93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order and the Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is the Associate Rector from Christ Episcopal Church in Springfield, the Reverend Charles Reeder. Reverend Reeder."
- Reverend Reeder: "Let us pray. Oh Lord, our Governor, Your glory is in all the world. We commend to You this state. Grant to our Legislators who bear the authority of government, that they may be lead to wise decisions and right actions for the welfare and peace of Your people. This we ask in the Name of Christ Jesus, Your Son, our Lord. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Domico will lead in the Pledge today."
- Domico et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Kulas, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if it's not too late to bring the Reverend back to the podium, we'd like to hold a short memorial for Representative DiPrima, who lost his first Bill in 20 years yesterday on the House floor. He's been very despondent, and he couldn't sleep all night."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, you know, when Mautino here, my seatmate, got up to oppose me, I was shocked because we're both of Sicilian origin. But I think what he did, he traced back our descendants, you know, and I think members of my family must have been members of the Mafia. You know, they must have knocked off some members of his family, and he was taking out his revenge on me yesterday,

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

you know. So, that's about it; otherwise, I would have never lost the Bill. But I'm going to come back with it.

I'm having it drawn up again, and I'm sure all you fine people will reconsider and restore my stature as not having lost a Bill in the House. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Let the record indicate that today is Lee Daniels'
40th birthday, would you Mr. Clerk? It's all maintenance
from here on, Representative. Take the record, will you,
Mr. Clerk? I understand that today is Laz Murphy's 40th
birthday too, Representative Daniels. Take the
record...the Roll Call, would you, Mr. Clerk? With 158
Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is
present. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you
seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, people are usually given presents on their birthday or for Christmas. And I would like to ask Mike Madigan for a present for today."

Speaker Ryan: "To ask your what?"

Daniels: "Mike Madigan, I want to ask him for a present, for a birthday present. I wonder if Mike Madigan would give me merit selection of Judges, Grand Jury and products liability for my birthday."

Speaker Ryan: "You'll be 120 before you'll see that happen.

Representative Vinson, what part of this dialogue do you want to participate in?"

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it may be..."

Speaker Ryan: "We all know you talked enough yesterday. I didn't know you'd be talking today."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a happier...in a happier frame of mind today than I was yesterday, and I think it might be..."

Speaker Ryan: "I'm sorry to hear that."

Vinson: "...Appropriate for you to make an announcement in

93rd Legislative Day

- April 15, 1982
- connection with the Parliamentarian and his personal life and a piece of happiness that's occurred to him."
- Speaker Ryan: "Did you say you wanted to apologize for the remarks you made about the Parliamentarian yesterday? Is that what you said?"
- Vinson: "No, I didn't. I just understand now why he was deranged yesterday, and I think you ought to announce that to the Membership."
- Speaker Ryan: "Anybody got a Bill they want heard?

 Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Lechowicz: "Well, why don't you to have him call merit selection of Judges now and the other two Bills that he was interested in."
- Speaker Ryan: "Do you want to call merit selection now, Representative?"
- Daniels: "Is...is Representative Lechowicz going to give that to me for my birthday?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Lechovicz."
- Lechowicz: "That and a few other things."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty, do you have any excused absences?"
- Getty: "May the record show, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Yourell is excused due to a death in the family, and I believe we've already excused Representative Vitek."
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. Representative Telcser, do you have any excused absences?"
- Telcser: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Journal show that
 Representative Ewing is absent because of legislative
 business, Representative Peters because of illness and
 Representative Gene Hoffman because of illness in his
 family?"
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. On page three under

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

the Order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 89, Representative Deuster. What's your pleasure, Representative? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Mr. Clerk. It is the intention of the Chair to make at least one pass through this Calendar on Second and Third Reading and then adjourn and go home.

Representative Kulas, that's for your information and your Members. Even DiPrima. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 89, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and #2 were adopted previously."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake...no, are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendments \$1 or \$2?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Deuster, amends House Bill 89."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, on Amendment #3."

