives about... what... about 70... about 50 million more, and elementary and secondary about 64... is the number that comes to my mind, but they will both receive more."

Hensel: "They will receive more, but they're not getting as much as they're asking for, then."

Reilly: "Correct."

Hensel: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 374. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires a three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 97 'ayes', 12 'nays', 4 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 374; and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Woodyard ready on... no, not yet. On the Regular Calendar, Conference Committee Reports, on page two, appears House Bill 1178, Representative Breslin."

is the one that I wish to have adopted. We have gone to Conference Committee, and I believe, cleaned up this Bill to the satisfaction of most. This Bill allows school boards to establish before school and after school programs for pupils in kindergarten through sixth grade. It changes the mandatory language of 'shall' to 'may' regarding what the program should include, and it tracks the language for the addition into the Chicago School Code to make it the same as downstate. So, hopefully, that meets everyone's objections. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Breslin has moved the adoption of House Bill 1170... the adoption of the First...

Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1178.

Representative Nelson, the Lady from DuPage."

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

This Bill allows school boards to provide latch key programs, but it does not force them to, and I support it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady has moved the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1178.

There being no further discussion, those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

This is final action and takes 60 votes. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

On this question, there 98 'ayes', are 10 'nays', 2 answering 'present'. The House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1178. This Bill, received a Constitutional having Majority, declared passed. House Bill 690. I understand. is no longer controversial. Is the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer, ready? House Bill 690, on page two of the Regular Calendar."

Homer: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. We're dealing here with the Second Corrected Pirst Conference Committee Report, which, in effect, puts the Bill in the exact form that it passed out of the House last month with 107 votes. It basically provides for a redefinition of theft of stolen property and creates a new offense of diversion of public utility service. However, the Senate Amendment, which provided for a presumption, has been completely removed through this Conference Committee Report, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 690. Representative Jaffe, the Gentleman from Cook."

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield for... for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Jaffe: "Is this the First Conference Committee Report?"

Homer: "It's the... Actually, the title is... it is the First
Conference Committee Report, but it's the Second
Corrected."

Jaffe: "Wait a second. I don't understand."

Speaker Matijevich: "How'd we... How'd we do that?"

Jaffe: "Well, wait a second. I don't really understand what
we're doing over here. I mean first, we had a Conference
Committee Report that was defective. Then you filed a

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Corrected Conference Committee Report, and now you're saying you have a Second Corrected. Is it the same as the First Conference Committee Report?"

Homer: "No, it's... I was advised by Mr. Getty that this was the proper terminology that... that until there's final action taken on a Conference Committee Report, it remains..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe, I understand this is the Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report."

Jaffe: "Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker, I really would object to what we're doing at this particular moment. What we're, in essence, saying is that if you circulate one Conference Committee Report, everybody either signs it or doesn't sign and then you find that it's defective, and so then you go back and you correct that defection, and then happens is that if you find out that maybe it won't pass that way, after you've circulated and had your meetings and everything else happens, and so, you go back and you make a Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report. I don't think that that's in order. I think we're really stretching the rules. We're standing on our head. bending over backwards. We're doing all sorts of things to terrible Bill, and I think that Parliamentarian is just off the wall on this one, if you think that we can have a Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report that differs from the First Conference Committee that everyone met on and everyone either signed on or didn't sign on to. And I would ask for a ruling."

Speaker Matijevich: "The... The matter is in order and was done with the advice of the Parliamentarian. Representative Vinson, the Gentleman from DeWitt."

Vinson: "Yes, initially, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Are we on the First Conference Committee Report for

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

House Bill 690?"

- Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. It's the Second Corrected First

  Conference Committee Report, and it's in order, done with
  the advice of the Parliamentarian."
- Vinson: "It's the Second Corrected First Conference Committee

  Report? That's what we're on?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's correct."

Vinson: "Okay, then. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

- Vinson: "Representative, is, in essence, what that... what the

  Conference Committee Report does is to recommend that the

  Senate recede from the presumption language?"
- Homer: "That's correct, and it puts this Bill back in the exact same form it came out of the House."
- Vinson: "So, in... What you then have, if there is a... if you've had replumbing on the gas pipes or whatever, that that is..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson, could you... I noticed that Representative Jaffe and others are still confused about the ruling, and I'm going to let the Parliamentarian clear this up for everybody. It's not as suspicious as one might think, so let's all hear the Parliamentarian."
- Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker, the Chair would rule that the Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report is in order. The chronology of events is as follows: The Gentleman submitted a Pirst Conference Committee Report, which Report was defective on its face. The Gentleman then submitted a Corrected Conference Committee Report to correct the original defect. In so doing, he inadvertently caused the wrong form to be filed. The Gentleman then withdrew that by submitting a Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report, which is the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

one that is now before the Body and is in order."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson, you may proceed."

Vinson: "Representative Hawkinson has enlightened me as to where
we are, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Alexander: "Thank you. Representative Homer, if I lived in a 36 unit apartment building, and I legitimately paid my utility bills on time, and some person in that building with the knowledge of how to bypass service meters and et cetera, would utilize my fuse box and jump the circuits, and I would have no knowledge that this has taken place, and I would not receive a bill for services the following month, would I now be guilty of having violated the unlawful interference with public utility services?"

Homer: "The answer is... The answer is no. You would... The...
You would not be guilty unless you did so knowingly, and in
order for you to be proven guilty, the state would have to
prove that element, as all other elements, beyond a
reasonable doubt. So the answer to your question is, you
would not be guilty."

Alexander: "Thank you. That's what I wanted to find out."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to address the Bill at this time. I have done it on several occasions. I will comment on your ruling. I think that your ruling is wrong.

I'm not going to ask to appeal the Chair, but it isn't as bad as you say it is, and just because you're in the Chair, and you're a dear friend of mine, doesn't make that ruling any better, and a ruling like that should not come out of the Democratic Party."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "I appreciate half of what you said, Aaron.

Representative Homer to close. Oh, Representative Kulas.

I'm sorry. I didn't see your light."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Kulas: "Is the Second Corrected First Conference Committee Report
the same as the First Conference Committee Report corrected
twice?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Kulas: "Then, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton, for what...

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. I just wanted to see if I could straighten this thing out and try to satisfy Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. That'll be hard. Go ahead. I tried."

Cullerton: "Representative Homer, this is a Bill that started out in the House, correct?"

Homer: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And you had a very minor change in the theft statute,

by striking the words 'by another'."

Homer: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And then the Senate, in their wisdom, made some
Amendments."

Homer: "Well, any..."

Cullerton: "Does this Conference Committee Report have any Senate
Amendments on it?"

Homer: "Does it now? No, it does not. It does not have any Senate Amendments. It would be in the same form that we passed it in the House at this time."

Cullerton: "Okay. Does it have anything to do with diverting...
with the offense of diverting water?"

Homer: "Yes. Now, in Judiciary Committee in the House, when it

78th Legislative Day

- July 2, 1983
- was a House Bill, we added on a provision that would create an offense a diversion of public utility service."
- Cullerton: "Okay. And... And this is already in another Section of the statutes, other than Chapter 38, a very similar type of a... of an offense, by tampering with meters and bypassing meters. Isn't that correct?"
- Homer: "To my knowledge, there is some provision in the Public
  Utilities Act, Chapter 111 2/3, but I'm not familiar with
  the exact provisions of it, Representative."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, the main thing is, you took out the presumptions and the prima facie evidence part in this."
- Homer: "That's correct. That was added by the Senate, and we're
  now asking, in this report, that we recede from that
  Amendment and put it in the form that the House passed it."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So the situation that Representative Alexander described, there would be... in no way would there be any diversion of power or interference with the service at all. Is that correct? In other words, when... her... the question she asked was, if you just happen to have an economic benefit because somebody tampered with the meter, and you end up having your bill go down, you wouldn't... you couldn't... in no way be considered to be violating this particular law. Is that correct?"
- Homer: "No. It... The... The element is in here that you have to do so knowingly."
- Cullerton: "You have to do what knowingly?"
- Homer: "Knowingly and without the consent of the owner, interrupt the service or interfere with the service."
- Cullerton: "Okay, then. So there has to be an interruption of the service or a diversion in whole or in part of the power supply or the water or the gas. Right?"
- Homer: "That's correct."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

believe first of all, that if a Conference Committee has never been voted on, it has to be the First Conference Committee. If there's a mistake made, either a technical mistake, or if the Sponsor wants to change... literally change what is in the Conference Committee, the only way to do it is to call it... is to call it Corrected, and if it's corrected twice, to call it the Second Corrected. And, as far as the Bill is concerned, I think we've amended it so that it does very little, and that's good. And therefore, I would support the Gentleman on his Motion."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Huff. Let's... We've spent hours on this thing. Let's conclude it, and... "
- Huff: "I'll try to wrap it up, Mr. Speaker. Will the... Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."
- Huff: "Representative Homer, this, according to my Conference

  Committee Report, this creates the offense of unlawful

  interference. Can you tell me what the penalty is for this
  alleged diversion?"
- Homer: "The... This would be a Class A misdemeanor,
  Representative Huff, which would provide for a maximum
  penalty of up to one year in jail and up to \$1,000 fine or
  both, would be the maximum."
- Huff: "Well, I can see the applicability for this for a single family dwelling, but can you explain to me how this would work in a multi-unit dwelling of, say, a hundred units or four... four units? Can you tell me how that would work?"
- Homer: "Well, if the unit was individually metered, and the landlord was not paying for the service, if it could be shown that an individual tenant, for the purpose of deriving economic benefit, tampered with the meter or somehow diverted or interrupted the service in such a way as to reap an economic benefit, then of course, it would be

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

applicable, but it would depend on the individual structure and the individual metering devices."

Huff: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to rise this Bill, because, as I to oppose perceive the gas companies and the water companies, they are not that perfect themselves. I think the real penalty should be the gas companies who sent out estimated bills that are percent over the normal rate of usage. And there are many circumstances upon which a gas line or water line can interrupted by nature that may appear to be the tampering of the tenant, and that may not be the case at all. T think this is a bad Bill in that it is very difficult to apply it in a practical sense, and I think we should against this bad Bill."

Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report House Bill 690. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes 60 votes and Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? final passage. The Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry. Representative Rice. minute to explain his vote. Proceed. Representative Rice."

Rice: like to share with the General Assembly. In owning what we call tenement dwellings that deal with ... that deal with public aid, sometimes things happen with meters. instance, if you are using heat, you have a faster meter than you have with a regular cook situation. Now, if meter is changed, and somebody decides to put some salt on it, and you own that property, you don't have to know anything about it. That will slow that meter down. Now. for the gas company... you are saying knowingly, the company's going to say to you, you're the owner of that property. You should know what's going on. I think it's a

### 78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

very bad Bill, out of all that I've heard here this last two or three days, and I certainly urge those red votes to come up on that... that board."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Take the record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 19 'nays', 2 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 690; and this Bill, receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Peterson...
- Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, I've just had a conversation with the Clerk, and I find I was not recorded as voting for Senate Bill 374. I ask leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' for Senate Bill 374."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The rules do not so provide. We ve allowing you, when we're ОD the Bill, right as we are concluding the Bill. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar Representative Satterthwaite... Have those analyses been distributed yet? They have not? Let's get on it. Representative Woodyard, are you ready yet? like to move these appropriation Bills. Are there any appropriation Bills on Supplemental 1 that have... Alright, we're going to go right down the list. House Bill 543, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes. That's not distributed. understand 714 is distributed - the I analyses. Senate Bill 714, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that
  we accept the First Conference Committee Report to Senate
  Bill 714. It is the Capital Development budget for the
  year, containing both new and reappropriations."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 714. Representative Yourell."

78th Legislative Day July 2, 1983

Yourell: "Yes, would the Lady yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Yourell: "Representative Satterthwaite, does Senate Amendment #1

provides money for Moraine Valley Community College
building?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, it does, Representative."

Yourell: "In what amount?"

Satterthwaite: "In the amount of 6.983 million dollars."

Yourell: "Seven million dollars, approximately."

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Yourell: "Well, Ladies and Gentleman, I made a little statement this issue a week or so ago, when this Bill was first considered in the House. And what we're doing here violating the Community College Act that calls for a formula for distribution for Capital Development's projects in the amount of 75 percent funded by the state and percent funded by the locals. Now, here we are, violating that formula for the first time - and I checked this out for the first time since the Community College Act was... became law; that for the first time, we're allowing the state to contribute less to a building project than the formula calls for. Now, I understand what's going on, that's my junior college out there. And I have no problem with the building. I do have a problem with the funding; because, under this formula, under the new formula that we are arbitrarily adopting - and believe it or not this going to come back to haunt us, because it's going to throw... throw out the window the old formula of 75/25 that's written in the statutes. And there is absolutely no statutory authority for this action. Under this new allocation, what we're doing is cheating the taxpayers..."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Out of the record. On Supplemental 2 House Calendar appears Senate Bill 83. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a... Senate Bill 83, all it does is say it's requiring... changing the law a little bit for the Board of Education. Instead of using the ledgers, it allows them to use microfilms. And I must say that this Bill passed the House 58 to... the Senate 58 to nothing, and there's no opposition to the Bill. It was on the agreed list, and all of the conferees have signed..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Shaw has moved the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate There being no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This three-fifths votes, and this is final passage. voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will record. On this question, there are 78 'ayes', 31 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee ... Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 83. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same... On the same Calendar, same page, appears Senate Bill 1313, Representative Farley, Gentleman from Cook."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1313, Second Conference Committee Report, is the same as the First Conference Committee Report. I know of no opposition. There was a problem in the Senate on time. So, that's why we brought it back here. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Farley has moved the adoption

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

of the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1313. There being no discussion, those in favor... Oh, Representative Dunn. I'm sorry."

Dunn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor explain the underlying

Bill and what's in this Conference Committee Report? I

can't seem to find any of it here on my desk right now."

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will. Proceed."

Farley: "Yes, Representative Dunn, as I explained yesterday, the original Bill 1313 provides for a 25 dollar increase in a penalty for violations of boaters. It also provides for a arm... Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson. Wait. You're through, weren't you, John Dunn? Yes. Representative Vinson, Gentleman from DeWitt."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Conference Committee
Report #2 on Senate Bill 1313. We've debated the subjects
in the Conference Committee Report at length on a number of
occasions, and I believe that in each case, as you go down
the list, that they're appropriate. And I would support
them."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Nelson: "Representative Farley, does this Bill or the Second Conference Committee Report include 40 million dollars in bonding organizations?"

Farley: "Yes, it does."

Nelson: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. I am advised that part of the Second Conference Committee Report is not underlined and that specifically regards DuPage

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

County Judges. Is that correct or incorrect; and, if it's incorrect, can we amend it on its face?"

Farley: "Representative McCracken, I think you are on the wrong Bill."

McCracken: "Oh. Alright. I'm sorry."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Okay. There being no further discussion, the Gentleman has moved the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1313. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Representative Reilly to explain his vote. Representative Reilly to explain his vote."
- Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in some ways in somewhat reluctant support of this Bill, but it absolutely, in my opinion, must pass the General Assembly. The projects which we are... I think, for which we are going to appropriate money, many of them of extreme importance to various parts of the state..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

  The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 73 'ayes', 39 'nays', and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1313.

  And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. On second Supplemental Calendar appears Senate Bill 879. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 879, Conference Committee Report #1, included the provisions in the initial Bill, removed Amendment #5 and included that municipalities can increase their debt limits by referendum in order to receive Lake Michigan water. It also added language which is

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

recommended by bond counsel to protect the integrity of the general obligation bonds pertaining to municipal water commissions. It also permits municipalities which are members of such commissions to, by referendum, provide for general obligation bonds to prepare for these. I'll answer any questions, but I don't think there is any problems. And I do move to adopt and accept Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Klemm has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 879. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those... One moment. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Brummer: "Is there anything in here other than... dealing with other than Lake Michigan water?"

Klemm: "Well, not in the Conference Committee Report. In the Bill, yes."

Brummer: "What's in the Bill?"

Klemm: "Well, the Bill was the preannexation agreements between municipalities and property owners could not exceed 20 years. That was part of the original Bill. Also, it established a method of determining value of water and sewage systems to be purchased by municipalities. That's still in the Bill. Let's see what else. The American Flag. The displaying of that is still in the Bill. Those were not ..."

Brummer: "The American Flag... Okay. That's in the Conference
Committee, I see."

Klemm: "Yes, but all we did was added on that the safety and welfare of the public on that one."

Brummer: "Okay. What are the provisions regarding the authority of a commission to borrow money for carpet purposes under

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Chapter 24, paragraph 11-134-4.1?"

Klemm: "You'll have to give me a moment on that one."

Brummer: "It's on page... Beginning at the bottom of page ten of the Conference Committee Report."

Klemm: "This is... permits the municipal water commissions to issue general obligation bonds by direct referendum. That would be starting at the bottom of page ten and going to bottom of page twelve."

Brummer: "Okay. And... And on page sixteen, there's language dealing with the fair cash market value and existing waterworks. Does that incorporate the provisions of Representative Hastert's Bill that we had previously heard?"

Klemm: "That is correct. It has been changed to, as you can see on page sixteen and seventeen on the Conference Committee Report, to limit it. But that was Hastert's..."

Brummer: "What are the changes with regard... How does this alter
the original Bill that passed out of Committee that
Representative Hastert sponsored?"

Klemm: "Well, it only applies to municipalities with populations greater than 30 but not more than 40,000 in counties that are not less than 300,000 or more than 400,000. So, it did limit which municipalities would it apply to."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in report... in support of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 879. This... This Report will substantially help solve a number of suburban problems. It is drafted in such a fashion that without it we would run into a very serious problem in providing water in the suburbs. I believe that Members should support this, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on it."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Klemm has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed This requires three-fifths vote and by voting 'no'. final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. 'ayes', 4 'nays'... The machine was... machine was a malfunction. We're going to have to take another Roll Call. Somebody tried to jump on there right at the I'm sorry. Dump this Roll Call. Alright. We'll end. again. On this question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will ... Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Оn this question. there are 94 'aves'. 8 'nays', 9 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 879. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 543. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "It's okay. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Conference Committee Report on House Bill 543 under the category of State Government. It includes the Arts Council, Capital Development Board. Bureau of Budget, Court of Claims, Revenue, retirement systems, civil service commissions, Central Management Services, Industrial Commission, Commerce and Community Affairs, Labor. Human Rights Department, Human Rights Commission, Transportation, medical center. Metro fair and exposition listed but was not funded in this group. The original Bills as introduced were nine hundred and eighty-five million three hundred and eighty-five thousand point six. As revised, it's nine hundred sixty-five million eight

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

hundred and eighty-five thousand point nine. The change was an increase (sic - decrease) of nineteen thousand (sic - million) four hundred and ninety-nine (sic - thousand) point seven, and these Bills were introdu... or discussed at great length on this House floor. And I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 543. The Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, Ted Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 543. I believe we have a 19,000 (sic - 19,000,000) dollar increase (sic - decrease) over the budgets as we discussed, amended and approved them previously. I would ask for your 'aye' vote to adopt the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lee, Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to discussion of this, but I do not have a copy of that Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummer."

Brunner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Brummer: "I don't think you indicated in here, and this is really kind of a general inquiry, where is the Public Defender Appellate Commission funding? Okay. I've been advised it's in Senate Bill 384. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion,
Representative Barnes has moved that the House do adopt the
First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 543. Those
in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting
'no'. This is final passage and requires three-fifths vote.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question, there are 78 'ayes', 23 'nays', 8 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 543. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 888... Who's seeking recognition? Your light wasn't on. Oh well. I've got a bad ear here; and, to tell you the truth, I've got a cataract operation I need next month. So, that's why of you in the back don't see me, but I haven't told anybody that yet. Senate Bill... House Bill 888. Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Conference Committee Report on House Bill 888 is under the category of Environment. It includes the budget of Agriculture, Conservation, Energy and Natural Resources, Environmental Protection, Mines and Minerals, Pollution Control Board and the Historical Library. The original package as introduced was sixty million one hundred and three (sic thousand) point eight. As revised, it was 67,922,000. The change is 7,797 (sic seven million eight hundred and eighteen thousand point two) dollars. These budgets also were discussed quite thoroughly on the House floor, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 888. The Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, Representative Ted Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave of the House, rather than to go back and redo all of these sheets, to amend on its face to indicate the fund from which the 15,000 dollars will come from on

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

page 16 of the Conference Committee Report on line four, after it says Section 1-27. I wish to insert there, with leave of the House, 'from the Agriculture Premium Fund', to indicate where the money is coming from. We have discussed this with all interest... known interested parties. And it would not then come from General Revenue Fund. It was a drafting error. And I'll ask leave to amend this on its face."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to amend it on its face. Leave is granted. Proceed."