Deuster: "On Amendment #3, I would ask that that would be...be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4...4, Deuster, amends House Bill
89 as amended."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that Amendment #4 be withdrawn."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #4, Mr. Clerk. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Deuster, amends House Bill 89
as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Deuster on Amendment #5."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Amendment #4...Amendment #5, I'm sorry. What Amendment #5 does is to amend this speed limit Bill to provide that we would not be losing our federal funds. As you know, the basic Bill says

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

for the interstate highways and the toll roads, the speed limit would be raised from 55 to 65. Recognizing that that might jeopardize federal funds, I am offering an Amendment to the Bill which I think will make this responsible and realistic Bill. What Amendment #5 does, it simply says that if you're driving over 55 on an interstate highway or the toll road, but not over 65, that the fine will be one dollar for each mile over 55 and also that court cost will not exceed five dollars. This Amendment is similar to the legislation adopted in Montana, Nevada and Wyoming and passed through the Indiana House to recognize that everybody's going over 55 on the interstate and that most citizens regard that speed as rather a violation, and so this does reduce the fine and make it rather small. At the same time, leaving the law that the Pederal Congress has mandated and imposed on the nation on the books. I think it's a good Amendment that will make the Bill conform to the way I'd like to present it to the House on Third Reading, and I would ask for your support of Amendment #5."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Deuster, do I understand that this would still be a violation under the law? You're not taking away the quasi-criminal onus?"

Deuster: "Yes, Representative Getty, this would still be a violation. The Amendment also provides that it would not be a moving violation that would result in the suspension of your license. It is still a violation of the law, but we are simply making the fine smaller and specifying what it would be."

Getty: "You're taking out the points, as they're called, that

93rd Legislative Day

- April 15, 1982
- would be assigned by the Secretary of State for a violation between 55 and 65 miles?"
- Deuster: "Yes, on page two of the Amendment, it simply says that conviction upon this offense would not be a violation that would result in the suspension of your license or be considered for that. So, if you did drive between 55 and 65 and at a reasonable and proper speed under the conditions, such speeding would not be grounds for revoking your license, but it still would be an offense."
- Getty: "All right. Now, the other part of the...of the Amendment would speak to the amount of fine that could be levied. Is that correct? And it would result in a loss of somewhere between 35 and 45 dollars, on the average, to the county. Is that correct?"
- Deuster: "For each individual instance of a violation. Right now, it is my understanding, by Supreme Court rule that, should you be going over 55 on the interstate, why if you wanted to pay...plead guilty and send that in, you would pay 50 dollars."
- Getty: "And under this, it would be no longer 50 dollars, but it would be somewhere between 35 and 45 if I calculate correctly. Is that correct?"
- Deuster: "No, what it would...Let's assume you were going 65.

 That would be ten dollars. That's one dollar for each mile over the limit, plus five dollars court cost. So it would be 15 dollars."
- Getty: "All right. I'm sorry, I misspoke myself. I was speaking to the loss in revenue. There would be a loss in revenue for each case under this of between 35 and 45 dollars...or 44 dollars for one...one mile over. Is that correct?"
- Deuster: "Yes."
- Getty: "What would the...What would you estimate the cumulative loss to your county, to Lake County be, Representative

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Deuster? Over the period of a year, for example."

Deuster: "I haven't estimated it."

Getty: "Do you know approximately how many convictions there are for speeding in Lake County per year?"

Deuster: "No, I don't. But I do know this, Representative Getty, that I, myself, when I drive to Springfield and I observe everyone else on the interstate, and I have been driving this road for 10 miles, as many Members have, I hardly anybody going 55, and I rarely see a police officer. on the toll road that goes through my Lake County District and the interstate system, all of the traffic, everybody, is driving between 55 and 65. I think the instances where an officer gets out there and sees 300 cars going 60 and issues a ticket are rare indeed. And so I would suspect that the revenue loss to Lake County would be minimal, and that the general revenue loss to the State of Illinois minimal. Because, the truth is, the law enforcement officers, and the Members of the Legislature and the citizens of this state really think that that law is ridiculous and, from my personal observation, I see very little enforcement of it. It's sporatic. Once in a while you*11 see somebody stopped, but the general flow of traffic is over 55. And I don't think, in answer to your question, that the revenue implications of this are going to be significant at all."

Getty: "But you haven't bothered to get that data so that we would be able to make a judgement on the loss to our respective counties. Is that correct, Sir?"

Deuster: "I think it's so speculative it's hard to imagine, and sometimes research and studies are not fruitful. For any Members that are concerned about the loss of revenue, I suppose they can kind of guess what it is. I haven't had a

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

study made of what it would be. No, Sir."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I...it would appear that Representative Deuster may have a good idea. question the wisdom of adopting this particular Amendment until we know exactly what the cost implications are to our counties. I would like to know, for one, how much the revenue loss would be. I don't think the research is that difficult. I think it would be a matter of contacting the respective clerks of the courts and finding out how many convictions there were for speeding violations between one mile and ten mile over the speed limit in areas where it was above 55. So, convictions for speeding above 55 miles an hour, one to ten miles over, determine that number from that we could get, at least, a rough idea of the amount of revenue loss to the state or rather to respective counties for that. The second part..."

Deuster: "Representative Getty..."

Getty: "...Of the Amendment, I think, is a good idea. I think that to remove the points from minor speeding violations is laudable, and I would certainly support that aspect of it. In fact, I would rather suggest that a further Amendment might be considered by Representative Deuster, calling it what it really is. We went from 65 to 55 or 70 to 55 in an attempt to conserve energy. And we ought to call it, not a speeding violation, but a violation of energy conservation and take it completely out of the aeges of...of being any sort of quasi-criminal act and have it be what it is, an energy violation. And I would recommend to Representative Deuster if he'd like to consider that, I would join with him in supporting such an Amendment."

Deuster: "Representative Getty, I appreciate those constructive suggestions. I would say that I would like, because of the time element, to put the Amendment on so it gets...and I

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

will consider that. I know that in other states they do call it an unnecessary waste of a resource in short supply. That's what they did in Montana, Nevada and Myoming. I didn't want to play around with the subject too much, but I'd be happy to consider that. I hope that we can put the Amendment on and, between now and Third Reading, I assure you that I will endeavor to get the statistics that you suggested might be important to have. I appreciate your helpful suggestions."

Getty: "Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. think this is very important; I would hope that you would pay attention. Normally, I would probably support this, but if you will recall, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year we changed the law which increased the fines for speeding violations, and now the most common fine is 50 dollars, which is 15 higher than the old fine. important thing, and I think, the thing that you should realize is the extra 15 dollars goes for to finance the police training under the Police Training Board. And I'm sure that "Al Appa" and the Police Training Board would not be supportive of this Amendment because it's going to take money away, some two million dollars, I believe possibly, for police training. And I think, under that, I don't think it's a good Amendment and I feel compelled to vote against it."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "All right. In response to statements made by

 Representatives Getty and Wolf, I...I am in agreement with

 Deuster. I don't think you can measure the money because

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

you don't know if the State Police arrest guotas will be increased. Then, there's the cost of a lawyer's fee if the guy's got a third ticket. In some of those counties, or in the collar counties, you don't know what the fee is going to be to fight that third offense. Then, there the result with the insurance company when you get a bump on your license. They increase the insurance premium. So I don't think anyone can measure the cost, the anguish, the frustration. So I think this is a very good Amendment because all the State Police will have to do is increase their quotas and quit running over themselves in all these counties and just stay on the highways and pick speeders."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a Cosponsor of this Bill, and I think it's a needed Amendment. I think we're, Representative Deuster and I, are realistic enough to realize we can't pass just a straight, flat increase in the speed limit. But, this has been done in other states. It has not been challenged by the federal people who threaten to take away the gas tax, and I would like to see this Amendment adopted with the provisions that Representative Deuster made."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to close."
- Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of this Amendment which Representative Friedrich and I are suggesting be put on our own Bill here. This does not increase the speed limit. All this does is to provide that where on an interstate highway and the toll road, you may be going between 55 and 65, that the fine will be reduced to one dollar for every mile over the limit with a court cost specified of five dollars, and also that this would