Leverenz: "Thank you. I rise in support of the Pirst Conference
Committee on House Bill 888. I believe that all of the
concerns have been addressed through the Conference
Committee. The negotiations were long. The changes were
few. The budgets have been addressed through the Committee
process also. I ask for your 'aye' vote to accept
Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 888."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative
Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will. Proceed."

Tuerk: "In the Conservation Section, there's a million six from the jobs Bills for historical purposes. There's a project up in Peoria County that I've been interested in for ten years. Do you know whether..."

Barnes: "Yes, you're talking about that trail?"

Tuerk: "Jubilee... No."

Barnes: "No? Which other one?"

Tuerk: "No, I'm not. Not this question. I'm talking about Jubilee College, the restoration. Is there any money in there for that?"

Barnes: "Not that I'm aware of, Representative."

Tuerk: "Is it in the reappropriation Bill? Have those funds been

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

reappropriated?"

Barnes: "Have they been appropriated prior to this year?"

Tuerk: "Right."

Barnes: "Then the unspent balance will be reappropriated."

Tuerk: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Diana Welson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to moving as expeditiously as possible, but we don't have these Conference Committee Reports in this row. We have the analysis but not the Reports, and it's very difficult to understand questions that amend them on their face when we don't have them before us."

Speaker Matijevich: "Go back to talk to Ted, and he'll show you.

No. It was... It was something that had to be done. Leave
was granted. Representative Kulas, Gentleman from Cook."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Indica... She indicates she will."

Kulas: "Representative Barnes, in the appropriations under Agriculture, I see a line item for 250,000 dollars for the promotion of the rabbit breeding show. Can you tell me how fast these rabbits breed? Because, two days ago this line item was 50,000 dollars."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp. Oh, Representative

Barnes. I was talking to someone. I missed that. You

know, I like to get in on everything, but... Proceed,

Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Representative Kulas, I questioned this myself. I mean, to spend 2500 dollars on a group that already knows what they're doing is a little bit much. But not only did Representative Ropp want it, it seems that one of the Senators, this is one of his big projects, too. So, we left it in. They felt that it was very necessary."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not in the rabbit business.

So, that wasn't my problem. But I want... just for clarification, under the program of motor fuel testing, it states, in this little white sheet, that it's 370 dollars per sample. Is that... I know we're going to contract this out, but is that the actual cost that it's going to be per sample for testing?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The answer is yes. She's modding."

Ropp: "That's a pretty good amount. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brunner."

Brummer: "Yes. I don't really have any interest in rabbit breeding, but I think maybe we ought to correct the record with regard to that. Our analysis indicates 250,000 dollars for rabbit breeding. I understand it is 2,500 dollars. So, it has gone from 50,000 down to... 50,000 down to 2500. I guess the rabbits are decreasing rather than propagating at the rate Representative Kulas might have indi... thought."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have leave of the Sponsor to ask a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Topinka: "Yes. I notice you have a 90,000 dollar item here for Dana House in Springfield, and I know that the people on the whole who represent Springfield did real well on the tax increase. And I keep seeing Dana House reappearing here and then on 714. Since you have an overall view of the appropriations here, how many times does Dana House appear and for how much? Are we totally rebuilding it, or partially rebuilding it, or renovating or cutting the grass? It seems like we're giving an awful lot to this particular project."

Barnes: "Representative, this is... the 90,000 is for operations,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

and the other amount was for capital. And, as you're aware, since we have been over there several times ourselves it's become quite a tourist attraction in Springfield."

Topinka: "That is in conjunction with the million dollars we paid last year to buy it. Correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Topinka: "Thank you. It's quite an..."

Barnes: "The market value is eight million if everybody recalls."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's not necessary. It looks like Jane
Barnes can close now."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said before, these budgets have been discussed quite thoroughly on the House floor, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Bill 888. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage. takes three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question, there are 80 'ayes', 19 'nays', 8 voting 'present', and the House does adopt... I \* m sorry. Representative Topinka, for what purpose do you rise? You want another ... Let's dump this Roll Looks like some voted the wrong way. We'll dump the Roll Call, and we'll do it again. On this guestion, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will Representative Karpiel. Okay. It's working now. Have all

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 'nays'. there are 87 'aves'. 17 8 voting 'present'. and the House does concur with the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 888. And this having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 378. Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes. I'm sorry. This Bill has not been distributed yet. Representative Woodyard. are you ready with transportation? Let's start getting ready with that. We want to move. On Supplemental 2 appears Senate Bill 1135, Representative Deuchler. you ready with that? Representative Deuchler on Senate Bill 1135."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1135. This Bill is essentially as we passed it before. It merely changes... The Senate changed the effective date to an immediate effective date. The Bill originally stated that in order to receive general assistance, an individual must have been determined to be ineligible for refugee assistance. And the additional Amendment was that the Department of Public Aid shall administer the Emergency Food and Shelter Assistance They already do this, but they don't have clear Program. authority. And I move that the House accept this Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Deuchler has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1135. There being no discussion, those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires Three-Fifths Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 103 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 answering 'present', and the House

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate
Bill 1135. Is Representative Davis ready with House Bill
1978 on Regular Calendar, page three? Representative
Davis, are you ready for House Bill 1978?"

Davis: "Out of the record, momentarily."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. How about 1864, page two?"

Davis: "Out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 2000, Representative Giglio. That's page three."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to 2000. What this Bill does, or the Amendment, it's to protect the local municipalities to recover some of the taxes that they have collected which they have to give back. It's... it's kind of complicated, truthfully, for a person like me. It's mostly a lawyers' interpretation. So, if Representative... if there's any question, I'd yield to Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2000, and Representative Brookins is going wild here waving at me. Representative Brookins."

Brookins: "I don't have no copy of that."

Speaker Matijevich: "There it is. Ethel will give you her copy.

Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman, or Representative Cullerton or somebody yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could he be anything but a Gentleman?

Representative Cullerton, do you want to respond

Representative Levin?"

Levin: "On page two of the Amendment, Section 149, it limits recoveries against a municipality. And my question is,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

what... what categories of recovery is this provision intended to preclude that, you know, areas where the law now provides for recovery?"

- Cullerton: "I have to ask you to try to rephrase that guestion.

  It's designed to... to define how a refund of a tax that had been declared unconstitutional is to be obtained. And it defines how it is limited. It limits the right to obtain the refund."
- Levin: "Is this intended to preclude payment of interest? It states, 'No other recovery shall be allowed.' And I'm just wondering, you know, what it is... what other... what kind of recovery can we have now that this would preclude in the future?"
- Cullerton: "Well, the... they're limited to a refund not exceeding the taxes, the fees or charges paid."
- Levin: "So that means that they wouldn't be able to get interest?"
- Cullerton: "I don't know the answer to that question. The purpose behind the Bill is to, you know, set a time period of one year. Now, I don't know the answer to your question with regard to interest."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question? Will the Gentleman yield to a question? Either John or Frank, I just wanted to... some clarification. It might be going into a little bit of what Ellis asked a second ago. The last paragraph in our analysis says, 'The language restricting taxpayer refunds for illegally collected taxes by a municipality raises serious questions concerning its constitutionality and appears to shift the balance in favor of the municipalities over the taxpayer in the local tax disputes.' Would you explain why this, you know, they come

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

up with this and what the problem they would see in the potential... the potential problems as far as this goes?"

Cullerton: "Well, I think that your analysis is somewhat accurate in that it does raise constitutional questions, but that's why we're going to have Getty on the bench so he can rule on it. But we have to pass it first before they can

Piel: "When you talk about the constitutionality though, John, wouldn't you suggest, you know, going to a Second Conference Committee Report and clear up any problems that you might have as far as the constitutionality of that question?"

Cullerton: "No. No."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, Sir. Proceed."

declare it unconstitutional."

McCracken: "Representative, is... is there some statutory authority now for refunds? Are we operating under the Revenue Act or..."

Cullerton: "My understanding is there's no statutory language dealing with this... with refunds of taxes that were declared unconstitutional. It's... It's case law."

McCracken: "Okay. So, there's no statutory prerequisites, no filing an objection, paying under protest. None of that's necessary. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, who's the Sponsor of the Motion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Giglio, and he yielded to Representative Cullerton."

Vinson: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "Does your provision amend the Municipal Code, or does it

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

amend... What does it amend? That's my only question."

Cullerton: "Chapter 24 adds a new paragraph."

Vinson: "Is that the Municipal Code?"

Cullerton: "It's... It doesn't apply to counties or townships.

It's... It says specifically, 'in any action against a municipality'."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Carol Braun's light is on. and it's off now. There being no further discussion, Representative Giglio has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2000. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'no'. This is final action and three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted? Getting close. Have all voted? All voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... will hold still for awhile. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Somebody's going to do some work here. Have all voted? Representative Giglio. Representative Cullerton, did you want to ... "

Cullerton: "Yes..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Clerk will take the record. I... I got news for you. It's still open. Clerk didn't take the record.

I was just kidding. I was playing... I was... I was playing one on you, people. So you thought you had me.

And that's a Republican Clerk. He knows how to cooperate.

Representative Giglio to explain his vote."

Giglio: "I guess, truthfully, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's probably a little difficult for those of us that are not lawyers to understand this Bill. But it only applies to municipalities, and there is... there is not anything in the statute to define something like this. And what we're trying to do is put it

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

in the statute, like this Body should, and let the courts determine if it's legal or not, hopefully, when there's a case filed against it."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? As long as the Clerk is me, I'm alright. Take the... Come on Kirkland. Quit playing games with me. Record. On this question, there are 71 'ayes', 33 'nays', 11 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on 2000. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Calendar, same page appears Senate Bill 949. The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly. Senate Bill 949."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Representative Ewing. I move... I move adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 949. as it left the House, is now back in the shape where it left the House. It simply creates it's a technical thing - creates a new fund within the Department of Rehabilitation Services into which they can deposit donated funds that they receive. The Comptroller requested this. It's been signed off on by him and by DORS; otherwise, they keep or spend the grants or money that they may cannot So, I move adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 949."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 949. There being no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires Three-Fifths Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 98 'ayes', 11 'nays', and the House... Representative Reilly. Yes, Representative Reilly."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Reilly: "We're going to have to back up, because, inadvertently,

I have... I have misled the House. Can we... What's the
procedure? Should I move to reconsider? Can you just dump
the Roll Call, because I did not read my analysis clearly
enough."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider? Does he have leave? Leave is granted. The..."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Motion is to reconsider. Proceed."

Reilly: "And I apologize. I had simply not read thoroughly Senate Bill 949, as it left the House, did indeed enough. do as I just described. It created the fund, and the Conference Committee affirms that. The affect of the Conference Committee is also to add in a renewal of the authority that we granted last year to transfer money into the... from various listed funds into the General Revenue Fund may not exceed 100 million dollars. The effect only goes through the 1st of January. The money must be repaid by July 1st. We did that this year. It was the only way we got through on a cash flow basis. We kept every promise we made. As a matter of fact, returned the money sooner than it needed to be. And it seems to me, as tight as things are going to be this fall before the new revenues begin to come in, that this is an absolutely necessity. So, on that basis, I'd be glad to answer questions. Otherwise, I would move for House approval of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 949."

Speaker Matijevich: "You are moving to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 949. There being no discussion, those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this there are 85 'ayes', 20 'nays', 3 answering 'present'. The House does adopt the First Conference Report on Senate Bill 949, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, hereby declared passed. On House Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Bill 714, which was taken out of the record, and I understand something has been worked out understand... understanding of it. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, once again, I move for adoption of Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 714. Ιt is the Capital Development appropriation Bill for this year, with both new and reappropriated in it. I will be happy to try to monies explain any questions or defer them to Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I realize that we're trying to move through this very rapidly. I think it's unfortunate that we did not have time to discuss some of the items in this important package. The fact that one of the projects which affects my district is not in here, whether it should have been or should not, I don't know; and, as we pass this through, I will never know. I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill and recommend that perhaps, in important matters like this, there needs to be at least some input from the Members."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I asked a question of Representative Barnes awhile ago relative to reapprop for the Jubilee College Restoration project."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Calendar announcement. We have

78th Legislative Day

- July 2, 1983
- to make these quick so we can get them out as quick as possible."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #3 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you. Proceed, Representative Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Yeah, I asked that question, and the answer was forthcoming. I have received the answer. It is reappropriated, and I appreciate the response."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, in that Bill, Representative Satterthwaite, there's an appropriation for seven and a half million dollars for the Sears building. Is that correct?"
- Satterthwaite: "For what?"

Street."

- Terzich: "Seven and a half million dollars for the purchase of the Sears building in Springfield. Is that correct? Springfield. In Springfield."
- Satterthwaite: "I still didn't get... What kind of a building?"

  Terzich: "The old Sears building on what is that Second
- Satterthwaite: "Yes, I defer questions on that item to Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Appropriations Committee I Chairman, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to your question is that we are purchasing the Sears building. It will be utilized as a state office building. It will house a total computer operation. Is that sufficient?"
- Terzich: "No... One thing I am questioning, Representative

  Leverenz, is is that seven and a half million dollars just

  for the purchase of that property, or does that include the

  renovation and everything else that goes with it?"
- Leverenz: "That is for the purchase of the building. We will take title to the property. Right now, your gross

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

construction foot cost will be over 200 dollars per square foot. It is cheaper to buy this building than to go from scratch. That's correct. No renovation, or it would say that."

Terzich: "Did Sears send you a thank you note for the purchase of that property for seven and a half million dollars?"

Leverenz: "No, but I'm sure, when you vote 'yes', the Governor will send you one."

Terzich: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Will the Lady yield to a question, please?"

Leverenz: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Piel: "Representative Satterthwaite, two questions... or two parts of the Bill that I'd like a little bit of an explanation on. I notice on our analysis it has 1,800,000 dollars for the construction of an all-weather running track. Could you explain this? This isn't for the rabbits, is it?"

Satterthwaite: "Again, I will defer to Representative Leverenz..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz."

Satterthwaite: "... on that item."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's an expert on this. Proceed."

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir. That is a reappropriation. That has been in the Bill before."

Piel: "Well, it might have been in the Bill before, but there's nothing stopping us from taking it out, you know."

Leverenz: "The support was not there to take it out. The support there was on all four sides of the Conference Committee table in support of the project."

Piel: "Very good, Ted. I'm really impressed. Second part - Dana House. I notice we've got an 850,000 dollar total

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

appropriation for Dana House. The 200,000 dollars for the parking facilities. I think any of us that have been over there realize they need parking."

Leverenz: "Correct."

Piel: "But the 650,000 dollars, could you break that down exactly what that's going to be used for?"

Leverenz: "That is renovation of the interior and exterior of the building. As you know, if you go by it now, there is work currently being done. This is to continue that work."

Piel: "They're going to be doing 650,000 dollars worth of renovation to the property in the next year?"

Leverenz: "That is correct, and the value of the property, as it was explained before, is over eight million dollars."

Piel: "Thank you."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Piel: "You're welcome."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask Representative Leverenz a question, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Van Duyne: "Representative Leverenz, is there any money in the Capital Development Board's budget for any work at Stateville Penitentiary?"

Leverenz: "Did you see it?"

Van Duyne: "I'm looking at the analysis here, and there is none designated. But..."

Leverenz: "There is..."

Van Duyne: "But there are vagaries in here, you know, just basic figures for work and such, and so I'm wondering whether there is the 238,000 dollars in there for tearing cell house D down at Stateville Penitentiary."

Leverenz: "I don't remember that particular project."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- Van Duyne: "Well, the project isn't going yet. It is now... The bid has been... hasn't been let. But they have accepted bids, and there's a bid for 238,000 dollars that I don't think is... any way near approaches logic. In fact, it approaches insanity a lot closer. And so I'm wondering and I don't want Representative Matijevich and Representative... I mean Director Lane and Representative Madigan to pull this over my eyes."
- Leverenz: "Let me explain again. As I said, I don't remember the project being in there. I am affirmed that it is not included in this Bill. It was the most frugal meeting I have ever seen on a CDB Bill. We are not building anything that burned down. We are not rebuilding anything that is extremely used. We are doing only those projects that have a high priority on a list on projects to move ahead on. That was not included, the one you have indicated."
- Van Duyne: "Okay. Two real quick guestions. Then the legislative intent is not to put any money in there for that purpose?"

Leverenz: "You are exactly correct."

Van Duyne: "And, also, if you could enlighten me, is there a Bill where it might be in, or do you know of?"

Leverenz: "We have one left in the Conference Committee for use in the fall."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the... Representative

Leverenz a question, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Younge: "Representative Leverenz, was Amendment \$17, which provided for a capital facility... the planning of a capital facility for a high tech center in East St. Louis, taken out?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Leverenz: "That is correct. You will find that the support was not there from all sides on a General Revenue Fund project."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Younge: "I'm opposed to this Conference Committee Report being adopted, and I'll ask for support in this House for sending this Conference Committee back for a second Conference Committee. It is very important for us to put high tech planning and facilities in areas that are severely depressed. I had ... I have reason to believe that the Southern Illinois University, which is a part of this Bill. would keep its agreement with me that ... to facility and that the University of Illinois would not oppose it. I had reason to believe that the... agreements would be kept and; therefore, the integrity of this process would not be put into question. The St. Louis Metropolitan Area is an area of high growth so far as tech is concerned, and we must put these facilities in places where there is job potential so that we will continue to have to require large amounts of public aid and assistance. And so, therefore, I ask you to send this Bill a second Conference Committee so that the agreements that were promised in reference to Amendment #17 could be kept."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Winchester: "Representative Leverenz, in the Committee there were several Legislators who were interested and concerned about various community colleges and various repair of roofs and so forth. It's my understanding that there is a provision that would appropriate 'X' number of dollars for those

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

community colleges, although they're not specified, to have additional funds for repair of structural deficiencies. Is that correct?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz, yes."

Leverenz: "That is correct. It is, I believe, a simple way of kind of block granting, if you will. There's a million-four to deal with construction deficiencies in community colleges."

Winchester: "Thank you very much."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Woodyard has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the main question is put. Representative Satterthwaite to close."

Satterthwaite: "I move for the adoption of Conference Committee

Report #1 to Senate Bill 714."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 714. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires a three-fifths vote. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn, one minute to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My question was going to be... and I think, as we vote on this, we should continue to remember that we have this wonderful seven million dollar appropriation for the vacant Sears building on South Grand here in Springfield.

I'd like to know how many square feet are in that building.

I'd like to know how much per square foot this building has

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

cost, and I'd like to know who currently owns the building.
Or perhaps what may be more relevant, who took an option on
it, in case it just happened to get this appropriation
through, to make a profit of several million dollars? I
just wonder who that person is."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino, one minute to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out for the record, as far as legislative intent is concerned, that the Dixon Developmental Center has a reapprop of 29 million dollars in this appropriation after. over the past eight years, we have poured 25 million into that facility as a mental health facility. I do point out the discrepancies and the differential, the exact increased cost that is involved with the conversion of units, and I would still like to point out for the record that there were no savings in closing the Dixon Developmental Center and converting it into a correctional facilities."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say that this
Bill could get a lot worse. It could be, in my opinion, a
lot better, but it ought to pass. Perhaps, you would want
to take the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 71 'ayes', 30 'nays', 12 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 714. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #2, appears Senate Bill 1002, Representative Stuffle. Out of the record. Proceed."

Younge: "... for a verification of this Roll Call. My light was

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

on, and there's one thing that we ought not tolerate here is that you should not recognize people when they... if you know they want a verification."