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

not be a moving violation for which you lose your license. This Amendment that we're putting on, which we hope you'll consider on Third Reading, when we get to that, is similar laws passed by Montana, Nevada, Wyoming and by the Indiana House. And I think it recognizes the fact that most citizens, most Legislators, most people in this nation and in this state do not think that the 55 mile speed limit serious and a reasonable law. Most people ignore it and violate it, and I think that by changing the fine, reducing the fine, we are recognizing that fact and bringing this law into reason. In response to Representative Getty's suggestion, I will endeavor, if this goes on between now and Third Reading, to get some statistics so we will also know, if there is a revenue loss, what that might be. I would urge your adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 89. I appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #5 to House Bill 89?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 429, Representative Pechous. Out of the record. House Bill 921, Representative Miller. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 921, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law. Second Reading of the
Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller, on...oh, any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further Amendments?"

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, Miller, amends House Bill 921 as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Miller on Amendment #3."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic, Speaker), and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 strikes everything after the enacting clause. It exempts the property passing to a surviving spouse. It raises the exemption level to 100,000 for other individuals in 1983. It increases an additional 100,000 until 1988, when the exemption would be 600,000. This is much in line with the recent revisions in the Federal Estate Tax. The effective date would be July 1, 1983. The fiscal impact would be about 16 million dollars in FY'84 and in FY'85 it would be a larger amount of 78 million. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Evell."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Ewell: "Who are going to be the beneficiaries of this 78 million dollars? In other words, the 78 million dollars in taxes are not going to be paid. Who's going to be the beneficiary?"

Miller: "It will be, in 1985, we'll be talking about those people
who now have no exemption up to the 100,000 dollar level,
which includes all surviving spouses, children and
unrelated individuals."

Ewell: "What's the current exemption..."

Miller: "Everybody will."

Ewell: "...level? What's the current exemption level?"

Miller: "For the surviving spouse, it's 60 thousand dollars. For children, I believe it is 40 thousand dollars and for unrelated people it gets as low as 250 dollars, I believe."

Ewell: "All right. Thank you."

Miller: "500 dollars. Thank you."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Ewell: "I'd like to speak to the Amendment just very briefly. Very briefly, I think that this represents another type of qiveaway. We are, in effect, going to have an impact upon the State Treasury of 78 million dollars in *85. provision for the replacement of these dollars. We are not talking about earned income or income that is passed where people earn by the sweat of their brow. But, what we're talking about is almost the most unearned type income, an estate that is given to you. I would suggest to the Members of this Body that, if we are going to be so benevolent to the tune of 78 million dollars, certainly there can be more deserving people. We will be, in this Body, before perhaps the end of this year or next year. asking for an increase in the income tax, in the sales tax, in the various other taxes in the state while we are giving away 78 million dollars to people who don't pay a dime on unearned income, an inheritance, if you will, and the exemption on a spouse is all the way up to 60 thousand dollars. I suggest we take a hard look at this type of legislation, lest one night, in the near future, this Body sit, wails and moans about the fact that we have to have an increase in the state income tax, which is a tax on earned This is the most least deserving segment of the income. society to receive the benefits and 78 million dollars. this case, is the case of serving greed rather than need. I suggest that this Amendment, indeed, ought to he defeated."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise because of the statement that we just had to sit through from the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle. It has to be one of the most perverse

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

statements that has ever graced this Body. We talk about earned income and who has the right to certain monies. The former speaker seems to think that the money that is out there in the hands of people who may die, somehow, belongs to the state. Now, what is basically wrong with any kind of inheritance tax is that we have the government or the state, if you will, benefiting from the death of one of its Now, if you and I happen to earn some money. earn some money, Mr. Ewell, and if we should die as we eventually will, and if we should wish to leave this to a friend or a child or a wife, to say that somehow the state has a right to that money and the people do not is, by any means, absolutely perverse. And somebody who can look what is out there and say, 'That belongs to the state' as opposed to belonging to individuals. has a view government and a view of individual rights that could only turn the stomach, if not the mind, of our founding fathers. This, indeed, needs to be looked at but certainly not from the standpoint of the former speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Byan: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Number one, this applies to estates of decedents dying after June 30, 1983?"

Miller: "Yes."

Brummer: "And what was the fiscal impact for the first...for PY'84, then?"

Miller: "Sixteen and a half million dollars."