- Speaker Matijevich: "You should have learned something yesterday. Representative Younge, the rules require that one, to be recognized, has to be in their seat. You should have learned that. You weren't in your seat, and we're on another Order of Business. We're on another Order Business. Senate Bill 378. Out of the record. Senate Bill 384. Out of the record. 313, Slape. Are you 313? One second. On Supplemental Calendar #2, appears Senate Bill 702. Representative Jaffe. Gentleman Cook, Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: Speaker, I'm going to move to adopt the Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill #702. This Committee Conference... Conference Committee Report is identical to the First Committee Report. The only difference is that took out the effective date. So, it needs fewer votes in the Senate. We have passed it repeatedly in the House. have debated it, you know, nine million times. think we Basically, it's the Bill that deals with three things deals with allowing a partnership to sue in its partnership name. Ιt also the has thing that Representative Kirkland wanted with regard to the landlord's five day notice. And the other thing is deals with the forum nonconvenience. I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 702. Representative Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would simply remind the Members that this is the Bill dealing with Madison County which has become something

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

of a laughing stock or infamous, if you will, across the country as a playground for... for trial lawyers to be able to bring a case before a friendly Judge or set of Judges, as the case in Madison County may be, to the expense of most of the parties involved in the general population. I would recommend a resounding 'no' wote on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Did he... Representative Jaffe has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference... Oh, I'm sorry. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I rise in opposition also to 702. This... This Ri 11 is trying to prove that persistence pays off. It's been beaten three times in the Senate. And Representative Jaffe was very candid for the Amendment which deletes the effective date. It can't pass in the Senate, and I hope it pass in the Senate as amended this time. This Bill is something that should make us ashamed to be lawyers. is a Bill that's designed to take advantage of unduly It's a Bill to take advantage of sympathetic juries. people doing business in the State of Illinois. It's Bill that should be beat. Let's stand up. Let's have some Let's say, 'No'. It's lost three times in the backbone. Senate. Beat it now. Beat it here."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the preceding speaker, he has always told us that he really isn't a lawyer. He's just a prosecutor. I think he just convinced me of that particular thing at the present time. This thing has passed in the House beforehand. I think I was quite candid in my remarks about it. I think we ought to pass this through and get it to the Senate where they will pass it, and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe has moved that the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 702. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes 60 votes and is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 64 'ayes', 45 'nays', 1 answering 'present'. House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 702. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1002. Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker ... "

Speaker Matijevich: "This is on Supplemental 2 Calendar."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Second Conference Committee Report on this particular Bill. We had a problem on the first one. Representative Hoffman concern about those counties who were under had some election commissions, in this case, DuPage County. We've removed the language that affects DuPage County from the Conference Committee Report so that it now contains what it did before, the underlying Bill. The Amendment for public input at county board meetings and the provision to allow the downstate counties, where they have county clerks running elections, to provide for an increase of two and a half cents in their rate for conducting elections or a cap their costs if they reach their costs before they reach As I indicated and read their rate limit. you yesterday, the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois supported that Report, and they support this Report because. as T said, they had agreed earlier if the rate we placed in at the time of the passage of a consolidated elections was they would support an inadequate. increase. They do support this one. And I reiterate the cap will any county to exceed their actual costs in their levy. I

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

would ask, along with Representative Woodyard, for an affirmative vote on the Second Conference Committee Report to this Bill."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle has moved that the
  House do adopt Second Conference Committee Report on House
  Bill 1002. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
  Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday when this First Conference Committee Report came up, I opposed it. Discussed this with the Sponsor of this legislation. He's been very accommodating. He's done as he indicated he would. And I now stand in support of the Bill, because there are many, many counties that need this particular legislation."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1002. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final takes Three-Pifths Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this there are 74 'ayes', 32 'nays' and 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1002. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1192, Representative Koehler. Are VOU ready? the Out οf record. Senate Bill 332, Representative Hensel. Are you... Hensel. Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 332. What the Conference Committee came up with, they added into the Bill to exclude those who commit misdemeanors from the state prison system, to keep from

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

exceeding the system's capacity. In 1982, the total number of misdemeanors that were committed to the Department of Corrections, the total number admitted were 842. The average daily population in the Correction institutions was 281. The average length of stay in the Department of Correction institutions were six months. And if there are any questions, I'll try to answer them."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hensel has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 332. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Hensel: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Dunn: "At the... First of all, who is going to reimburse the local governments for any increased costs as a result of this legislation, which would require that all misdemeanor convicts be confined in the county jail instead of the facilities of the Department of Corrections?"

Hensel: "The county would have to sustain the cost on keeping them in the county jails."

Dunn: "And where will the county get those funds? Is there... Is there a corresponding appropriation Bill someplace to provide additional funds to counties to reimburse them for these costs which are mandated by this Bill?"

Hensel: "I don't think there's any appropriation at this time, no."

Dunn: "What are... What is the maximum penalty for which a misdemeanor or a conviction can be... What is the maximum penalty which can be imposed for a misdemeanor conviction?"

Hensel: "These would be Class A misdemeanors and... 364 days, just under a year."

Dunn: "And have not some people, who have been convicted and sentenced to six months or up to a year in confinement,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

been sent... sent to Department of Correction facilities, particularly at Vienna?"

Hensel: "I didn't catch the question. I'm sorry."

Dunn: "If people are sentenced to confinement for six months or up to a year, hasn't it been quite common that they do not serve their time in county jails, but they serve them in Department of Correction facilities?"

Hensel: "Yes, that's correct."

Dunn: "And there will be quite a few of these people I would imagine."

Hensel: "Yeah, the daily population in the Department of Correction institutions is 201; and, because of the..."

Dunn: "Well, my analysis indicates that, as of March, 1983, there were 865 misdemeanor convicts in Department of Correction facilities. What is the cost per day for... or cost per year per convict in a Department of Correction facility, misdemeanor convict?"

Hensel: "The number, the 800 figure or whatever it was you gave is the yearly intake, and the cost is approximately 12,000 per year."

Dunn: "And what is 12,000 multiplied by 865?"

Hensel: "Just give me a minute. I don't have my calculator."

Dunn: "I don't either. That's why I asked."

Hensel: "I believe that it would be about a million, unless my decimal point is off. Ten million?"

Dunn: "Be more like ten million, wouldn't it?"

Hensel: "Ten million."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. What this Bill does is impose a ten million dollar price tag upon the counties of the State of Illinois, and I ask you where the counties are going to get the funds to pay... pay these... for the confinement of misdemeanor convicts. We have state facilities which were established,

### 78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

designed and operated for the purpose of housing set up, those who have been convicted of misdemeanor sentences year in confinement. And it's been more or less traditional that you might serve 30 days in a county particularly downstate, maybe even 60 days, but anything over that you're generally put in confinement Department of Correction's facilities. This Bill, instead of making that discretional with the Judge who sits in the home county, who knows what's going on in this jail, knows whether there's room in the jail for a prisoner or whether there is not, knows whether to send the prisoner to the Department of Corrections or keep him in the county Bill mandates that the prisoner remain behind in the county jail, most of which downstate are overcrowded have no more room. There's no more money. There's no wav to get money to house these convicts in county jails, and is just a thinly veiled attempt to cover up the fact that we have a tremendous shortage of prison space in State of Illinois. And this is one more way to cover it Those who say you lock them up and throw away the key are those who ought to sponsor the appropriation Bills to provide housing for convicts. If they are unwilling to that, they shouldn't support such legislation, and they should not be imposing Bills like this upon the counties of those of us, particularly in downstate, whose jails are overcrowded. We don't have any money. We're not going to benefit that much from the income tax increase... plenty money in the State of Illinois at the present time. Tf we can spend seven and a half million to buy the Sears building right here in Springfield, we can spend ten million dollars to the State of Illinois to pay for the housing of misdemeanor convicts where they've traditionally been housed for years, and years and years. This is a bad

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Bill. Let's defeat it, send it back to Conference Committee and clean it up."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe, Chairman of Judiciary."

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Hensel: "Yes."

Jaffe: "Was there or is there still an agreement between the County of Cook and the Department of Corrections, wherein there is an agreement that the Department of Corrections will take the overflow of misdemeanors if they are capable of doing so? It's my understanding that there is such an agreement."

Hensel: "Would you repeat that? I couldn't hardly hear you."

Jaffe: "Okay. What we have in Cook County is I think that there was an agreement between Cook County and the state that, in the event that the state could, they would pick up some of the misdemeanors, because county jail is overflowed. I know at the present time they're both filled to capacity; but, at one time, they had that agreement. I still think that agreement is in effect, is it not?"

Hensel: "No, there's no agreement, but they do send them at the discretion of the sheriff."

Jaffe: "Alright. Well... Okay. Well, the problem that you have over here, if my Conference Committee Report is correct, is that, by law, we would now say that the unit... that the Department of Corrections would be prohibited from placement of misdemeanor convicts in their facilities. Is that correct?"

Hensel: "That's correct."

Jaffe: "Well, why do we want to do that, if we're in a situation where, say, they do have space, and they are able to help out the Sheriff's Office in Cook County? Why should we

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

mandate, by law, that they cannot do that?"

Hensel: "Well, what they're trying to do is keep the ones that are in the corrections the ones that have committed felonies and to take the ones that have committed misdemeanors out. I would believe that they would accept the ones from the counties that have the felonies, and I think that would keep them segregated a little better."

Jaffe: "Well, to the Bill, if I might, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Jaffe: "The one thing that bothers me about the Bill, in addition to what Representative Dunn said, is that we, in Cook County, had an agreement with the Department of Corrections, and that agreement stated that the Department of Corrections would, in fact, pick up the overload that we have in County Jail. As you know, in County Jail there are all sorts of lawsuits pending, because we really don't have enough room in County Jail. I don't see ... I understand now that they're both filled to capacity, and there isn't much movement. But I don't see why in the world we would mandate that the Department of Corrections could not enter into this type of an agreement when, in fact, it could help Cook County out. I think that it's a bad thing to put into law. You shouldn't put in a prohibition that... that would prohibit an agreement, you know, that has stood in Cook County for a long period of time, and I think, in the long run, it's going to hurt the people in Cook County. And. therefore, I would vote 'no' on this particular Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved the previous question.

Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay', and the previous question is put. Representative Hensel to close."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Hensel: "Yes, I would just like to remind everyone that what they're trying to do is free up the beds so that they can keep the felons in jail and not turn them loose early. It also would keep the ones that have committed misdemeanors closer to home; and, if they have good records, they could probably be released early. I also understand State's Attorney Daley is in favor of this. And I would just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hensel has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 332. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This requires three-fifths vote. Clerk will... Representative Friedrich, one minute to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Could we have a little order, too, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's have a little order."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a good Bill, and I'll tell And I'd vote for an appropriation to make that money why. available to the county jails. What's going on now, a high percentage of these... these people come from Cook County. They get a six month sentence. They allow them for the time prior to the trial. So, they're sent down to Vandalia for three months. They have to be processed, in addition to the transportation down there. They're out in three months. You have to buy them a new suit and give bucks and a bus ticket back to Chicago. Some of these guys are getting a new suit every year, and it's... tell you what, it's really expensive and if ... there's nothing right about it. I realize that it will cost the counties ... "

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Friedrich: "... and I will... I will vote for an appropriation to reimburse the counties. But that's the way to go, because

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

it will avoid building more prisons and save a lot of money."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring his remarks to close. Representative Cullerton, one minute to explain his vote." Cullerton: "Yes, I am speaking in favor of this particular I don't think ... I think people are missing the point. state prison include some of our murderers. rapists, armed robbers, and they are housed in these state penitentiaries. What this ... What the practice has been is counties who are unwilling to raise the money update and build new prisons still have Judges who like to send misdemeanants to jail. And since there's nο their county, then they have to go to the state prison and mix with these felons. That can only have the of encouraging these misdemeanants to become felons in the future. Now, I think the counties and the local. there have got to know what the ... what the situation is when they send people to jail. When they send misdemeanors to jail, they should take the responsibility. They are the ones that would know that their county jail is overflowing. They might be a little bit more considerate, I think, and consider alternatives other than sending misdemeanants to jail. But to mix misdemeanants with felons is really a bad, very bad concept, and I don't ... I just think the people are missing the point. This is going to encourage and increase crime if we continue to mix them. So, I think

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 74 'ayes', 38 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 332. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared

we should vote 'aye'."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

passed. On the first Calendar.... On the first Calendar appears... Representative Breslin on House Bill 1257, on page two of the Regular Calendar. Representative Breslin. This is why I had to move fast, LeRoy. Peg Breslin's next, and you never can tell. Today is her due date."

Breslin: "I think I'm being used for a lot of excuses around here. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Conference Committee Report #1 on 1257 deals with the House Bill creation of the Illinois Super Fund Program. These are the changes that are made in the hazardous waste disposal fee structure. It increases the fee for off-site disposal from one cent to three cent, it... for liquid waste. from two dollars and two cents a cubic yard to six dollars and six cents a cubic yard. This is for off-site disposal. Previously, there was no fee on on-site disposal and been raised to three cents also. The original Bill raised it to three cents also. That is not a change. 1,000 dollar cap remains the same. The deep will... well injection fee has been increased. It was, before, it was on a 2, 4, 6,000 dollar schedule a year. Now it is at 2, 5 9,000 dollar a year schedule. There were many people who thought that the original fees were much too low. that is the reason for this increase. It also establishes fee for off-site treatment. That is reclamation, and recycling of hazardous wastes of two cents gallon or four point four dollars and four cents a cubic The majority of the rest of the legislation stays the same. This legislation still authorizes the General Assembly to appropriate money to the Hazardous Waste Funds. It has a 10 million dollar cap of the fund, if the should ever reach 10 million dollars in an unobligated balance, then the fee should be suspended until the obligated balance falls below 8 million dollars. Then the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

fee will be reinstituted. That is all the same. The way
the funds are to be split between the Hazardous Waste Fund
and the Hazardous Waste Research Fund stays the same. And,
the cleanup liability tracks more clearly the Super Fund
Act which we had previously agreed to. The Senate put on
an Amendment that remains on to exempt petroleum products
which tracks Super Fund exactly. I had some concern about
that issue. I am told by the people that drafted the Bill,
compromised on these... on all of these issues that that
was their agreement, and as a consequence, we are going to
accept that. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Breslin has moved that the House do adopt the 2nd (sic - 1st) Conference Committee on House Bill 1257. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I, too, rise in support of the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1257. This Report is specifically endorsed and supported by the State Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers' Association. It deals in a fair way with the problem that we have of raising sufficient revenue for the Super Fund for the cleanup of these facilities. T think one of the most important things Members ought to account in considering this Report is take into the difference in the fees charged between Illinois and surrounding states. Currently, in Illinois, we charge one cent per gallon for the off-site disposal of hazardous wastes. The proposal on 1257, which left the House, and which we voted on at that time in the form of an Agreed Bill, would have raised those fees substantially higher. My recollection is to four cents per gallon. if we raise those fees to four cents per gallon, we would have been forcing... we would have been creating

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Illinois where we were substantially at odds situation in with all of our neighboring states. Wisconsin only fee of .06 cents per gallon. That's not six cents. six tenths of a... six hundredths of a cent per gallon. And Indiana only has a fee of three-fourths of a cent gallon. If we create that kind of situation, we're going to substantially harm business in the metropolitan and we're going to make it absolutely impossible to raise the money for the Super Fund for the cleanup of these facilities. If we're going to clean up these facilities. we're going to have to raise the revenue to do it. order to raise that revenue, if we're going to do it in the a user fee, then we have to have people using Illinois facilities for the disposal of these wastes. Committee Report created a more equitable Conference situation. It is still a very substantial increase in cost of disposal of these wastes, approximately a 300% increase in the fees paid by off-site commercial facilities. That 300% increase, combined with the other fee increases, will raise the revenue necessary to fund the Super Fund and necessary for the cleanup of these facilities. For those reasons and with the knowledge that the industry groups in question have jointly approved support House Bill 1257, I would rise in support of it and urge your 'aye' vote on the Conference Committee

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. To the Conference Committee Report #1 to 1257. I think this Body should be aware that since the Leadership, Representative Breslin, is in favor of this legislation and the Leadership on the other side of the aisle, Representative Vinson, has also agreed with this legislation, I would like to point out that there are some good provisions in here, but

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

there's two issues I think you should be extremely aware Number one, what this Conference Committee will implement upon the recyclers and the technology people I'm not certain that's the right way to go, because in fact, you lower the landfill charges from the original concept and then institute a fee for recyclers, what you're saying in essence is that. 'We agree landfills should continue to be the mode of operation for hazardous waste. I'm not certain that this House should take that posture. There are good provisions in here as it pertains to the Super Fund. I think that has been reached. I don't particularly care for that agreeement because the landfills happen to be in And I think it's rather ridiculous to charge the recyclers who are doing a job technologically to eliminate put them in there and make that a disadvantage waste. for those individuals. I also think that the deep injection should be addressed with a higher fee since they are placing more of the hazardous wastes in deep wells. don't understand how this Conference Committee got to where it is now. I disagree with those two provisions. I do not philosophy of increasing or decreasing the fees the for landfill operations which will promote landfill And that's where all of our problems are. I'm sorry to say this has been agreed to by, it looks to me like, Leadership on both sides of the aisle, but I quess that the other provisions of the Bill would be acceptable. getting an awful good Somebody's break here. Tim not certain who it is, but if I were interested. as many Members are in this House, I'd certainly find out before I voted on it. In that regard, I will vote 'present' on this legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, the Majority

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Leader, Jim McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to make just two points in regard to the There are currently seven states, I believe, in the country, among them, New York, Florida, Kentucky and that currently impose a fee on processors. We have on the Super Fund cleanup list in Illinois today eleven sites. Three of those sites are processors. I think you will remember recently where the Attorney General became involved with the cyanide chips in Chicago that had been abandoned. Those cyanide chips were taken to a processor to deal with. So let's not pretend that the processors are the best environmentalists in the country either. I think that a fee imposed on incineration is just as important as imposed on land disposal. I think that those individuals that live next to incinerators are concerned about what's coming out of the smokestack just as those that live next to a landfill are very concerned about what may be going into the ground water. So, I think this addresses both problems. I think it's a fair and I think that when we raise fees by 300% on the business community, it's about as much as they can bear. we take into consideration how many other taxes we have been forced to raise this year because of the Reagan recession. I think this is a good compromise, and I would urge everyone to vote for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Will Representative Breslin respond to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Oblinger: "Representative Breslin, I have one of the concerns that Mr. Mautino did, and that is why we are taxing, or whatever you want to call it, the deep well people.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

They're the ones that are doing what we want them to do.

They've invested all this money, and then we put a big fee
on them. And I don't understand why we penalize people who
are doing what we want them to do."

think vou mis... misunderstood Representative Mautino's comments. As I understood them, I thought he said that he thought the deep well injection fee was too Isn't that... that is correct. low. That's what he said. is a very difficult package to put together. Representative Oblinger. There are many people who believe fee is too low. There are many who believe the fee is too high. It is... this is a compromise between all those many, many varied interests. The deep injection, from what I have learned, is the safest of landfilling that is... that has been used in this state for many years. That is the reason that it is fee structure and not on a cent per injected schedule as the others are. In addition to which, people should know that those people who ... who do deep well injection, and there are only five companies in the state, that substance they deep well inject is the least harmful to the environment because of its high dilution. And injected below the water levels in ... in every place in the It is almost a mile injected into the ground, and the area that it is injected to is covered by shale on bottom and shale on the top, so that it cannot permeate those two areas. However, there are many people who believe that because it is landfilling period, it should be discouraged one way or the other. So, this is the We originally had... had compromise. brought their fee down to substantially less than it would have been, had it been a three cent fee or the three dollars and three cents per cubic yard fee. That's all I can tell you.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Representative."

Oblinger: "Thank you. I thought we ought to at least offer some incentive for the proper way to do this, and we're not."

Breslin: "Yes. I would also say at this time, Representative, that because we have... have made this compromise on the fee for deep well injection, we in no way intend to influence the present dispute between deep well injectors and the EPA over whether or not they should have been paying the off-site disposal fee for the past few years. That is presently a dispute that has been turned over to the Attorney General for litigation. We, in no way, want to affect the outcome of that suit and don't mean to make any statement as a General Assembly as to what should have been done in past years in Illinois regarding the payment of fees by deep well injectors."

Oblinger: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. Representative Breslin to close."

Breslin: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you should know that this Conference Committee Report, as drafted, raises a lot more money than the previous Bill did. That is an advantage. You should also know that this Bill has no effect on salt water injection wells. Those types of processes are not even covered by... by the Environment Protection Act. There is no effect there. This Bill only deals with injection of hazardous waste. Lastly, I would... I would stress the fact that this is a compromise piece of legislation. I have some philosophical problems

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

with it. Other people do too, and I appreciate that. we are raising a great deal of money to help us attack the problem of improper hazardous waste disposal. addition to that, you should know that by July of 1984, one year from now, liquid hazardous waste will be precluded in the State of Illinois. By January of 1987. landfilling disposal will be precluded in the State of That is one of the major Illinois. advantages of instituting a fee on the off-site treatment that is processing, reclaiming, recycling, incinerating. Ιf don't do this now, we will probably have to do it at some later day or there will be no fees generated to continue to address the problem of hazardous waste disposal contamination in the state. So, those are the pros and cons. On balance, I believe, an 'aye' vote is the proper vote."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Breslin has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1257. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires a three-fifths vote. Representative Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a potential conflict of interest on this issue and accordingly will vote 'present'. I would... I recognize that this is a compromise and may very well be the best thing to do, but I would echo the sentiments of Mr. Mautino that it seems unfortunate that we are increasing the price of recycling and incineration when those two processes are taking care of the problem and getting rid of it rather than just covering it."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marzuki, one minute to explain his vote."
- Marzuki: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to speak in

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

I was not recognized because the debate. question was I would like to ask this Body to listen very carefully to what Representative Mautino said. in the wrong place at the moment. It's one thing to clean up the problems that we have created at Sheffield. and Wilsonville is another, to make certain that these don't occur by the proper recycling of these materials. think that when we talk about deep wells as a solution. you have to remember that the solution before was Sheffield and Wilsonville. We don't know whether the deep wells are going to work. The fees should be there in order prevent our facing this kind of a thing. It's a very important issue. I think we really should send it back to Committee and get those fee ... that fee structure changed a bit to encourage recycling. It's not going to hurt the can people, the paper people, the people that are doing the obvious recycling now. It's going to hurt those engaged in the more difficult attempts at recycling the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring his remarks to a close."

Marzuki: "... difficult hazardous materials."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Nelson, one minute to explain her vote."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I realize that this Bill is a compromise, and I certainly am pleased that it will raise our Illinois Super Fund money which we need very badly. But, I'm voting 'no' because I object to certain portions of the Bill, namely, those that establish a Hazardous Waste Advisory Council, another Council that sounds very much like a Commission to me, and the Section that imposes a fee on the disposal facility operators. I think that discourages responsible disposal of hazardous wastes through..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Lady, bring her remarks to a close."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Nelson: "... reclaiming and incinerating them."

- "Have all voted? Have all voted who Speaker Matijevich: The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 6 'nays', 15 voting 'present'. adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1257. and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, the Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. House... On the Supplemental Calendar #1. Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you rise?"
- McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and make a Motion that we suspend the rules so that we eliminate an explanation of vote. It's the 2nd of July, and I have no desire to stay down here till the 4th of July listening to a lot of people talk when there's 90 votes on the Bill. Why don't we just do away with the explanation of vote so we can get out of here."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, let's... let's everybody use... try to use their best judgment without going to that Motion. On the Supplemental 1 Calendar is Senate Bill 390. The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would defer to Representative Reilly on Senate Bill 390."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman yields to the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly. Proceed, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 390. This is the DOT reappropriation Bill, and let me explain for those who perhaps have not dealt with that before. We appropriate the entire amount of a project, a road project. It may take two, three, four years to build it. Each year we have

# 78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

reappropriate that money so that the payouts can continue. There are no new projects in here. It's simply reappropriation so existing projects can go to conclusion. The Bill, as revised, contains 18,918,500 dollars. I would move adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 390."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly moves the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 390.

  On that, the Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, Representative Ted Leverenz."
- "Thank you, Leverenz: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 390. You will note. Representative Reilly has stated, there is nothing new in It allows us to complete that which is in and up the development construction. Ask for your green vote."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the 1st Committee... Conference Committee Report on Bill 390. There being no further discussion, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This final passage and takes three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 107 are 'ayes', 1 'nav'. answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 390. And having received the Constitutional Majority... Bill. Kirkland 'aye', is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, Senate Bill 101. Is Representative Vinson on the floor? He's handling this for me. Senate Bill 101. the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Sam Vinson. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe the Membership will recall that earlier

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

in the Session Senate Bill 101 came over to the House and in that form would have essentially revoked what is for all intents and purposes a property tax exemption for pollution control facilities on all regulated utilities. chose to adopt an Amendment to Senate Bill 101 which the effect of realizing the Sponsor's original purpose when first introduced this legislation some time ago. purpose being to ensure that the statute and the property tax exemption pursuant to the statute was not available to nuclear power plants. The form in which the Amendment written would have quaranteed that the property tax exemption would still be available for coal fired utilities. And the purpose for adopting that particular Amendment was number one, to protect and enhance the use of Illinois coal, and number two, to ensure that probable adoption of acid rain legislation in the Congress this fall that we would not be putting ourselves in a position where Illinois coal would fail to be utilized. And we would not be putting ourselves in a position where rates would be unnecessarily increased. utility The Amendment was adopted by a very substantial vote. Conference Committee Report would recommend the ... that the Amendment language which does protect Illinois coal and which does protect the rate payers of coal fired utilities in this state would be part of the legislation. That is in the Conference Committee Report. In addition. the Conference Committee Report also designated that the decertification language for private sewage lines does not interfere with the Cook County Metropolitan Area Sewage Treatment Plants which may cross county lines. However. the language suggested by Mr. Hastert which deals with a particular situation in his area where a private for-profit sewage treatment plant managed to get all of its facilities

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

exempted from the... pursuant to the property tax exemption for this is in the Conference Committee Report. I would move for adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 101."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 101. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "I know... Will the Gentleman yield to a guestion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Pierce: "I know, Mr. Vinson, that you covered a lot of ground there. Are the coal fired electric generating plants, are they back in Senate Bill 101 so that they will not hurt... hurt the local taxing districts where they're located, or is it just the nuclear plants?"

Vinson: "They... The House Amendment remains in the Conference Committee Report. So, if we adopt the Conference Committee Report, and if it becomes law, the coal fired utilities will continue to have the property tax exemption. It's not really an exemption, but in effect, it's an exemption for their pollution control facilities."

Pierce: "So we didn't change their... does the Bill change their status?"

Vinson: "The Bill would not change their status under current law. It would just deal with the nuclear power situation."

Pierce: "But it would with the nuclear power plants so that the
Zion Plant and 'Potesse' Plant in DeWitt County and other
places around the state will not be able to put their whole
plant in as a... and all their containment walls and
everything as a environmental factor to avoid paying real
estate taxes. Is that right?"

Vinson: "Yes, the Zion plant would be fully taxed if the Bill becomes law."

Pierce: "Alright, then I think the Report is a good Report, and I

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

will... I will support Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 101. And I think the Speaker in the Chair deserves much credit. He's kinda guiet today, being in the Chair, deserves much credit for hard work done in earlier stages on this Bill over the past two or three years."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you, Representative Pierce. I appreciate that. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, if I might briefly speak to this issue."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Brummer: "As... As the Sponsor, I'm sure, indicated, I didn't listen closely to his remarks, but this... this Conference Committee Report suggests that the Senate concur on Amendment #1. Now as everyone recalls, who's interested in House Amendment #1 eliminated provisions of this Bill the pollution equipment, pollution control equipment with regard to fossil burning facilities - fossil fuel facilities. That means, for example, in district that there will be eliminated from this Bill approximately 1.8 million dollars per year of taxes that would otherwise have been included within this. don't criticize the... the method by which this addresses the Zion situation. 1 do think unfortunate. And I think this Legislature will ultimately have to address some of the problems that arose as a result of the fossil burning facilities and some of the methods used by some of the utilities of placing those plants, heavily loading them in 1975, 1976, 1977 when they first went on the assessment role. They loaded them very heavily as personal property and not real... not real property. And quite frankly, in my judgment, the... the local taxing officials at that time, not looking down the road to the removal of the personal property tax, did not really examine that issue very closely because when they went

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

•75 or 176, they generated the same amount of taxes whether it was called cor... real estate or personal Then we passed 1296 here, and we locked in some property. of the allocations between personal and real estate the result that, for example, in Jasper County there will be pending after this year's taxes are paid million dollars of payback from the units of local government to the public utility company. That is a AGLA serious issue. That's an issue that's... that's going to be circumvented by the passage of Senate Bill 101. I don't have any quarrel, as ... I'm being repetitious with regard the method by which this addresses the nuclear plants. It ignores the fossil fuel plants, and I would suggest that some place that issue has to be addressed yet within the next forthcoming years."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer. The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Vinson, are you familiar with the constitutional provision that we have that requires that there be uniformity of assessments?"

Vinson: "Yes, I am."

Homer: "Are you concerned that that constitutional provision will be violated by this Conference Committee Report in that nuclear power plants will be treated differently than fossil fuel plants for the purpose of assessment?"

Vinson: "No, I am not, and let me expand on that for a minute.

Mr. Justice Getty and I substantially reviewed that
question before the Amendment to 101 was offered in the
House. There are... the constitutional provision has been
litigated a number of times. The most obvious example that

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

believe most Members around here would be familiar with would be in connection with the separate assessment system have with the farm valuation system in this state. value farm land different in the state than we value other commercial property, and that has been Constitutional. The ultimate question is whether the distinction is reasonable, whether it is a reasonable distinction. And in this case, I believe it is reasonable distinction because of the very different situation you have in regard to a nuclear facility and a coal fired facility."

Homer: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Homer: ΠI don't.. I don't think it's that clear that ... that there will not be a constitutional problem. And although I congratulate Representative Matijevich and Representative Vinson, the others who worked diligently on this Bill, and I agree with the concept as it applies to Zion and other nuclear plants, the same rationale applies equally to fossil fuel plants. These assets are economically productive for the power utility companies because they're allowed to include them in their application for their rate increase. And the cost of that is passed along to the consumer and, in fact, the consumer... the pollution control facilities do generate a return and profit to utility companies just as any other asset that they have. In my particular district, we have a power plant that located within the Canton Union 66 School District. loss of revenue from that ... from that decision or from the decision of the court which removed the... the pollution control facilities resulted in a loss of two million dollars per year in revenue to that school district and a substantial loss in other revenue to other taxing districts

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

located within that ... within that district. And I think this is grossly unfair. We provide the fire protection. the police protection. We provide schools to educate the children of the employees of the power plant. It's a tremendous burden upon the taxpayers of It's a... that area. And to discriminate against those kinds I think is unjust, unreasonable, unfair. And I do think it also, all due respect to the Sponsors, jeopardize your Bill because I think you're going to see a law suit where the constitutional pro... prohibition against the different treatment or the different assessments for like kinds of property will be questioned. And I... it's very regretable that this Conference Committee Report found itself in its present form."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 101. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This requires three-fifths vote, and it's final passage. Have all voted? who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this voted question, there are 96 'ayes', 10 'nays', 1 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 101. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 513, Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Senate Bill 513 is a combination of three Bills at this point, and I would like to just briefly run through them.

One of the provisions of Senate Bill 513 places in it House Bill 626 which passed out of here 108 to nothing and simply repealed obsolete language in the School Code. The second major provision in this Bill has to do with the intent of

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

original Bill which authorized school districts to enter into joint agreements to build or acquire special education residential facilities. It had been amended to provide assurance to private providers that this would not a competitive situation for them and so that the availability of private special education facilities had to be considered prior to any school boards OF алу cooperatives taking action establish their t a own facilities. The third provision of the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 513 adds provisions of House Bill 1187 which passed the House 106 to 4. This to do with some work that Representative Steczo and I did with staff and with members of the State Board of Education to rewrite the School Code Sections that have to school consolidation. We got rid of the word consolidation because in some parts of the state that's a pejorative term, and we worked very hard with staff to put into the statute absolutely clear language about how to go about combining school districts or forming unit districts. That is what is now Senate Bill 513, and I would like to move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady moves that the House do adopt the

  First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513. The

  Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for questions?"
- Speaker Matijevich: ' "Proceed."
- Brunsvold: "Diana, does this include the increase in taxes to offset the unit districts as according to the duel districts?"
- Nelson: "Representative Brunsvold, this does not. It is true that when we worked on this consolidation effort that was part of a package of Bills, but the tax change that would

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

equalize that money available to unit districts with duel districts was in House Bill 1189, and that is not in this Bill."

Brunsvold: "There is nothing in this Bill for a tax increase without referendum?"

Nelson: "No, there is absolutely nothing in this Bill."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Will the Sponsor please..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Oblinger: "I want to know why a Bill that costs nothing but will
do all the good for the senior citizens... We're always
talking about we can't afford money. Here we come with a
nice little proposal that doesn't, why that's been
deleted."

Nelson: "Representative Oblinger, the Conference Committee that met on this dealt with a number of issues and prioritized those issues, and there were persons who disagreed with the concept of providing lunches to senior citizens at the schools. They simply did not feel, those members of the Conference Committee, that schools were presently equipped to handle that additional burden."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, to the... to the Conference Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Oblinger: "I had indicated that this... that I certainly would be agreeable to accepting a substitute for 'shall', mandating schools to do this on the receipt of five percent of the voters to 'may'. The schools may do this, and this was not accepted. When we're always saying, well, everything costs money. Senior citizens are getting greedy. This is one that would have helped them because there are a number of places where we do not have nutrition sites. I can name ten of them in this county alone where the voters would

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

have to determine whether they wanted to do it, and it would help a lot of schools that cannot afford to continue school lunches to do so because the seniors were going to pay for it. And the final thing we all said is, we always say the school referenda do not pass because the senior citizens vote against it. We said this was a good opportunity for them to get into the schools and see what we're doing, and I think this is bad to delete this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummer."

Brumner: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. This Conference Committee
Report which is 51 pages has just now been placed on our
desks. Our rules provide, for a very good reason, one hour
that they should be on our desk. I think we're going to be
here an hour from now. I would ask that this be taken out
of the record for at least a half hour so we can at least
peruse this 51 pages and have some idea of what we're
voting on."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady has moved... The Lady has moved to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513. Out of the record. Okay. Start reading the Bill now. Leave to handle... Leave to proceed with Senate Bill 384. Leave. Senate Bill 384, Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes on Senate Bill 384."

Barnes: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I just took a bite of apple.

Just one minute. Birkinbine says that's not in the rules.

Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 384, this is
listed under the Constitutional Officers and Elected
Officials. It is the budget of the Appellate Defender, the
Attorney General, the Auditor General, the Commissions, the
Comptroller, the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the
Secretary of State, the Supreme Court, Treasurer, budget
for the General Assembly, the Appellate Service Commission
and the Judicial Inquiry Board. As introduced, it was two

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

hundred and eighty-one million four hundred and sixty-two thousand point five. As revised two hundred and seventy-four million five hundred and sixty-three (sic - thousand) point three. And so as you can tell, it is nine (sic - six) million eight hundred and ninty-nine (sic - thousand) point two less."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes... Representative

Barnes has moved that the House do adopt the First

Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 384. The

Chairman of the Appropriations II Committee, Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Ladies Motion, believe if my count is correct that this is the last appropriations Bill we have to pass out of here today. in any event, we're getting real close to the end, and I would just like to point out that we have held to the bottom line that was laid out based on the tax package, that was approved by the Legislature so that this budget is closer to the bottom line than any other budget in the last decade. And I think it's something that this General We... While we did increase Assembly can be proud of. taxes, we have not spent the money lavishly. We have spent it wisely, and we've kept within the bottom line."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to appear to be a spoilsport but I don't... I don't have the Conference Committee Report on my desk. And while I'm here, I would like to raise a point of inquiry. According to my rule books, these Committee Reports, because of the posture that we're in with regards to the Session, requires to lay on the desk one day. I'd like to get a ruling on that."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Senate Bill 384. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage, and it requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 74 'ayes', 29 'nays', 7 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 384. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leave of the rules to proceed with... Senate Bill 378. Leave to proceed with Senate Bill 378. Leave. Representative Barnes on Senate Bill 378."

Barnes: "I defer to Representative Reilly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly on Senate Bill 378."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is our last appropriation Bill. I would move adoption of Conference Committee..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record for a minute.

Representative Breslin, I missed you over there. For what
purpose were you seeking recognition?"

Breslin: "I was seeking recognition..."

Speaker Matijevich: "I thought you needed a doctor, and I didn't want to be involved in it at all. Proceed."

Breslin: "I was seeking recognition to declare a conflict of interest in the last appropriation Bill. I don't even remember the number of it. Oh, yes..."

Speaker Matijevich: "384."

Breslin: "384. I have a personal conflict of interest in the appropriation in the House Bill... House Bill or Senate Bill 384 and, thus, was... wished to be recorded as not voting."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let the record so show. Now we return to Senate Bill 378, Representative Reilly."

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

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

House. House Bill... The Conference Committee Report on House Bill 378 deals with the subject matter of Human Services. Provides the budgets for the Departments of Aging, DCFS, Dangerous Drugs, Rehab Services, Guardianship and Advocacy, Public Health, Vets Affairs, Mental Health and Public Aid. The Bill, as it stands, appropriates 3, 799,369,500 dollars. It is within the summit guidelines just down to the last penny. We have followed those. I would move adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 378."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 378. On that, the Appropriations II Chairman, Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Gentleman's Motion. Afraid on the last Bill I miscounted. This... This, I believe, is our last appropriations Bill. It is the Human Services budget. It is basically as has been represented to you the allocations that you have seen distributed among you during the last several days. And this is out of a 4,000,000,000 dollar appropriation. We are within two one thousandths of one percent of the bottom line. tightest Human Service budget we have ever adopted, but we did provide for all of those programs which were destined to be cut. We have put them all back in pursuant to the tax package that we adopted, and I now support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 378. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 89 'ayes', 14 'nays', 5 'present'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 378, and this Bill. the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority. is hereby declared passed. On page two of the Regular Calendar. under Conference Committee Reports. leave to proceed with House Bill 1838. Leave. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept Conference Committee Report #1 that was corrected. House Bill 1838 contained two provisions that provide for newspaper notices required by the Truth in Taxation Act, contained the commonly known name of the taxing district. Additionally, notices must be the item required in the Act. We removed the Amendment that would require the Comptroller to qive out names and addresses of senior citizens the who are on...under...who are getting grants, and I would Bove to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Capparelli has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838. There being no discussion, all favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting This requires three-fifths and is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 82 'ayes', 13 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. The House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1838, and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page three of the Calendar appears House Bill 1978. The Gentleman from Will. Representative Davis, are you ready to proceed on that? few minutes, huh? Alright. Out of the record.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Supplemental Calendar #3, leave to proceed with Senate Bill 1001, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rhem. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rhem."

Rhem: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Second Conference Committee
Report on the underlying Bill, Senate Bill 1001, the
Conference Committee Report request the Senate to accept
House Amendment #1 which makes administrative changes in
the provisions applying to the Job Training Coordinating
Council. The... Request the House to rescind... to recede
from House Amendment #2 which contain labor provision that
mirrored the CETA Act language for labor guarantees. I
move to adopt the Conference Committee Report #2 on Senate
Bill 1001."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Rhem has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1001. The... Representative Woodyard."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Woodyard: "Representative, you have deleted the language... Over here. You have deleted the language out of the Bill which provided for union concurrence. Is that not correct? And also you removed the guidelines for the... that were under the old CETA program. They now conform to the JPTA guidelines?"

Rhem: "That's correct."

Woodyard: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Woodyard: "I really have no opposition to this Bill. It really doesn't do anything, and we have absolutely no need for it at this time. But I do commend the Sponsor, and I appreciate the results of that Conference Committee Report by you taking out the language that was creating all the problems for us over here. And so I have no opposition to

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

2

the Bill."

Rhem: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dunn."

John Dunn: "Will the Sponsor explain what this Bill does as amended?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed. Representative Rhem."

Rhem: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Rhem."

Rhem: "Representative, this puts... It puts... It codifies the council which has been put into place."

John Dunn: "What council is that?"

Rhem: "It's the Job... Illinois Job Training Coordinating Council."

John Dunn: "Oh."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dunn. Alright.

Representative Friedrich. Representative Dwight

Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think Representative Woodyard... say this precisely. This doesn't hurt anything, but it doesn't do anything either. This... This group is already in place.

They've already organized and met, and they're at work.

Now, we're going to pass this Bill. If you want to vote for it, it won't hurt anything, but it sure isn't any good."

Speaker Matijevich: "Calendar announcement."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #4 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Rhem has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1001. Those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed by voting "no". This is final action and requires a three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

there are 73 'ayes', 29 'nays', 4 answering 'present', and Senate Bill 1001, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page three of the Calendar, leave to proceed with Senate Bill 313, the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would move that the House does adopt the Corrected Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 313. And what this Conference Committee Report asked the two Bodies to do is to amend the enacting clause and strike everything after it. And then what is does in actuality is, it creates nine new Judges in Cook County, three Judges in the full circuit, 1 in the suburbs and 5 in Chicago. It creates two new Judges in DuPage. In the 5th Judiciary District, it creates two new Judges, 1 in the 20th and 1 in the 3rd. In the 2nd Judiciary District, it creates a new Judgeship in the 16th circuit."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Slape has moved that the House do adopt the 2nd... the Corrected Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513 (sic - 313). There being no discussion... LeRoy Van Duyne. 313, I mean."

Van Duyne: "Very, very quickly, is... is there a new Judge for Will County in here? Each circuit located in the 5th Judicial District having a population of excess of... That's the only... applies to the 5th, right?"

Slape: "To the 5th, yes, Sir."

Van Duyne: "There is nothing for the 12th?"

Slape: "No, Sir."

Van Duyne: "How come?"

Slape: "Well, I guess the caseload didn't warrant it at this time. Probably next year, Representative."

Speaker Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the Second...