Brummer: "I can't understand. Are you saying sixteen or sixty?"

Miller: "One six point five."

Brummer: "And what is it for the following year?"

Miller: "Seven eight point four."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15. 1982

Brummer: "Why...I don't understand. It becomes effective on the...on the beginning of the fiscal year, why is there such a dramatic difference between the two years?"

Miller: "Because of the lag in collection rates, Bich. People dying don't pay their tax immediately upon their death.

There's a certain time limit, as you know."

Brummer: "Okay, very good. Thank you. Okay. Now, with regard to the exemptions, the schedule of exemptions, you have 100,000 in 1983, 200,000 in '84 and so forth going up to 600,000 in 1988. That is with regard to each recipient. Is that correct?"

Miller: "Yes."

Brummer: "So, that exemption, at least by 1988, if there are more than one recipient, it would be higher than the Federal Estate Tax exemptions."

Miller: "Yes, that is true."

Brummer: "Okay. Now, in that language dealing with the exemptions, the exemption appears to apply to...to all recipients and is not just restricted to Class 1 recipients?"

Miller: "That's my understanding."

Brummer: "In other words, if...if the recipient was a total stranger, the exemption would still apply to them."

Miller: "That's correct."

Brummer: "Now, you...you removed the exemption language for the Class I beneficiaries by interlining it, but the exemption for the Class II beneficiaries and the Class III beneficiaries was not removed. I was wondering if that was a technical error. There seems to be inconsistency. For example, for Class III beneficiaries, you still have the 500 dollar exemption in there. And...But the exemption language starting with 100,000 dollars seems to apply to everyone."

93rd Legislative Day April 15, 1982

Miller: "What page are you on, please?"

Brummer: "Well, the specific exemption language is on page six beginning on line 11; 100,000; 200,000 and so forth like that."

Miller: "Right."

Brummer: "Okay, and the language on line four says any gift, legacy, inheritance, transfer, appointment or interest passing under this Act to any person, so it would appear to apply to everyone. The exemption would appear to apply to everyone."

Miller: "Other than a surviving spouse, that's correct."

Miller: "Right."

Brummer: "Okay, then on page seven, at the top of the page, interlined the...the various items on Class I beneficiaries. Beginning on line 14, I think, is the language that is generally referred to as Class II beneficiaries: uncles, aunts, nieces and nephews. And αn line 26 thereof, it says which may be valued at a...at a less sum than 500 dollars shall not be subject to any such duty or taxes. So the 500 dollar exemption is still there for the Class II beneficiaries. And when you get to the Class III beneficiaries, which are basically strangers, line eight...I mean on page eight, line seven, you still have the 100 dollar exemption. I would...I would suggest maybe that's not what you intended to do. You apply the 100,000, 200,000 dollar exemption to everyone, Class I, Class II, Class III beneficiaries, but then you still leave in the exemption language on the 500 dollars and the 100 dollars with regard to the Class II beneficiaries and the Class III beneficiaries on page seven and page eight.

Miller: "It may be that there is a technical error there, I'm not

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

entirely sure. Obviously, the Legislative Reverence Bureau put this together. If there is a problem with it, I'm sure we can cure that in the Senate. But it's a technical problem, as you've noted, and obviously the substantive intent is very, very clear. I'd be happy to clear that later. Thank you for bringing it to my attention, though." Brunner: "Okay, where do you get...Where do you retain the percentage rates for the taxation οf Class Ι

Miller: "It's on page five, line 13."

Brummer: "Okay, thank you."

beneficiaries?"

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a guestion?"

Speaker Byan: "Indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative, you've indicated to this Body of a...the fact that this could have an impact of 70 some million dollars in the following fiscal year. Would you tell this Body what part of government do you propose that we cut? What further cuts do we...do you propose that we make? And what I'm saying is that from what I read. education is in bad condition. From what I read, the Institute for the Visually Impaired is going to be closed at this date. It is still going to be closed because we can't find 900 and some thousand dollars in the Governor*s Now you propose that we have further cuts of around 70 some million dollars. What do you propose that we cut further?"

Miller: "I don't think there will have to be any spending cuts.