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Corrected Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 'ayes', 30 'nays', 1 'present', and the House does Second adopt the Second Corrected Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 313. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. believe I announced the...on the last Bill that the Bill received... 313 received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority and hereby is declared passed. On the Supplemental 3 House Calendar, leave to proceed with Senate Bill 513, Representative Gene Hoffman from DuPage Proceed, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen House, the First Conference Committee 513 includes the provisions that were in the original Bill which provided for the authorization to school districts to enter into joint agreements to build and acquire special education residential facilities. This has been worked out with the private providers, and everyone is in agreement on The second provision on... of the Bill that. some errors that were in House Bill 626 as it left the House to repeal some obsolete language, and these changes. the statutory provisions were revisory in natural. And the third provision is the provisions of House Bill 1187 which passed this House 106 to 4 Оn May 27th to revise improve the two articles in the School Code concerned with school district reorganization. There are no non-referendum tax increases in this legislation. It just consolidates, puts things together in a proper order. This was discussed at the time it was on the floor of the House, and I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Report #1 on Senate Bill 513."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Keane. Oh, that's Al Ronan's light. I'm sorry. Al Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a fine Conference Committee Report, but even more importantly, it's got a good Sponsor. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all The Clerk will take the record. voted who wish? there are 102 'ayes', 10 'mays', and the House does adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 513. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental House Calendar #2, leave to proceed 557. with Senate Bill The Gentleman from Representative Nash, on Senate Bill 557. Representative Nash on Senate Bill 557."
- Nash: "Can we take it out of the record for a quick second?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Quick second. Supplemental 3 Calendar appears Senate Bill 1176, Representative Winchester. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, you skipped over Senate Bill 690 on Supplemental Calendar 3. Is there a reason for that?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "No. Let's back up then. Senate Bill 690, Representative Wolf, and then we'll get right back to you."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to adopt Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 690. This is the same Conference Committee Report that we sent out of this chamber yesterday by some 90+ votes. There was a little confusion in the Senate as happens over there occasionally, and they got it confused with another Bill. I think it's been discussed in these chambers, and I would simply move for adoption of Second Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 690."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf moves to adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 690. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bus Yourell."

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Yourell: "Representative Wolf, is it my understanding that contained in this report is a provision that would make it illegal to have certain windows tinted in your automobile if that model year was later than 1978?"

Wolf: "It would require that the glass, if it is tinted, conform to federal specifications. It does make it illegal for certain tinted glass to be on the windshield and the side glass to the left and right of the driver."

Yourell: "Well, suppose... I have a, I suppose, a conflict of interest in this matter. I do have a 1979 Suburban that has all of the windows tinted, but with the exception of the windshield. Now, do I have to remove all of that?"

Wolf: "If the... If the glass on the left and the right of the driver doesn't conform to federal standards, it would.

There is a provision in the federal standards to have... to have tinted glass, but not the smoke type glass that only the driver can see out of. And there are certain

78th Legislative Day

- July 2, 1983
- specifications under federal standards that it would have to..."
- Yourell: "So the answer to my question is, yes, indeed, I do have to remove that. Is that correct?"
- Wolf: "That would be correct if that would be the situation in your case. Yes."
- Yourell: "Well, it is. I... I... have all of the windows tinted with exception of the windshield, so I have to remove all of the tint... I have to remove all of that glass out of there, except the rear deck window. Is that right?"
- Wolf: "Just... Just the glass to the left and right of the driver, not the..."
- Yourell: "So I've got to take that glass out. Is that right?

  Just answer 'yes' or 'no'."

Wolf: "Yes."

Yourell: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in opposition to this..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Yourell: "... Conference Committee Report. I think it's absolutely ridiculous that an individual who has this kind of a situation could not have been grandfathered in when you drew up the report. Now, to suggest that I have to remove all of the windows in my car with the exception of the rear window is absolutely ridiculous, and if anybody is faced with that same situation, I would ask that they join me in voting 'no' on this stupid Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf to close."

Wolf: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the previous speaker has elaborated on this Bill to a degree that it doesn't pertain to some of the provisions that are in there. This only pertains to the nonreflectorized glass. You don't have to remove all of the tinted glass in your car if it's prior to 1978, just those that are on the left

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

and right of the driver. I think this is a reasonable concept, and I would move for adoption of Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 690."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf has... Representative Cullerton, are you seeking recognition? Representative Wolf has moved that the House do adopt the Second... the Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill 690. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. I'm sorry. This requires 60 votes. Alright 60 votes. This requires 60 votes. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I wanted to explain my vote. When this Bill first came on my desk, I agreed with... I had the sentiments that Representative Yourell expressed that there should be a grandfather clause in here. So I put it in. Then the Motor Vehicles Laws Commission came to me explained that people don't have to replace glass. What we're talking about in a tinted windshield is really a film that you can just peel off the glass. That's what explained to me, the Motor Vehicles Laws Commission. Now if they were in error, then the Bill should be defeated. If they're right, I don't see any problem at all."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? Oh, I'm sorry.

  Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

  On this question, there are 60 'ayes', 44 'nays', 7

  answering 'present', and the House does adopt the Second

  Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 690. And this

  Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

  hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1176, the Gentleman

  from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The only thing... When we went to the Conference Committee, one of the Members wanted to delete

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the words, 'any person violating', and insert 'any person who knowingly violates,' and I would now move that we accept Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Winchester moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report There being no discussion, those in Senate Bill 1176. favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. requires 60 votes and is final passage. Bave all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question, there the record. are 99 'aves'. 2 'nays', and the House does concur with the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1176. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. Regular Calendar, leave to proceed, Senate Bill 1222. three. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen House. I would move that we adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1222. T+ contains the provisions of basically two Bills. And the first thing is it to ... it clarifies the legislative intent of Section 24-12 and 34-85 of the School Code as authority of school boards to suspend teachers. to apply only in relation to dismissal procedures. clarification is necessary due to some school boards attempting to expand suspension authority by local policy changes rather than by legislative action. The second part of the Conference Committee contains basically the same provisions that were in House Bill 580. sponsored by Representative Van Duyne, regarding the organization of a community consolidated school district. I would move for the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved that the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1222. Representative Gene Hoffman, the Gentleman from DuPage."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate the explanation of the Sponsor of this Bill, and I rise in support of its passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Cullerton: "Yes."

Hawkinson: "Representative, when we had this Bill in Committee and when we passed it the last time, we still had that rather silly provision the neither you or I agreed with about the Class of felony penalties that was conflict of interest."

Cullerton: "Oh, that was struck. Yes, that was struck."

Hawkinson: "That's out of the Bill."

Cullerton: "Yes, I promised that, and that's out of the Bill."

Hawkinson: "Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 1222. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this On question. there are 99 'ayes', 9 'nays', 2 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1222. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page two appears Senate Bill or House Bill 320, Representative Brunsvold, the Gentleman from Rock Island."

Unknown: "Turn me off."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're off. Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 320, when it

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

passed this House, simply stated that the school employee, a teacher, could examine their personnel files. It did pass. In the Senate, Senate Amendment #1 was attached to the Bill which stated that... gave the formula for adult education, and therein lies the problem. Went to Conference Committee. We discussed it in detail, and I would at this time move for the adoption of Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill... House Bill 320."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brunsvold has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 320. There being no discussion, those in favor signify... Representative Gene Hoffman. I'm sorry. I didn't see... I didn't see you. I'll get back to you, Dick. I didn't see any lights, frankly. Representative Gene Hoffman and then Dick Mulcahey. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I apologize. I didn't get my light on quite as quickly as I should have. I was one of the four Members of the Conference Committee to which the Gentleman referred that met on this particular Bill. Six Members of the Conference Committee signed it. Pour of us did not. deals with the adult ed reimbursement formula, and it is a suggested change from an agreement that was made last School Problems Commission in Subcommittee of the which all of the parties including the parties who proposing this change were involved. Now, the current reimbursement formula is designed to reflect the actual program cost per units of instruction and to reduce the differences in reimbursement levels among programs. Under this formula, adult ed programs are being reimbursed for their actual cost, not to exceed a maximum reimbursement rate of \$29.50 per awaited credit hour. Now, the proposed

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

reimbursement rates in this program would increase the... the level up to 50, let's see what the numbers are here, up to 45 dollars. Now, this exceeds the average reimbursement rate per estimated midterm credit hour in FY'82 because that's the number we use for PY'84 by 55%. If this were to be funded, it would be an additional 3,000,000 dollars, but since it isn't going to be funded for additional money, you're going to have to redistribute the money for high cost programs away from low cost programs. So that. effect, this would actually increase the differences. Now, the proposed reimbursement rate in this program, if we were look at it from the point of view of the general state aid formula which we use just for the general fund for adult students would exceed the foundation level that we have in our present formula which is \$17.64 by over 50% when you use the 29.40 per credit hour. Now, are... there is disagreement among the parties involved. rise in opposition to this. As far as I was concerned, after we finished about a year's work and effort in area, last spring we adopted a program. And now, we're back again before it even goes into effect. It went yesterday, so I shouldn't say even before it goes into effect. It went into effect yesterday. The statute that we put in place, we put in place last year. Bot.h Senator Berman and myself, and Senator Berman was Chairman the Subcommittee, I, as Chairman of the School Problems Commission, endorsed the program from last... last year. I would also bring to your attention ... "

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through?"

Hoffman: "I would also bring to your attention that we have been discussing this quite a bit the last few weeks. We have not been able to come to agreement and... for any change.

And for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

of the House, I rise in opposition to this legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bepresentative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, some of the things the previous speaker said are accurate. Some are not. Frankly, the program put in place last year was put in place with a qun."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. One moment. Representative Breslin in the Chair. Proceed, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Frankly, some of the statements made are accurate. Some are not. The program put in place that took effect vesterdav devastates the community based programs. Representative Hoffman, I think, knows that. Other people here who will rise to oppose this Bill and this report know that too. Frankly, the people who agreed to that year, as Representative Hoffman failed to tell you, had to agree to it. It was the only game in town, as some here like to say. We were at the 11th hour, and adult education in Illinois would have sunsetted without some change in the law. They agreed to that change only with the agreement that if they looked at the formula in place and found that it didn't work or produce necessary dollars. they would come back and negotiate between community based programs and community college programs. The community colleges did not negotiate. They refused to until the last two days, and they can tell you otherwise but it's not true. They offered in the last two days a proposal that's virtually different than what went into effect no yesterday. Very little change. So let's look options. If this Bill fails, will the community colleges The answer is, no, they won't be be hurt? hurt. They won't be hurt at all. They won't be hurt if it passes either, but if this Bill fails, those community based programs that serve the high cost poverty student that by

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

federal law are high cost programs in part because thev require specific full time instructors, and intermediate instruction and other things, those programs may well cease to exist. If you want those to cease to exist, then In the City of Chicago alone, they will lose a half a million dollars if this Conference Committee Report fails in their community based programs. Minimally. without the ability to capture any new money, this House passed out an addition 2,000,000 dollars for adult ed a few minutes ago. That money can be distributed fairly under this formula in this Bill. So if it fails, it won't community colleges, but it will devastate local I have no brief for this Bill for my district. programs. don't even have a community based program, but I'll tell you this, I've worked with them in my old district around this state and looked at the negotiations, if you can even call them that, and I've seen what's happened here. These people are going to be put out of business. put out of business by the community colleges unwillingness to compromise. We offered them, yesterday, the community colleges, a floor to give the community based programs the old '82 funding, work from a new base for the additional and a half millions dollars and spread it out between the two categories. Representative Hoffman suggests up from the law that went into effect vesterday σo from a 29 dollar base to a 45 dollar base for maximum reimbursement, and that's true. But he didn't tell you that they come down from a 52 dollar base that was in effect in FY'82. That's the point. We offered compromise. point raised by the community real compromise, on every colleges, and I have one ο£ those, but they would not negotiate in good faith ... They negotiated in good faith, but they offered nothing, virtually nothing. So the option

78th Legislative Day

July 2. 1983

is to buy the community college argument, and we all have those or to buy the community based program argument and most have those, even though I don't. The point is, you · will devastate, no matter what you hear here, you will clearly devastate community programs if this Conference Committee does not pass. You will not devastate the community colleges. You won't take a dime from the community colleges that they're not getting now. You won't deprive them of access to the new money, not at all. Amendment... This Conference Committee, rather, only fair game in town, not just the only game in town. T+ really needs to pass if we want to take care of those people who want to be educated who happen to be in poverty classes in this state. There's a reason why those programs That's because of the federal mandate that they cost morebe served. It's because, obviously, if you provide day care and transportation under the federal mandate, you have to provide full time instructors. You're teaching the hard to reach and hard to teach as the federal mandate provides. It's going to cost more money. Nobody's suggesting we take away from the community colleges. not not Representative Brunsvold, not anyone. ₩e need Conference Report. We need a fair policy. And without it. keep this in mind. Without it, you devastate those community programs in the City, in Mattoon, in East St. Louis, all over this state. I rise... I urge a n affirmative vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Just briefly, I've been trying to follow this. I have interests on both sides of this issue in my district, and the best sense I can get is that this is a hard worked for compromise. And... And perhaps both sides won't admit

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

that, but that appears what it is. And I think it should be taken that way, and I would urge support for the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."

"Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly, the... McGann: the three previous speakers have certainly given you all of the outlines of this program, but there's something that they fail to realize. And those that are from the Chicagoland area and those that have anything to do with community colleges, those that have elementary and secondary education, beware. They say that if this ... if this Conference Report does not pass that Chicago will lose 500,000 dollars. Believe me, Chicago, that's just a compared to what the rest of the state's going to get. There is a great disagreement with this program as stated before. We're increasing the reimbursement per credit hour but we're going to be servicing less students. Remember that, Members of this Assembly, we'll be serving less students. And I will just quote from the Conference Committee Report you have before you, 'The formula provided for in this Conference Committee Report provides a higher rate of reimbursement per credit hour and, therefore, reduce the number of adult learners funded. Please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Before I speak to the Bill, Madam Speaker, I would ask the

House suspend Rule 65(b) while the present Speaker's in the

Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "65(b) or 67(b)?"

Piel: "65(b). That was my first point. Justice Getty is shaking his head 'yes'. That's the right one, Mike."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the Rule of 65(b). All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say

78th Legislative Day

- July 2, 1983
- 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the..."
- Piel: "Secondly, Madam Speaker, a question of the Chair. Could the Parliamentarian possibly look at the Bill? I notice the names are not typed in on the Conference Committee Report, and I was wondering if it was in proper order."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman's point is well taken.

  Representative Brunsvold moves to suspend the Bule 79(e)...

  79(a) in order to have this Bill heard immediately. All

  those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. All

  those in favor vote... Okay, it takes 71 votes. All those
  in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'.

  Representative Brunsvold to explain his vote."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to say to the Body that this was a staff error. They were instructed have the names typed in, and they did not get the names typed in. I think we ought to at least address the Bill as has been presented because this is a very important issue as far as adult education is concerned. Some people are going to lose if this Bill doesn't go through. So at least let's be able to hear the Bill, and then you may however you wish. But I think we need at least 71, and we've got... Thank you very much for the votes consider the Bill as presented. Thank vou."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much. I... I recognize that the names have not been adopted to this Conference Committee Report.

  We're on the debate. I've spoken in opposition to it. I believe that we should hear this Bill right now, not withstanding that technical error which was no fault of the people who are involved."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

there are 81 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the Motion carries. Is there any further discussion on this legislation? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've talked to Piel: t he people in the community colleges, and a lot of community colleges in this state, a lot of them, I had a whole list of them the other day when I was first brought up on this Bill... A lot of the community colleges in state and throughout everybody's district are going to lose considerable funds with this. I would suggest that you all be very careful how you're placing your vote on House... on the Concurrence Motion on House Bill 320 unless you've checked with your local community colleges and junior colleges. This is a type of a Bill to where the majority of junior colleges or community colleges will either break even or lose money. I talked to the Sponsor of this Bill the other day, and Representative Brunsvold was under impression that when it got to Conference Committee that Amendment #2 was going to be taken out. Amendment still on the Bill, and Amendment #2 would be devastating to lot of the community colleges around the state. A11 I can say is, either a 'no' or a 'present' vote. Send this back to Conference Committee. Get this Amendment taken off, and you know, let him come back with a Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I serve currently on both the Higher Education Committee and on the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee. I think some

78th Legislative Day

July 2. 1983

people are having problems of confusion because they don't realize that these really are two separate programs have been funded by two separate routes. What we are talking about here are programs that are run usually conjunction your local school with district available to people in the community who would never of setting foot inside their community college. The funding systems are different. The programs are somewhat different, and they serve two different sets of clientele. Many of the people who are being served by these programs simply do not consider that they are going into the higher education setting which is the image perceived as community college. I think these programs, run through your school districts, are much more able to serve the very, very needy people who as adults frequently cannot write, cannot cope with the basic kinds of services and abilities that are necessary for employment. These programs work. They work well. We should not endanger them by putting them into a system of funding that does not allow them to continue to function. They are productive in the sense that they take people who are unemployable or employable only at a very low rate and put them into the mainstream of society. I would Members of this House to adopt this Conference Committee Report. We can work further to resolve the differences between the two systems for next year's funding level, but it would be very devastating to put these programs out business at this crucial time when we know that we need to put people to work with an educational skill that their advantage. Please vote 'yes' on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Edgar, Representative Woodyard."

78th Legislative Day

July 2. 1983

Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think there is any stronger proponent of a community college system on floor of this House than myself, as evidenced by the fact that I have been the Sponsor of the formula and rate for the last four years, as well as the appropriation Bills for community colleges, and I certainly don't have a quarrel with the community college system over this. And we all know that we are going to have to do some reforms in the adult educational area. There is no question of that. But this is not the way to do it. I happen to have one the best adult area education centers in my district. T+ has brought people back into a very productive life. Thev have placed over thirteen hundred people in jobs in the last few years. And that's important. If this Conference Committee Report is not adopted, that particular center may very well have to close it's doors. I urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative
Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Many of the questions I have are being responded to by a staff person, but I guess I'd like to ask the Sponsor, if I may, in terms of a situation. If you have a community college that offers vocational training... whose Bill is this? Larry's? I got a community college that has a vocational curriculum. I also have a community based agency that offers vocational training and education. In that instance, how do those two facilities come out on this Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stuffle to answer Representative Mautino's question."

Stuffle: "Maybe you hit upon the best question of the day. Under this Bill, if it passes in this form, your programs in your community, through the school districts or through the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

centers, will be able to capture the money that FY'82. based upon this formula. Then they would have to compete for the rest of the money with community colleges. The community colleges will be able to they captured, capture the money without a doubt. question was raised about less students being served. someone being impacted, my friend, Representative McGann. That's not true. No fewer students will be served either place than before. No cuts will accrue to either community colleges or your adult ed programs in the communities. appropriated two million point one five three more dollars an hour ago. That money will be in the rate formula. Thev both have equal access to that money. Clearly, without question or doubt, this Bill won't hurt either one. If the Bill fails, however, it will devastate the local community based program that you want to see funded, because it will drive the rate down from a maximum fifty-two dollars to twenty-nine dollars. That will mean the high cost program that serves the adult poverty person that wants to go work won't be funded to the level necessary to keep it going."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane." Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I worked today with both sides in trying to affect a compromise on this Bill, and one of the reasons that we can't ... there was no compromise is is that it's a basic question in this Bill is whether you want to serve more people at less cost or fewer people in high cost adult ed programs. I agree with Representative Hoffman. Last year the School Problems Subcommittee worked agreement that everyone at that time agreed to. out an That agreement on rates went into effect yesterday. We are now one day after that agreement has gone into effect being

positions... and asked to dump that agreement.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

think we should. I think there is equity. There's arguments for both sides of the Bill. At the conclusion of our meetings this morning, I asked both sides when there was no... there was no further give on either side, and we couldn't come to a compromise, I told them are now going to go to a decision that will be more of a ... it's not as good a decision as a compromise would have been because it goes into the political process. I think that we should reject House Bill ... this Conference Committee Report, and that we should continue to work, put this back in, ask for a Conference Committee, to hold that Conference Committee... hold Conference Committee Report #2 until fall when hopefully between now and the fall, we can work out an agreement that both sides can support. So on that. would ask you to vote against Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 320."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Let me just reiterate a couple of points. There is doubt that there will be no fewer students served. doubt that the community colleges, Representative Piel, won't lose any money. I heard that same rap. I talked to president. couldn't justify that position either. Нe They will get the same money they got as before, at They will be able to capture, as will the other programs, from the 2.153 additional dollars passed here. passed... that will be passed in the Senate today. point is you either qut the community programs, or you fund them at the old level and let others capture. McGann's Representative statements to the contrary notwithstanding, I hate to differ, they are not spent the last two months every day working with the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

figures from all sides, to a great extent with Senator the Senate. We've looked at every figure and every option. The options today from the community college amounted to little or nothing. These community programs will die. I'm telling you that now. I can tell you at least one that will close it's doors if this fails. want that to happen, if you want to talk about public aid, do it. But if you want to put them to work, if you want to in poverty people, pass this Conference teach them. Committee Report. I repeat, I have no brief, I program. I do have a community college. ı. like Representative Woodyard, have sponsored... in fact, longer than him. seven years in a row, the Community College Budget and Rate Bill. I would not hurt my community college when I have no adult community program. Obviously, a fool to do that, and you know me well enough to know that I get every dollar I can get on this House floor from whoever we can get it from, and I rise and ask for your vote to protect these people that we all say we and we all say we don't want to be on welfare. work. And they ought to be taught, whether it's in the community college or the community program. And when they are taught the community program, not in the community college, then we ought to put our money where our mouth is. equal access to this. Pass the Bill, and guit fighting the turf battles. We can't put it on Postponed. We can't hold for the Second. There will be none. We can't hold it for the fall. The funding is now. The year will be half over by the time we would ever take this up. There are no alternatives. We need this report."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 320?' All
those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

This Bill requires a Three-Fifths Majority for passage. Have all voted who wish? This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, Conference Committee Report #1, there are 54 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Madam Chairman, I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Breslin: "It's really not appropriate at this hour.

  Would you prefer a Conference Committee, Second Conference
  Committee? Very good. The Gentleman asks for a Second
  Conference Committee, and the Second Conference Committee
  will be appointed. Leave to go to Senate Bill 557. There
  being no objection, leave is granted. Senate Bill 557,
  Representative Nash. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"
- Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 557, the same form that it left the House and went back to the Senate, and that deals with our office expense, the seventeen thousand for office expense allowances. It's the language that the Comptroller wanted in the Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the acceptance of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 557, and on that question, the Gentleman... the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to remind you that this Bill is a little bit more controversial then the Gentleman suggested. This is the Bill that would allow Legislators to bill the taxpayers for their travel expenses through their legislative district allowance, so that the legislative district allowance would no longer be designed just to

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

serve the constituents, but it would also include opportunity for us to use it to serve ourselves. no restrictions in this Bill about travel reimbursement except that it cannot be on days when the Legislature is in Session. It doesn't say that it has to be in Illinois. doesn't say that it has to be on official business. Ιt doesn't say that it even has to be within the United States. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is exactly the wrong move to take with the other things that have been going on this week. It would send a very bad signal to the public. The Bill is not crucially needed in its other provisions, and it is certainly very bad in that provision. And it ought to go to a Second Conference or just get wiped off the face of the Calendar. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, would prefer that this would say, travel within your district. I know the people who are talking against live in the suburbs and in Chicago. But what if you had to your district office? I have one down here in travel to Nokomis, a hundred and thirty mile round trip. I try to go at least once a week when we're not in Session, another one in Taylorville, eighty miles a round trip. I pay all expense myself. Portunately, I'm able to afford it. what if I weren't? Am I then supposed to not visit district offices? I would appreciate it if they would limit it, limit the travel money, but I think it's wrong to say, subsidize the state because we are not going to help you with this. It sort of precludes people who don't have extra funds from actually participating in district activities."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I voted 'yes' on this Bill last time it was up, and of course, the news media in my local area received the well know smear letter in several newpapers have printed. I might add that I went back, and I did inform the media that I do have district offices, one in Kankakee, one in Watseka. And I have hours in the Watseka office is two days a week we're not in Session, and with the expenses that we incur as a State Representative and for the expenses that we have for the seventeen thousand dollars a year, if I have money that might be left from the... having two offices, I'm certainly would reimburse myself for the mileage going back and forth to Watseka to service the people in that area. So I would urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw." "You know I hear one of the speaker's talking about this is Shaw: the wrong thing to do. Well, I'd like for some of those ... the person who said that to come over to my office. See, I got at least a thousand letters that I haven't answered over there, that people entitled to get an answer on. you cannot do it with the money that you are now and I think that's unfortunate. I support this Bill, and I urge an 'aye' vote on it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Leverenz: "I understand the Comptroller's Office in the past has paid vouchers for a Legislator on a car checked out of the motor pool. Is that correct?"

Nash: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "And that it is in the wisdom of the Comptroller's

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Office to no longer do that without specific language because it's a gray area. Is that correct?"

Nash: "Yes, the Comptroller's Office was doing that since the enactment of this legislation, but just a few months ago they discovered one of... one of the counsels for the Comptroller discovered that this language was in the gray area, and they drafted the language of this Bill, as I stated earlier, when we had debated the Bill on the floor."

Leverenz: "If a Legislator has to attend a public hearing, as we had in 'Triton' or anything else with the task forces or with the Commissions, and chooses to take a state car, and drive that state car, maybe take staff with him, this allows him to participate in that meeting, paying for the use of that vehicle, serving his constituency from his district office expense. Is that correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "There ... "

Leverenz: "The answer is 'yes', Representative Nash. Just turn around and say 'yes'."

Nash: "Yes."

Leverenz: "Then ... "

Nash: "Representative Shaw's over here talking about the Bill at the same time, and excuse me for not being able to hear you."

Leverenz: "That's okay. I want it clear for the record, and certainly for some people that might be on the other side of the aisle or squirreled away somewhere in some room in this Capitol that chooses to send out what I would term a generic press release, criticizing certain Nembers, taking out of context certain information, declared needed by the Comptroller's Office for proper payment, and especially, I guess, one stood to say that all of a sudden we're going to pay to roll around the state in an automobile and a car for purposes not designed to represent our constituency is to

#### 78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

do nothing but dirty up this Bill, and may have participated in sending out the releases to dirty up a few Members. I suggest to you that is grimy politics. Accept Conference Committee Report 1, and if you don't choose to use it, sit down and be quiet. Vote 'green'."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Nash to close."
- Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just one quick comment. The Comptroller's Office advised me that... that in district travel, it's for the district only. It's not for out-of-state travel. You can go out-of-state now and put a voucher in, if you want to do it, but your...the voters in your district will get to you. I ask for an 'aye' vote. This is a good Bill. It's a Member Bill, and so..."
- Breslin: "The question Speaker is, 'Shall the House Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 557?1 Ϊs that correct? Is it #1, Mr. Clerk? Yes, #1. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This Bill requires a Three-Fifths Majority for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Conference Committee Report, there are 60 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', and 11 voting 'present'. The Gentleman Second Conference Committee Re... and it will be appointed. Sir. The Clerk needs time to make a n announcement."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplementals to House Calendars #5 and 6 are now being distributed."
- Speaker Breslin: "On that last Senate Bill 557, the Bill did not pass. It required 71 votes to pass, and a Second Conference Committee has been formed. The Chair will now go to Supplemental #4, Saturday, July 2nd, Conference

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Committee Reports, Senate Bill 26, Representative O'Connell. This is on Supplemental #4, Senate Bill 26."

- O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 26 is much lighter than it was last night. Senate Bill 26 only contains the extension of the Agent Orange Commission, and the establishment of the Vietnam Veterans' Leadership Program within the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. There was substantial amount of debate on it over the past two months, including the last few weeks. I would simply request that the Conference Committee Report #2 be adopted."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Conference
  Committee Report #2 on Senate Bill 26, and on that
  question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative
  Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."
- Vinson: "Just to refresh our memories, what was on this Bill last night that's not on it now?"
- O'Connell: "To refresh memories, there are about thirteen
  Commission that increased membership on those Commissions
  and the Pollution Control Board. Those provisions are no
  longer on Senate Bill 26."
- Vinson: "Is there anything in this report that in any fashion affects the selection or the structure of the Board of Tax Appeals of the County of Cook?"
- O'Connell: "I wish it were, but it is not. That's House Bill 26,
  Representative."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Mays: "Does Amendment #2 to this Bill this Conference Committee
Report has issued deal with the veterans'... Vietnam
Veterans' Leadership Program recommendation for employment
centers?"

O'Connell: "That's correct."

Mays: "Does the Department of Veterans' Affairs have any veteran service centers in the state right now?"

O'Connell: "They have...if I could address that. The reason why we are recommending that it go to the Department of and Community Affairs, and I might add that the Department of Veterans' Affairs is entirely neutral on this issue, is that the problem with the ... that the veterans have encountered is that there are several different places, after they go to the veterans' affairs centers, find the answer to their request for a job. in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, amounts to one-stop-shopping, if you will, where they, in conjunction with the Federal Job Trainings, would be in a position to respond to the veterans needs at the one location. So, in answer to your question, yes, Veterans\* Affairs does have field centers; but number two to that answer, it is not adequate and the Veterans\* Department is neutral on the Bill."

Mays: "Does the Department of Labor have veterans' service employment people within its department to address employment concerns of the veterans?"

O'Connell: "They... They might, but I don't think it's very well known."

Mays: "Madam Speaker, to the Bill. We've discussed this over and over again. I think he's... you know, what he's trying to do is to highlight the fact that we're concerned about Vietnam veterans. We want to try to help them get jobs.

I, however, believe that this is... you know, while the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

intent is very good, the way we're going about doing it through this Bill is not going to give the message to the veterans that they have got a one-stop shopping center, so to speak, for this particular thing they do. They've already got it with Department of Labor. In my mind we can do it through Department of Veteran's Affairs, expand the duties of the regional offices, and not confuse veterans as to where they should be going for what particular service. It's my understanding we've got ten different agencies catering to the veteran right now. I would just as soon see all those go under Department of Veterans' Affairs so we don't have any confusion as to where they can get these services. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Dupage, Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Representative...

the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Karpiel: "Last, excuse me... Last night, Representative, this Bill passed out of here with all those Commissions on it, et cetera. I take it in the Senate they didn't agree to the Bill?"

O'Connell: "No, they didn't."

Karpiel: "And they called for a Second Conference Committee.
According to my analysis, it says that the effect of
Conference Committee Report #2 leaves the Bill intact with
the Vietnam Veterans Amendment added in the House. It
doesn't say anything about taking off all the Commissions."

O'Connell: "No, that's wrong, Representative. The... And the report that's filed simply adopts House Amendment #2 on Senate Bill 26. You can ask your..."

Karpiel: "And did not adopt all those Commissions?"

O'Connell: "Pardon me?"

Karpiel: "Did not adopt the... all those Commissions?"

78th Legislative Day

- July 2, 1983
- O'Connell: "No, no, those Commissions were put on in Conference

  Committee Report #1."
- Karpiel: "Alright. We did appropriate money for all of those

  Commissions earlier today. Do you know... happen to know

  where they are?"
- O'Connell: "I have no idea, and it's not relevant to this... this Bill."
- Karpiel: "It's relative to me. I want to look for them."
- O'Connell: "Well, it may be, but I can't answer your question,

  Representative."
- Karpiel: "Okay, thank you very much."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."
- Ropp: "In the last couple of three days, we extended the provision for asbestosis from three to twenty-five years because that had an... kind of an... ongoing occurrence that might affect one's health. Is that the same possible situation with Agent Orange?"
- O'Connell: "I can't quite understand the last part of your sentence."
- Ropp: "My question is, why if there is a need for a study for Agent Orange, and I would support you in that regard, why did you extend this Commission indefinitely? If you study the problem that we have, isn't that sufficient, to study the problem and then provide some answers? If those answers are just, then why do we have to go on with the Commission indefinitely?"
- O'Connell: "Well, I agree. The Senate Sponsor placed the indefinite nature. However, I would suggest that if, within the next few years, which we hope, that an answer to the Agent Orange question is adopted, I heartily doubt that

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the Body would appropriate the sums to keep the Commission going. Now, in regards to the indefinite nature of this, one of the functions of the Commission has been to articulate to the veterans how they can go about obtaining information and physical screening as to whether they, in fact, may be candidates for any diseases that may emanate from exposure. This is an ongoing issue. Coordinating these efforts with the Vietnam veterans is an ongoing issue. We aren't the arbitrators... arbiters of the decision whether indeed exposure results in the diseases."

Ropp: "Okay, thank you."

Breslin: "There being no further discussion, Speaker the Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell, to close." O'Connell: "Tha nk you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we aren't asking for anything in this issue that every other veteran of other wars, every other veteran at all has ever asked for. We are addressing a problem of not only the potential for exposure to this defoliant that we discussed last year very thoroughly. We're also addressing the outgrowth of an employment situation that is uniquely attributable to the Vietnam veteran. We have in this state some 350,000 Vietnam veterans. Of those 350,000 Vietnam veterans, it's estimated that twenty percent... twenty and I might add, higher in the black population, twenty percent are unemployed. Now, that presents a unique situation that I don't believe spreading the issue throughout the Department of Labor, spreading the issue in the Department of Veterans' Affairs where they aren't equipped to address that unique issue is not helping the Vietnam veteran. We want to call attention that there help. Very few Vietnam veterans have been helped since they came home from that war. This is just one way with no money... there's no money appropriated for this.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

through the Grace of God, the Federal Government come up...
comes up with the funds, then maybe we can articulate that
into the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs.
This is simply requesting the machinery to put this into
effect. It's a voluntary coordination with the Vietnam
Veterans' Leadership Program. Please adopt this Conference
Committee Report."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is. 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 26? those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires a Three-Fifths Majority for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill. there are 'ave'. 28 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the Conference Committee Report #2 is adopted. Bill. having received the necessary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Supplemental Calendar #4 appears Senate Bill 310. Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen in the House, I
  would like to make mention that the Conference Committee
  Report that I have says First, that this should be the
  Second Conference Committee Report, and I would make leave
  to change it on its face."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to change the number on the Conference Committee Report from #1 to #2. On that question, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brunner."
- Brummer: "I have no objection to what the Gentleman requests, as long as we know which Conference Committee Report we're changing on its face. I suppose both of them say First apparently. I only see one on my desk which says First. How do we identify which one you propose to vote on?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Terzich: "Well, I... in my explanation of... of the Conference Committee, we did... did not adopt the First Conference Committee this morning, and I did request a Second. I don't know... how that got on there. There's a difference in the... in the amounts, which I'll explain in my explanation."

Brummer: "What's the NLRB number... or LRB?"

Terzich: "Well, the... the one that I'm going to be speaking on is LRB#8301678TH."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, do you have that Conference
Committee Report in your possession?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, I have the same LBB number."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave, therefore, to have that Conference Committee Report numbered as #2 and we will be voting to adopt Conference Committee Report #2. Does the Gentleman have leave? There being no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Proceed, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the last time with regard to the Regional School Superintendents. The Conference Committee has been signed by all the Members that were in attendance. been dramatically reduced. It provides for a five thousand salary adjustment for the Regional School Superintendents. As I mentioned before, this is a very, very minimal salary adjustment. They have not had one. This would make eight years. It's absolutely necessary that there be... they get some adjustment, because if they don't have it before August 1st, then that will make eight years without a salary adjustment. These are hard-working individuals, well-qualified, having to have in excess of a It's a very, very minimal and equitable master's degree. salary adjustment, and I would appreciate your concurring with Conference Committee #2 on Senate Bill 310."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman moves to adopt Conference Committee
  #2 on Senate Bill 310. And on that question, the Gentleman
  from Dupage, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: Thank Aon Aeta much, Madam Speaker. Ladies 5 n a Gentlemen of the House, I supported this Bill as it originally was proposed. I supported the Second Conference Committee. and I rise in support of this Conference Committee. This ... These people, unless we make this change, are going to go an additional four vears without any consideration. I believe they deserve this, and I rise in support of this legislation."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pedersen."
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, would like to stand in support of this Bill. I think Representative Terzich be commended on the hard work he's put into it. served on the First Conference Committee. We could not agree. Нe was willing to go back, make some further reductions. What Representative Hoffman has just stated is These Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, will not have any increases over an eight year period if we don't act this Bill, and I hope you will look at this Bill very And I recommend a 'yes' vote. carefully. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 310?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires a Three-Pifths Majority for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill... On this Conference Committee Report, there are 81 voting

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

'aye', 26 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Conference Committee Report is adopted. The Bill, having received the necessary Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk for an announcement."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #7 is being distributed."

  Speaker Breslin: "Appearing on Supplemental Calendar #4, appears

  Senate Bill 1026, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Conference Committee #...

  the Second Conference Committee to Senate Bill 1026 removes
  the language that was opposed by Representative Woodyard,
  as it pertains to the rules and regulations of CETA being
  included in the legislation as it pertains to the Job
  Training Programs Act. The legislation now just... the
  legislation in its present form in Conference Committee #2
  sets up the Small Business Division and guarantees its
  continuation under the Department of Commerce and Community
  Affairs. And I move for adoption of Conference Committee
  #2 to Senate Bill 1026."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to adopt Conference
  Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1026, and on that
  question, the Gentleman from Edgar, Representative
  Woodyard."
- Woodyard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to express my appreciation to the Sponsor for removing that language, and don't have any particular opposition to the Bill. Bill, as Representative Mautino introduced it. and certainly indicated to me, was introduced as a shell Bill. So the shell Bill became a very monstrous vehicle, and it's back to a shell Bill. And so I really don't have any opposition to it. We are... It only is doing things that we are doing today anyway in the Small Business Division of DCCA, and also the creation of a Small Business Council

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- appointed by the Governor. I don't think we need it, but I really don't have any opposition to it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question, Madam Speaker?"

  Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for question."
- Vinson: "Did... Is that an accurate characterization of where we are here, Representative?"
- Mautino: "He's accurate in the sense that the Amendment has been removed. The Bill sets up and continues the Division of... the Small Business Division in DCCA, and it's Representative... or Senator Hall's Bill, and I'd like to pass it out of here in its present form."
- Vinson: "Well, I suppose we have just gotten to the point where shells are in the eye of the beholder, so..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, to close. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "I'd just ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Second Conference Committee to 1026."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1026 be adopted? A11 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. requires a Three-Fifths Majority for passage. a11 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This Conference Committee Report has 81 'ayes', 25 'nos', 4 voting 'present', and is therefore adopted. The Bill, having received the necessary Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on the Order of Supplemental Calendar #6 Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 1117. Representative Steczo or Representative Matijevich. wish to proceed on that Bill? 1117. Representative

78th Legislative Day
Matijevich."

July 2, 1983

- Matijevich: "I called for an analysis of that about a half hour ago, but I haven't got it yet."
- Speaker Breslin: "We'll take it out of the record with leave to return."
- Matijevich: "No, wait, wait. Here's my guys here. I'll know all about this in about two seconds. This is no net increase... Oh, go ahead. I'm ready to proceed."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Proceed."

- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is no increase in dollars. All this is a transfer from a debt service fund to the School Construction Fund. So there is no increase in dollars, and I would move the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1117. Appreciate your support. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1117. All those... There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt this Conference Committee Report?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires a Three-Pifths Majority for passage. voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On Bill, there are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Conference Committee Report #1 is adopted. This Bill, having received the necessary Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Appearing on Supplemental Calendar #6 appears House Bill 1382, Representative Homer, 1382."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to, at this time, defer to Representative Vinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Homer. I... Would you repeat what you said?"
- Homer: "Madam Speaker, I asked to defer to Representative Vinson

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

with respect to this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. would move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report 1382. on House Bill What it does is to address and hopefully resolve a problem relating to certain school districts in areas where there are power plants to help them in the matter of taxes that they thought were properly collected but have apparently been improperly collected. will permit those particular school districts and units of local government to move forward from this time on with the ... without having to pay those enormous refunds; but, at the same time after having passed 101 some minutes earlier, the conjunction of the two Bills is to the tax exemption for those coal fired utilities in the future. I think the two Bills together work out an equitable compromise."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Conference

Committee Report \$1 to House Bill 1382. And on that
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Vinson, do you think there's something that you and I could put into legislative intent to help this Bill in the future?"

Vinson: "Well, we can certainly try, but we might just refer to the earlier dialogue you've had..."

Cullerton: "Yes..."

Vinson: "... and incorporate that by reference."

Cullerton: "Yes, that would be on Senate Bill 2000?"

Vinson: "Yes, that's correct."

Cullerton: "Yes. Okay, we'll incorporate by reference, for

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

legislative intent purposes, the comments made on Senate Bill 2000. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative
Brummer. Excuse me. Representative Johnson. I was
looking at one light and saying another person."

Brummer: "I'm from Effingham."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I guess I should direct the question to the Sponsor of the Amendment. I'm... I'm either looking at the wrong Bill, or I have no idea how this does what you say it does. The Bill, as it came out..."

Vinson: "You're looking at the wrong Bill. Everything in the original Bill has been stricken."

Johnson: "And all we're dealing with is Amendment #2?"

Vinson: "No. All we're dealing with is Conference Committee

Report #1, which doesn't have anything in it for Amendment
#2 either."

Johnson: "Okay. So, the Bill and all the original Amendments and Senate Amendments are totally irrelevant to this Bill now. Right?"

Vinson: "That's absolutely correct."

Johnson: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative
Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Brummer: "You indicated the problem you hope to address. Could you indicate how you hope to address that problem?"

Vinson: "What was the question?"

Brummer: "You had previously indicated, in the explanation, the problem that you intended to address. I don't think you indicated how you wanted to address that problem. Could

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

you explain why this Bill addresses the problem of coal fired plants?"

Vinson: "As... As you know, we passed 101 some time earlier. By action..."

Brummer: "And that dealt with exemptions on pollution control equipment."

Vinson: "That's right. And by ... "

Brummer: "Now, this does not seem to have anything to do with pollution control equipment directly."

Vinson: "I'll answer the question, if you'll let me,
Representative."

Brummer: "Okay. Thank you."

Vinson: "We passed 101 some time earlier today. That preserved, in effect, for the future, the exemption for pollution control equipment on coal fired utilities. By action of this Bill, we will, in combination, we will not... we will create a situation where those units of local government affected will not have to make the refunds for a very substantial period of time in the past that they are currently liable for."

Brummer: "Well..."

Vinson: "So, in essence, we are trying to preserve what they have already collected to a substantial extent and then, with 101, still preserve for the future the... the exempt status on their pollution control equipment."

Brummer: "Well, as you know, I have a... Newton I and II power plants in the middle of my district. That's why I had interest in Senate Bill 101. They are coal burning facilities. I think they will be this year, by the time taxes are paid, 3.8 million dollars in claims for refunds there. Now, this Bill, at the bottom of the Conference Committee Report, says that the prevailing party in any such action shall only be entitled to a refund in an amount

### 78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- not exceeding the taxes, fees and charges paid for a period of one year prior to the date upon which the complaint was filed. Does... Could you explain how that operates?"
- Vinson: "Yes. The effect of that is to... to limit the amount that CIPS could get back."
- Brummer: "And that amount would be limited to the amount that had been paid under protest or some other amount?"
- Vinson: "The amount which had been... The amount which had been illegally collected prior to one year prior to the commencement of litigation."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are you finished, Representative?"
- Brummer: "Well, I don't suppose I have any quarrel with this. I

  don't think it addresses the CIPS problem whatsoever,

  because all those taxes were paid under protest and

  complaints filed with regard to each of those items, so I

  don't think that resolves the issue. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn.

  The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker, I rise to guestion whether this Amendment is in appropriate form. If you look at the Amendment on lines 33 and 34, it appears not to be consistent; or, if it is, then, in fact, we have a double negative which would seem to end up with a positive. And while the speaker previously read that language and omitted one of those words, 'not', in fact there is a double negative in the sentence, and I question whether that is an appropriate form for the Amendment."
- Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I would simply suggest that the Lady addressed the problem with an Amendment, and we're not on an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady meant to say the Conference Committee

  Report #1, and there does appear to be a typographical

  error. We would suggest that the Gentleman amend the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Conference Committee Report on its face."

Vinson: "I so move."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is moving to eliminate a technical error on line 33 of Conference Committee Report #1 to strike the word 'not', because it appears again in the next sentence. I am informed that in Enrolling and Engrossing that would probably be done anyway. However, does the Gentleman have leave to do this? There are objections. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I would ask the Chair for a ruling as to whether that problem is correctable in Enrolling and Engrossing."

Parliamentarian Getty: "On behalf of the Speaker, the Chair would rule that the appearance, in line 33 and in the last word of line 33, of 'not' and the same word appearing immediately thereafter as the first word in line 34 would be treated as surplusage, a typographical error correctable ' in the normal course of business in Enrolling and Engrossing."

Speaker Breslin: "For further discussion, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "I just simply move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be

put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say

'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it,

and the main question is put. The Gentleman from DeWitt,

Representative Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. As I indicated previously, in combination with 101 this Bill will preserve the use of Illinois coal. It will... It will solve... It will avoid a rate increase for utility consumers; and, at the same time, assist certain units of

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

local government, school districts particularly, in their severe financial problems. And I would move for adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 1382."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1382 be adopted? A11 favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires a Three-Fifths Majority for passage. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Report, there are 99 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the necessary Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave, we'll go to Supplemental Calendar #1. being no objection, Supplemental Cal... Excuse me. Supplemental #1. I meant Supplemental #5. Appearing there is House Bill 687. Representative Hannig, House Bill 687 on Supplemental #5."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move that the House accept the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 687. As amended, this Bill would put House Bill 687 in the same posture that Senate Bill 89 left this House. Specifically, what this Bill would do would be modify the state aid formula so that it would take the form as originally introduced and proposed by the School Problems Commission. There are many on this floor who know more about the school aid formula than myself, and I would yield to them for questions, but this formula, for the most part, would be beneficial to the suburban and downstate Illinois schools. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Conference
Committee Report #1 to House Bill 687, and on that
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas."
Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Kulas: "Representative Hannig, how much money will the Chicago School District lose because of this Bill."

Hannig: "Five million dollars."

Kulas: "Five million dollars?"

Hannig: "Under some proposals, but not this proposal, it could have lost as much as eleven million."

Kulas: "And where is that five million dollars going to go?"

Hannig: "Well, the money will be redistributed through the formula, and as you might guess, it will go into the suburban and downstate schools."

Kulas: "I see. Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker.""

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Kulas: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill where a certain deal was cut where they raised the real estate taxes in Chicago by the sum of ninety-five million dollars, and now they are going to take five million dollars back so that Chicago taxpayers can pay for the schools in suburban and downstate. So I'm asking each... each and every one of you who lives in Chicago, your people are paying for their schools down here. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I appreciate the concerns mentioned by the previous I would only share with him the fact that change in the formula does a number of things, but when you compare last year's appropriation of four hundred and sixty-eight and a half million dollars with the appropriation under this program of four hundred ьnа eighty-nine million dollars, you can see that there is an absolute gain for the City of Chicago. I would also point out that the percentage of the total that goes to Chicago under this proposal increases over the proposal from last

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

year. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we discussed this Ri 11 before on the floor of the House. This is a compromise proposal on the Title I issue for one year to level out big gainers with big losers. The parties that are most affected were involved in the Joint Finance Committee between the State Board and the School Problems Commission, which proposed this program. And I rise in support of Conference Committee Report #687 (sic - #1). is fair. It is equitable. It treats everybody reasonably, and I move for its adoption."

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

you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Cullerton: "Thank the House. I have tried this Session to learn a little bit about the state aid formula, and it's a very complicated But it's very easy at this point of the Session to not know a thing about the state aid formula other than how much you are either going to make or how much you are going to lose for your home district. I have some amazing statistics in front of me that show where the money is coming from and where it's going to. The people who going to lose is not just the people in Chicago who lose five million dollars. The other people who lose are the suburban areas in Cook County, DuPage County, Kane County, Lake County, McHenry County, Will County, Decatur, Granite City, Peoria, Rock Island, Belleville and East St. Louis. They all lose money. That's all you have to understand. Anyone from Chicago who votes for this Bill is either out of his mind, or they made a deal. If they made a deal. they are really being unfair to the people and to the children that we are so concerned about in the City of Chicago, for the kids. What it stands for is that we are willing to raise our property taxes, which is the wrong way

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

of paying for the schools and not bringing in our fair share of money from the income tax, which is the right way of paying for the schools. If you made a deal, it's a bad deal. Everyone from the City of Chicago should vote 'no', and I want to remind all of the other Legislators from these counties that they are going to lose money under this particular formula, and I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from... the Lady from DuPage,
Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Representative Cullerton is right on one point. Chicago people probably should not vote for this Bill, but it is not true that people should not vote for this Bill. school aid formula, there are always winners and because it is a very complicated algebraic formula that has number of factors in it. Factors in the school aid formula include not only your equalized assessed valuation, but also your average daily attendance, and many school districts in recent years have been getting a double whammy because while their equalized assessed valuation went up, which means that they would receive less state aid, attendance. their weighted average daily attendance would go down, which also meant that they would receive state aid. What we do here in the State of Illinois is appropriate a particular sum of money that is then split up statewide, and what we do with the formula is guarantee that every student in the state has X number of dollars for his or her education. That number of dollars is a total of the dollars that are raised at the local level through the property tax plus the state aid that comes from Springfield. I would submit to you that the income tax proposal that we passed helps our students, and that proposal contained in House Bill 687, the First Conference

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Committee Report, is a fair method of apportioning that money. It is a compromise. It is the same proposal that passed out of here as Senate Bill 89. It allows school districts to choose. They may either choose eighty-five percent of the 1970 Title I weighting for their low income students, or the 1980 census figures. I think that that's a fair compromise, and I would urge 'aye' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape. Slape: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 687, I think presents House. probably problem I've ever had since I come to largest the Legislature, because under the provisions of this Bill, and I would imagine that most downstate Legislators will at their school district, they find they are in the same situation. I have school districts that gain, and I school districts that lose, but the problem with it in my district is I'm in a position of having to vote in this instance against the gainers because for my Legislative area, I come up with a forty thousand dollar net loss under this formula. You know, Representative Kulas and Representative Cullerton talks about they are going to take five million dollars out of the City of Chicago. they are taking five million dollars out of the City of don't know where they are spending it. I know it don't get far enough down to my district for mе interested in. And if you are a downstater, and if you haven't looked and seen what your district is gain, or where your... which districts are going to lose. you might be smart like I am and vote 'present' on this." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek." Vitek: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the other night when we passed this fifty cent tax on the Chicago taxpayers, a lot of us didn't realize that

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

it was going to hit the senior citizens. Josephine, listen to this. You voted for that Bill, and then afterwards explained that I didn't explain it to you. This will affect our senior citizens that are living on a When you raise the taxes only eighty-nine dollars a year, you are taking three months of substance away the senior citizens that they can't buy food for. Now, when you go into shopping centers and you see these people on public aid, and they are in front of you, and they got a shopping cart filled with three carts of steaks that thick, and when you see that little old lady that goes to the counter, and she sees the price on that steak, living on senior citizen income, she puts the steak back because she can't afford it. But these other people, they load up with food stamps, and then they have the courage to have the kid take that out to their Cadillacs. Vote 'no' or 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. аma absolutely appalled. I have been a Member of this General Assembly for five long years. And true, I have been called a wheeler dealer. But you know what? I'm an amateur. wheel and deal of all time is being perpetrated Members of the General Assembly. The atrocity of Members on the other side that have put together this package which is against the people of my district, which is against the people of most of the districts here in the State of Illinois is unbelievable. Never in my best day could I flim flam money around like these people have done. appalled. I'm chagrined, and I'll tell you one thing. I \* m going to vote a big red 'no' on this Bill, and the kids at Granite City are never going to forget me. I vote 'no' for

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Granite City."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Representative Ronan, for what reason do you rise?"

Ronan: "If this gets the required number of votes, I'm verifying it."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig, to close. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Mr... Madam Speaker, I would yield to Representative
Stuffle to close."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stuffle to close."

Members of the General Assembly, we go through Stuffle: "Well, this every year, and I think Representative Vitek knows, we have some senior citizens too. The point of the matter that if we do nothing, if we don't pass this Bill, we have a situation where the new federal quidelines for Title I or that definition now the census formula, creates giant winners in school districts in some cases, giant winners and qiant losers on the other hand. It so happens in in this Bill 89, which is the underlying Bill in this, my district loses money too. But the point of it is, we can either decide to fairly and equitably level winners and level the losers, which this does, or drive more money into some, and take giant amounts from others. This doesn't help me, but it helps overall to level those figures. Chicago gets, in case you want to know, 33.9 percent of the state aid now, and they go up to 34.09 under this Bill. We passed out a Bill that took eleven million Chicago. This only takes five. Bill redistributes less money. There's still winners. There's still losers. For the sake of all the kids in all the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

state, we tried to middle this thing after looking at dozens of alternatives. For that reason, I rise and ask for your affirmative vote."

"The question is, 'Shall Breslin: the House Conference Committee Report #1 to Bill 687? • House A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority in order to pass. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. question, there are 74 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'. Representative Ronan requests a verification of the Roll Call. The Sponsors request a Poll of the Absentees. Poll the Absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Bullock. DiPrima.

Doyle. LeFlore. Levin. McMaster and Taylor."

Speaker Breslin: "Poll of the Affirmative Vote, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Barger. Barnes. Birkinbine. Brann. Breslin. Brookins. Brunner. Churchill. Cowlishaw. Curran. Daniels. Davis. DeJaeqher. Deuchler. Didrickson. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Plinn. Virginia Prederick. Dwight Friedrich. Giorgi. Hallock. Hannig. Harris. Hastert. Hawkinson. Hensel. Hicks. Huff. Hoffman. Johnson. Karpiel. Kirkland. Klemm. Leverenz. Koehler. Matijevich. Mautino. Mavs. Mulcahev. Neff. McCracken. Nelson. Olson. Pangle. В. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Piel. Pierce. Pullen. Rea. Rhem. Rice. Richmond. Ropp. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Steczo. Stuffle. Tate."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Koehler asks leave to be verified. Is that acceptable, Representative Ronan? Yes, it is. Representative Hastert makes the same request. Representative Leverenz makes... Representative Leverenz."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Leverenz: "Speaker... Madam Speaker, record me 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz asks leave to change from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Oblinger asks leave to change from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Brookins, for what reason do you rise?"

Brookins: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brookins asks leave to be verified, Representative Ronan. Is that acceptable, Representative Ronan? Very good. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Topinka. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Wait.
White. Winchester. Wojcik. Woodyard. Younge. Zwick.
No further."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer. Representative Homer would like to change his vote from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Ronan, do you have any questions of Affirmative Roll Call? Excuse me. Representative Christensen, for what reason do you rise? Representative Christensen wants to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Shaw wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Turner wishes to change his vote from 'present' to 'aye'. We'll let you know how people are recorded at the present time. Representative LeFlore asks to be recorded as voting 'aye'. is... How many are recorded 'aye', Mr. Clerk? There are 79 voting 'aye'. Representative Ronan. Do you persist? He does persist. Proceed, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Huff. Remove him."

Ronan: "Ebbesen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ebbesen. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Ebbesen. Remove him."

Ronan: "Virginia Frederick."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Frederick is in her chair."

Ronan: "Harris."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Harris. Representative Harris.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Ronan: "Neff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Neff. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Neff. Remove him."

Ronan: "Piel."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel is in the chamber."

Ronan: "Johnson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson is in the back sitting down."

Ronan: "Winchester."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Winchester is in his chair."

Ronan: "Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Steczo. Remove him."

Ronan: "Curran."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran is in the center aisle."

Ronan: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Jane Barnes. Representative Jane Barnes. Is the Lady in the chamber? Remove her."

Ronan: "Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge is in her chair."

Ronan: "Jesse White."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White is in the center aisle, second aisle."

Ronan: "Representative Rice."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rice is in his chair."

Ronan: "Representative Rhem."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rhem. Representative Rhem is in the center aisle."

Ronan: "Oh, now I understand. And then the final perpetrator,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Representative Braun."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun is in the back of chamber. er... Have you finished with your Poll of the Affirmative? He has... The Gentleman is finished. the count, Mr. Clerk? On this report, there are 73 voting 30 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And the This Bill, having report is adopted. received the necessary Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority... Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Mr... Madam Speaker, I move to reconsider... Would you announce the Roll?"
- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill, having received the necessary

  Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

  passed. Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Having voted on the prevailing side by which Conference

  Committee #... Report #1 to House Bill 687 was adopted, I

  now move to reconsider the vote by which that was
  approved."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock."

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

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that Motion lie upon the table. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion lies upon the table.

  Representative Matijevich in the Chair."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Majority Leader, Representative Jim McPike on the Adjournment Resolution. We're not leaving yet. This is the Resolution."
- McPike: "Mr... would you... Mr. Speaker, would you have the Clerk read the Resolution?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 72. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly, the State

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when both Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 2, 1983, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, October 5, 1983, at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Matijevich: "You've heard the Resolution. Representative McPike."

- McPike: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the Members, I gladly move for the adoption of this Resolution."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. We're not adjourning yet.

  Representative McPike moves that the House do adopt House

  Joint Resolution 72. All in favor say 'aye', opposed

  'nay', and the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 72.

  Supplemental Calendar... House Supplemental Calendar #7.

  Leave to proceed to Senate Bill 526, Representative Terzich

  from Cook. Leave is granted. Proceed."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to adopt Conference Committee
  #1 to Senate Bill 526. What they did is they receded from
  House Amendment #1, and also it removes the Illinois
  Commerce Commission provisions as contained in the House
  Amendment #1 was removed. And it places areas supplied by
  the Chicago water that are outside the boundaries of the
  Metropolitan Sanitary District under the same rate terms
  as the areas supplied within the district boundaries. This
  provision would limit the rates for non-district residents
  to no greater than the existing meter rate. And I would
  move for concurrence with Conference Committee #1."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved that the House do adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 526. There being no discussion, those in favor will signify... one moment. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 97 'ayes', 6 'nays', 2 answering 'present', and the House does adopt the First

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 526. And this having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority. is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill... leave... On House Calendar Supplemental 6, leave to proceed Senate Bill 1307, Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell on the floor? Representative Yourell. Representative Myron Olson is going to handle that. Leave to proceed. Leave is granted. Proceed."

Olson: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We move to concur in Conference Report \$1 on Senate Bill 1307, which is a basic State Board of Election Bill, and included Senate Amendment \$1, which ordered the State Board of Elections to use Central Management Service data processing services to fulfill their duties and obligations. I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report \$1 to Senate Bill 1307."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1307. There being no discussion, those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the voted? record. This takes three-fifths vote. On this there are 101 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1307. And this Bill, having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Be at ease. passed. Representative Yourell, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Yourell: "I was out in the Rotunda when you called 1307 Conference Committee Report. Can we get that?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's the one that Myron Olson did a good job for you."

Yourell: "Oh, he did?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Speaker Matijevich: "Yeah."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "House Supplemental Calendar #6 appears

Senate Bill 1336. Leave to proceed with Senate Bill 1336,
the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas. Leave is
granted. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move now that the House accept the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1336. The Second Conference Committee Report deleted the Section and it no longer contains the provisions which reduced the number of years of service required for a Member of the General Assembly to continue participation in the General Assembly Retirement System after leaving the Legislature. So all the Bill deals with now is the retirement formula of the Cook County Employees and Officers Annuity Fund Article and the Cook County elected officials. And I would move for its acceptance."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas moves that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1336. Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative, as I read the Conference Committee

Report, there is nothing in the Conference Committee that

affects the General Assembly Retirement System. Is that

correct?"

Kulas: "That's correct, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you."

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

Johnson: "No questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Represent... There being no further discussion, Representative Kulas has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Bill 1336. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote and is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? I'm trying to get Clerk will take the Representative Kulas. record. wasn't going to take any chances. On this issue, there are 71 'ayes', 34 'nays', 7 voting 'present', and the does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate 1336. Bill and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Pifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Be at ease for a moment. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, during the lull, I been very carefully going through the Digest and best I can tell, there were still 50 to 75 Bills which haven't surfaced on Conference Committee Reports. As soon as they do and we vote on them, can we go home?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You can go home before that. I can...You can bet on that. And I missed the pool by a half hour. House Calendar Supplemental 2, leave to proceed with Senate Bill 1263, the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing. Leave is granted, proceed."

Ewing: "I had risen, Mr. Speaker, for an inquiry of the Chair. You want to go ahead, alright. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the vehicle which has been chosen for the bonds for the transportation series A in the amount of 375,000, transportation series B, 250,000, and for the Capital Development Bonds in the amount of a 153,000,000. And I would ask for its favorable approval."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing has moved that the House do adopt the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1263. There being no discussion, those in

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote and is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 93 'ayes', 6 'nays', 6 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1263. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have a few more matters that we're waiting to be printed, so don't anybody leave yet, but we're going take care of a little level time here. Agreed Resolutions. The Clerk will read the Besolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 71, Davis Leverenz;

  House Resolution 458, White: 464, Curran; and 465, no, take

  out 465, that's the Death Resolution."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi, the Gentleman from Winnebago, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Giorgi: "House Joint Resolution 71, Davis Leverenz, they wanted to remove Heritage House from supplying any food any longer; and 458 by White Younge, asks the chief academic officer at the University, Southern Illinois University to take immediate and conclusive steps to secure the continuance of this program that has to do with the... I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say "aye", opposed 'nay', and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 464, Curran."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 465, Younge, with respect to the memory of B. Buckminster Fuller."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the Death Resolution. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the Death Resolution is adopted. Introduction - First Readings."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2297, Greiman, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Occupation and Use Tax Acts to exempt from such taxes, clothing, shoes, and wearing apparel for children under 18 years of age and infant care accessories. Pirst Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2298, Younge, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Pirst Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "We will be at ease. There's... Speaker Madigan is over in the Senate trying to work out a problem.

  One of our appropriation Bills is... one we think is most important affecting the Governor, and the General Assembly has hit a little snag in the Senate, and Speaker Madigan is trying to work that out. If we can work...If we can work that out, the old saying goes, we're home free. Stick around. Stick around. Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "In as much as we are in recess, could the Clerk be allowed the opportunity to read..."
- Speaker Matijevich: "We are not in recess, everybody stay real close."
- Leverenz: "Could the Clerk read the Davis Leverenz Resolution that we just passed?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "We better not, Ted. John Vitek, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"
- Vitek: "Just a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Go ahead."
- Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a senior Member of the House here... 76, July the 8, I don't mind telling you my age, but I want to thank you all one and all. All the new Members, the old Members, I wish you a happy summer and hope that the good Lord sends me back in

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

the fall. Thank you."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Very good, John. God bless you, John. God bless you. The House will come back in...on Supplemental Calendar #8 Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 357, Representative Jaffe. Representative Jaffe in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 457, Representative Nash. Senate Bill 457. Representative Nash."
- Nash: "Mr. Speaker, can we take it out of the record momentarily?"
- Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? What?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I was a member of that Conference
  Committee, and I would be glad to handle the Conference
  Committee Report if Mr. Nash doesn't want to."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Well, he said take it out of the record for a moment. Senate Bill 457, Representative Vinson handling that for Representative Nash."
- Vinson: "No, that's, that's 357."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Are we still 'go' on this? Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 457, and I would point out to the Membership that the Bill, the Conference Committee Report does remove the language that the House adopted in House Amendment #3 which is simply, while it's desirable, and while I voted for it, at the time it was before the House, there is simply no way to fund it within existing revenues that the state has. The Bill is now, as...basically, as it emerged from the Senate, and it does require the Department to make public its reimbursement methodology for nursing homes. The...That is the essence of the report, and I

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

would move that the House do adopt the Conference Committee Report.  $^{\mathfrak{n}}$ 

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 457. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote-This is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, wish? there are 89 'ayes', 7 'nays', 1 voting 'present', and the does adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on House Senate Bill 457. This Bill, having received Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared On Supplemental Calendar 2, leave to proceed to 557. Senate Bill Leave is granted. Representative Nash...and leave...leave to amend the House Conference Committee Report so that underlying language shall be underlined. The Senate version is underlined and the House is not. Leave that the language as used in the Section the term 'travel shall be limited to travel within such legislative OF Representative district in connection with his or her legislative duties and not in connection with any political campaign\* be added and underlined...be underlined. Leave is granted. Representative Nash on Senate Bill 492...557 rather."

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

This is the same Bill we debated a few minutes ago. It takes out the objective language. It limits...It makes a permissible limits to travel Section to duties within your legislative, or representative district and not in connection with any political campaign. I urge for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Nash moves the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 557.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Representative Johnson."

- Johnson: "Stuffle says to keep it short cause he can win the pool, so I will. Is this the Bill, the same Bill that Representative Pullen addressed a few minutes ago, that we've voted on about thirty-five times this Session, or is it different?"
- Nash: "It's the same Bill that Representative Pullen talked about, and we corrected the situation in reference to travel that she had concerns with."
- Johnson: "I... I didn't understand that, Representative Nash."
- Nash: "We...Representative Pullen said some of the other Members concern with this piece of legislation was with the portion on travel, and we limited travel. If anybody wants to charge travel to expenses within their districts, the representative or legislative district and not in connection with any political campaign."
- Johnson: "Well, you couldn't...you couldn't do it in connection with the political campaign anyway. That's clearly impermissible to use that in the connection with a political campaign anyway, so why put something in that's meaningless."
- Nash: "Well, that's correct, but it's in the language to make it clear. This is a Bill for the Members. It's the language that the Comptroller's Office wants so they can pay our vouchers for the 17,000. There is no increases in this piece of legislation. It's a Bill sponsored in the Senate by Senator Rock and Senator Philip."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 557. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This takes three-fifths vote and is final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 80

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

'ayes', 21 'nays', one voting 'present', and the Bouse does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 557, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Vinson, are you seeking recognition?"

- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you'd care to go to the first Bill on Supplemental #8 Senate Bill 357, I'd be glad to move for adoption of that Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, Representative Vinson moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 357. There being no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

  This takes three-fifths vote and is final passage. He's handling it for Jaffe. Leave...it, yeah, leave the voting open. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, just because it's late, and just because everybody is tired doesn't mean we have to start passing bad Bills, and this just happens to be one of them. believe this is the one that we considered in Judiciary Committee. It has to do with Crime Victims Compensation and whether or not a prisoner loses his rights when he's in I think what the Bill was...said was if that people jail. incarcerated, they...for some reason. they can't...thev're not eligible under the Crime Victims Compensation Act. So that if someone was severely in prison, they just wouldn't be eligible just because they happen to be in prison. Now, the way the Bill was originally drafted, and I don't know that I've actually had a chance to look at this particular wording yet, the way it was originally drafted, it could be anybody who happened to be detained. They need not even be sentenced. So that somebody was out speeding and didn't have any money and didn't have a bond card, and they had to be put in the fail

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

for overnight or for a few hours, and then, one of the other prisoners injured them, they wouldn't come under the Crime Victims Compensation Act. It's just a crazy idea, and I see no need to pass it, ... I don't see any reasons to call it, but it's a mistake if it was to pass. And the Sponsor of the Bill isn't even here. I don't know who presented it. Representative Vinson, if he presented it, he...he's making a mistake. Now, I see why it's called, but I just don't think it's a good idea to pass it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Of course, the House rules permit any Member of the House to move for adoption of a Conference Committee Report, and the Gentleman knows that. And this is a particularly good Conference Committee Report, because this is a Conference Committee Report that will save money for taxpayers, and it's a Conference Committee Report that will deny benefits to criminals. And I think we ought to do that in both cases, and I would move for adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the record. On this question, there are 46 'ayes', 4 'nays', 59 'present', and the House...the Motion fails, and the House does not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 357. Yes. there were three-fifths were required, and the Motion, having failed to receive the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, was declared lost. Larry, they never lose. You can look out the window and watch Lincoln Fest. How about that? There's fireworks outside too, you know. 250,000 people in town and none of them are here watching us, imagine that. They took...We used to be the best show in town. longer."

Speaker Madigan: "House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, do you

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

have a House Joint Resolution? The House will come to order. Mr. Hallock, have you found your key? Okay, fine. On Supplemental #9, there appears Senate Bill 1263, Mr. Ewing. Mr. Ewing."

- Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the bond authorization legislation which we passed earlier today. The attorneys for the Governor and the Secretary of State determined that there were three words which needed to be added to correct a defect that they thought might be in this authorization of this Conference Committee Report. And I would move, then, for the adoption. The money is the same in this Bill as it was in the original Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1263.

  The Chair recognizes Mr. Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich."
- Hatijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, so that we do this properly, I would ask leave and use the Attendance Roll Call to reconsider the vote by which this was adopted, so then we can adopt the Corrected First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there a leave? Leave is granted."
- Matijevich: "Leave and use the Attendance Roll Call as journalized."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Mr. Ewing moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1263. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. This will require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? For what purpose does Mr. Matijevich seek recognition?"
- Matijevich: "Again, so the record shows this is the Corrected Pirst Conference Committee Report, Nr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 89 'ayes', and 4 'nos'. The House

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

does adopt the corrected version of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1263, and this Bill, having received the Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, have you found the Senate Joint Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 38. Whereas, for the past three years Chicago has been the site of the Chicago Fest and the Taste of Chicago events; and whereas, this well-known and successful fair provides annual recreation hundreds of thousands of people from Chicago, other parts of Illinois and other states of the United whereas, these festivals have created tremendous qoodwill and exposure for the Chicago area as well as generated needed revenue for its citizens; therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and the House of Representatives concurring herein, that we respectfully urge the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois to continue to hold the Chicago Fest and the Taste of Chicago events: and be it further resolved, that a copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mayor Harold Washington and Governor James Thompson."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Panayotovich."

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I introduced this Joint Resolution because all I'm asking for here... Before I say that, I should just tell you a little bit about the Chicago Fest and Taste of Chicago. They're events have been held in Chicago for the past three years. They are events that have drawn hundreds and thousands of people from just the state, the city, and other states around us. It's goodwill. It's exposure. It's revenue for the state. It's revenue for the city. It's not asking for any money as we've had arguments before

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

about that we've always had it. It's, basically, Chicago's
County Fair, and all I would ask is for a favorable vote on
this Resolution to say that we, here in this state, want it
to continue. It's privately funded. It does not cost any
money. We're not asking for money. All we're asking, is
we're asking that the Governor and the Mayor go along and
say that this is a good thing for the state. Thank you."
Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp."

- Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, just a question of the Sponsor. It...In the past, it had been costing us \$500,000, and I think the last time we authorized that there was to be some reporting to this Body or to the state, and I don't think I've ever seen that report, but in this Resolution, there are no dollars whatsoever?"
- Panayotovich: "No dollars at all. All we're asking is that we, as the General Assembly, realize that it is a great draw for the state and the city, and we want to see it continue.

  No monetary figures or anything...at all."
- Ropp: "Well, I certainly would want to commend you for doing this. However, I'm wondering whether or not you'll be able to handle it without the 500,000 that you requested from the state the last couple of years. If you can do that, more power to you, and I think that..."
- Panayotovich: "Give us our chance. That's, you know, we, in Chicago, would like to do it."
- Ropp: "I hope you use all American things. And if you really want to save money, why use the best and open it up for international trade, and you'll really have a super good show."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Panayotovich moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 38. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're waiting for one MOTE Conference Committee Report which should take 10 to 15 minutes, and then, we will adjourn until October 5. For my part, I would like to thank all of the Members for their outstanding dedication and work during this Session of the Legislature. I'm sure you remember that on the dav inauguration, I made certain pledges and I called upon you to join me in an effort to improve the image of this Body. I think we have come a long way in the last six months, in terms of professionalizing our conduct and improving the decorum of the House. I think that the tone of the Session was set in great part by Mr. Daniels, when o n OUT inauguration day, he moved that my nomination to the Speaker of the House be unanimous. That was something that had never seen in my thirteen years in the House, and at I said that I was very grateful and very thankful. and I wish to say that again. If you reflect upon this Session, especially those of you who have been here in the past, and compare this Session with prior Sessions, I think we will all agree that despite the two or three strong disagreements that we had, that this has Session marked by extraordinary harmony. We have worked We have worked cooperatively to identify the issues of the state and to move legislatively to try and solve those issues. I'm sure that not everyone vil1 leave here today completely happy, but that is the legislative process. You cannot come here expecting to get everything that you want from the Legislature. understanding come here that this is system of I think that our performance of advocacy and then compromise has been quite admirable and something that will commend ourselves when we return to our districts tonight, and I do mean tonight. The Chair recognizes

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Daniels."

Daniels: "Well. Mr. Speaker, you are right. We had a lot of problems in the state that we had to look at this term, and I've served here nine years, a little bit less than you And I can tell you that I really have have. been individually honored to serve as the Minority Leader. have told you before, I'm looking forward to serving as Speaker in another year in a half. Come on, can't you applaud a little bit over on the other side either once in awhile. Thank you very much. But I...No. no votes have to wait a little while. But, I can tell you that when we first started together, you as the new Speaker and me as the new Minority Leader, we looked forward to a Session that had many difficult problems that you said right off the start, you willing to attack. are willing to look at, and when we met privately, you told me that you were willing to work together as much as possible to resolve those differences. And you know, when we look at what we've done this Session, utility reform, hazardous waste, on and on, and on, of course, just recently a very difficult tax increase that had to be balanced in every segment of the State of Illinois, and then followed by RTA reform which has passed this chamber, now over in the other chamber, waiting for them to do what's right. And I think that this House, under your Speakership, has distinguished itself as a House of unity; as a House that has been willing to cross the other side of the aisle to work on legislation in a nonpartisan manner, and to work together to resolve that, and I know that... I was talking to John Matijevich the other day. In 1979, remember John, the package there when you were in the Chair, and we really had a very interesting battle. I hear Jack Davis laughing, cause it was a great time then. And many of us look at the

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

past and know about the difficulties we've had then. And we do match the Session just like you've said, Mr. Speaker, and if we look at what we've done now, I don't know of any other Session that has had as many difficult problems, has been willing to tackle those problems head on say to each other. 'Let's ioin together Sponsorship, and work those problems out so it'd be the best solution for the people of Illinois. I know and know that those people on the other side of the Rotunda are dealous of all the things we've done here, and for that, each and everyone of you deserve a tremendous amount of credit. an awful lot of credit, and if I wasn't. basically, a partisan and the Republican Leader in the I \*d invite all of you to return. But if you don't side mind, I'd like to have twelve more on this aisle. Now...Now there's two ways of settling that. Either we can do our job as Republicans and beat you in the next election, or twelve of you can come over here on this side and join us. Andy McGann, you can be the first one to cross the line and come over and join us. Because as Andy said, we won't deal with any hypocrisy in Springfield for the next six months, will we, Andy? To all of you, and in particular. Mr. Speaker, to you, I know that when we started working together, we had our doubts about two leaders have to meet head on at times. Tn the two or three battles we had, you're an articulate and certainly, an excellent strategist. And I have the utmost and highest degree of respect for you and abilities, and in particular, your desire to represent your I hope that we will continue in that vein. When we have to fight, we'll fight. When we have to solve problems, we'll solve problems. And man, I'm telling you, I think we solved an awful lot of problems this Session.

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

To all of you, thank you. You deserve the credit. Mike and I want to tell you how much we appreciate all of your help, and thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Do have a short wait, if you would all be very patient. And in conclusion, I'd like to personally thank all of the Democrats, especially, the Members of the Democratic Leadership, and in particular, the Majority Leader, Representative Jim McPike, for the outstanding work that all of you have done in developing Democratic initiatives throughout this Session, and as I said earlier, moving legislatively to solve the problems of the state, so thank you very much. Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I, too, Mr. Speaker, would like to thank my Leadership and all of their hard work and effort and their willingness to work the many hours that we know that Leaders have to work, and of course, our tremendous staff. We're so thankful to the staff that we have that serves us that has to sit up till four, five, six in the morning. I know Phil Gonet, several nights I'd leave the office, come back, and he'd still be up working, and several nights, he didn't get any sleep at all. So, to our staff, under the Leadership of Zale Glauberman, Deputy Minority Leader, and Phil Gonet, and Ron Gjerde, and all of the other people that worked so hard, I want to thank then too, on behalf of all the Members of the House, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vitek."

Vitek: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1960 when I came down here, we used to work till four, five, six o'clock in the morning, and we used to sleep on cots out in the hallway out there. I was in charged of a whole row here and each one was assigned a row. We'd alternate and get up after two hours of rest. Thank God, under your Leadership and our Minority Leader over there,

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

we didn't have to do that this time. I was able to sleep in Gary LaPaille's office. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Governor would like to invite everyone to a after Session party at the Mansion immediately after Session, which will mean immediately. I believe...Mr. Daniels would that be immediately after the Senate adjourns, or immediately after we adjourn? Why don't we just..."

Daniels: "If we wait for the Senate, it'll never be."

Speaker Madigan: "Shall we just storm the Mansion?"

Daniels: "Not only should we storm the Mansion, we should take it over completely."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay, so everybody is invited immediately after the House adjourns. Mr. Daniels, I think we're prepared to begin. The Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels for the purpose of a Motion."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, we have one Bill left. It's House Bill 2055, which in it's former form, is rather controversial. In it's new form, it's not controversial. The new form, which Mr. McAuliffe will move on, will ask the House to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2055. being distributed to your desk right now, and I would move to suspend the requirement that it sit on your desk for one I think, if you look at the Amendment, that you'll find out that we're only asking the House to concur Senate Amendment #1. And if the House accepts that Amendment, then Mr. McAuliffe will move for the adoption of the Conference Committee and explain the Conference Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I was given to understand that you were not going to call this Bill, and additionally, this report has only just this second hit my desk. I have not had a chance

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

to examine it to know what it does, and so, with your leave, I understand we're anxious to get out of here, I would like an opportunity to read it in its present form, and at that point, if you would take it out of the record to give me just five minutes to read it, I would appreciate it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Speaker, maybe I can assist Representative Braun. It's a very short Amendment. The House...The Motion adopt the Conference Committee Report is to concur in Senate Amendment #1. The effect of Senate Amendment provides that a candidate who was defeated in a primary can then not subsequently run as a candidate of a political party in that general election. This was the Amendment that, previously, was passed on House Bill 856. Passed the House by a vote of one-hundred to six...to eight, and it has been, previously, And I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I noncontroversial. have asked that this be part of our action today and does not contain any other provision in the Bill. And I think if Representative Braun were to look at the very simple single sentence in there, and the analysis which are...Do you want me to send you an analysis over here? alright."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I have examined the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2055, and the Corrected First Conference Committee Report on that same Bill. Based on a reading of the two of them, it appears that the Sections following line 28 of the First Conference Committee Report has been deleted by the corrected copy.

And I, therefore, withdraw any objection to this Bill being heard at this time."

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels requests leave to suspend the Calendar requirements, and the requirement that the Conference Committee Report lie on the desk for an hour.

  Is there leave? Leave is granted with the...through the use of the Attendance Roll Call. The Chair recognizes Mr. McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2055. Senate Amendment #1 provides that a candidate who was defeated in a primary cannot, then, subsequently run as a candidate of a new political party in the general election. This Amendment is the same as it was in House Bill 856 which passed a hundred to six."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "I think, for the record, you should clarify that what we're doing is adopting Conference Report #1 on House Bill 2055."
- Speaker Madigan: "Corrected. For what purpose does Representative Braun seek recognition?"
- Braun: "In response to Representative Vinson. We're adopting the Corrected First Conference Committee Report on that same Bill, which deletes the provisions having to do with aldermanic elections, and which is signed on the second day of July as opposed to the First which is not dated."
- Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 90 'ayes' and 2 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion to adopt the First Corrected Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2055 is adopted, and this Bill, having received an Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Representative Braun seek recognition?"

78th Legislative Day

July 2, 1983

Braun: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I think you forgot to say
Corrected. You did?"

Speaker Madigan: "I did say Corrected."

Braun: "I'm very sorry."

- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Is there any further business to come before the House? Representative Wojcik, are you seeking recognition?"
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am. I've listened to both, you the Minority Leader, Daniels, speaking as to the new era that we have faced, and I will just like to say that as a and someone who is experiencing politics in the whole for the very first time, I would like to commend for the promptness and the orderly process that you have run the House. I will like to commend Mr. Daniels for sincerity, and understanding. I would also like to compliment Mr. Larry DiPrima, who has given me Veterans Affairs. insight into How about Veterans Commissions? But most of all, I would just like to thank everybody in this House for a lovely, lovely six months and fantastic growing time, and it's just been nice to know both sides of the aisle and to work with you for the coming year. Thanks a lot for everything."
- Speaker Madigan: "There being no further business to come before
  the House, the Chair recognizes Representative McPike for
  the Adjournment Motion."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, October 5, 1983 at the hour of 12 noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. The House stands adjourned until October 5, 1983. Thank you very much."

01/11/84 10:05 - \_

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

PAGE 1

JULY 02, 1983

	JULY 02, 196.	3	
HB-0320	CONFERENCE	PAGE	109
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	43
BB-0687	CONFERENCE	PAGE	144
HB-0690	CONFERENCE	PAGE	28
8880-aH	CONPESENCE	PAGE	45
HB-1117	CONFERENCE	PAGE	138
HB-1178	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	27
HB- 1257	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	76
	CONPERENCE	PAGE	138
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	99
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	51
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	173
HB-2297		PAGE	160
HB-2298		PAGE	160
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	128
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	38
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	87
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	16
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	3
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	133
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	102
	CONFERENCE	PAGE PAGE	68 164
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	22
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	97
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	95
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	85
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	13
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	4
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	161
SB-0481	CONFERENCE	PAGE	15
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	92
SB-0513	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	10.3
SB-0513	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	95
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	155
	COMPERENCE	PAGE	19
	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	123
	CONFERENCE	FAGE	162
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	6
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	105
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	65
SB-0714	CONFERENCE	PAGE	36
	CONFERENCE OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	57
SB-0879		PAGE PAGE	38 40
SB-0949		PAGE	55
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	100
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	67
SB-1026		PAGE	136
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	50
SB-1176		PAGE	107
SB-1222	CONFERENCE	PAGE	108
SB-1226	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	17
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	158
SB-1263		PAGE	166
SB-1307	CONFERENCE	PAGE	156
SB-1313	CONFERENCE	PAGE	38
SB- 1315		PAGE	17
SB-1336	CONFEBENCE	PAGE	8
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	157
HJR-0072		PAGE	154
SJR-0038	ALUPTED	PAGE	167

01/11/84 . -

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

PAGE 2

JULY 02, 1983

### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REP. MATIJEVICE IN CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REPRESENTATIVE RICE	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	1
GENEBAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
BEPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR	PAGE	112
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICE IN CHAIR	PAGE	154
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	159
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	159
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	159
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	165
ADJOURNBENT	PAGE	176