I think we will simply be cutting the revenue. The fiscal impact will be in Fiscal Year 1985. By then, I'm certain, the changes that are going to be happening at the national level will have impacted in Illinois, and we will have

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

additional income into our State Treasury which will permit us to have this tax relief that's much needed without a cost...cut in expenditures for education and mental health and all the very important programs we're down here to serve."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this issue. As I read here just a few days ago an article referring to Illinois' rating on the bond market, we, as you know, have had a triple A bond rating. Yet, four investment firms have said that that rating must now be downgraded because of the fiscal impact that Reaganomics and the fact that the federal fiscal policies are now impacting on the Illinois economy. Also, I read where the rating, the bond rating, had said that when Governor Thompson went on Wall Street he indicated to them that revenue collections are going to improve. Al...And also, I'm sure that he indicated to them that in this Legislative Session, we are probably going to do some things to make the revenue collections improve. What you are saying now would be to the contrary. rather than make the revenue projections look better, you're going to make it look worse, that there will be further erosion. You know, the inheritance tax generates 160 million dollars. It's nice to come up here and say that we're all for eliminating the revenue tax base that we have from the inheritance tax. That all sounds good, and I think it sounds good to have that on your campaign brochure that you're for eliminating the revenue tax, shouldn't be taxing the dead people. But I want to tell you that when you say that you've also got to say that you are for a tax increase to make up that loss. You know, we no longer can...can balance the budget by some creative accounting method. You can't do it. Sooner or later it's going to catch up to you. And I think that Bob Mandeville

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

and the Governor are realizing that it's catching up to them. And the only point is when is it going to catch up to them, before the November election or after the November election. I'd like to vote for you too, but I can't vote for a phoney Amendment when the education of our children is at stake. I can't vote for a phoney Amendment when the mentally ill and their concerns are at stake. I can't vote for that phoney Amendment when we're going to close down the only institute in all of Illinois that provides for the vocational needs, a residential facility for blind people in Illinois. Call this Amendment what it is, phoney campaign, election Amendment. That's all it is. Until you can find other monies that take its place, you've got to be against it."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Br. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen House. I can hardly believe my ears from the statements of the last speaker. I sat in the House Appropriations Committee just on Tuesday and, if my recollection is correct, which I'm certain it is, he and the Democratic Members of the Appropriation Committee were trying to find fault with the Department of Revenue's efforts to collect the revenue that is justly due the State of Illinois under the existing laws. They were trying to find fault with Director Johnson's proposals to put more revenue collection officers and more revenue auditors on line. This is a very good Amendment. In my area, the Illinois Inheritance Tax is the most disliked and hated tax that there is. I urge the adoption of Representative Miller's Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn. No, Representative Beatty, the Gentleman from Cook."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I believe that the thought process here is a good one in the fact that the man wants to give tax relief ... relief. But I believe it's premature. I think what we need is a study, really, of all of the tax laws that we have. We just can't piecemeal say we're going to eliminate inheritance tax. We do need state I think that there is another tax here, a sales tax on food and drugs, that we really should be eliminating and the Governor has plans to try to make some changes he can get more revenue. I think he wants to raise the tax on liquor or maybe on gasoline. We do need some revisions in the tax law, and I think that the fact of the matter that needs some study. And I believe that we may have to revise the tax, the income tax, which seems to me a more fair tax, because you're taking money from people as they're earning it, and I think it's a more fair tax than sales tax or the inheritance tax. But I think this is premature. I think the Sponsor is thinking the right way. though, for tax relief. But, I think we should really be against this Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you...Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, this is a point I have been here now two days, and I have clarification. heard three times that the Governor is closing the Institute for the Visually Handicapped in Chicago. not closing it. He has postponed, anyway, the closing until June 30. It was supposed to be April 30. I think we ought to have a more positive attitude about this. He said he would not close it unless he could find there was the same kind of place for any blind person as the service they received there. And I think we ought to say 'Thank you',

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

at least, to the Governor. He did not do that, and I'm sure it was that...because of a lot of the efforts of a lot of you right here on this floor. So, please, don't say again that the Governor is closing the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan." Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. adequately explained the provisions of the Amendment, but I think it's important for all of us to realize that this Amendment, if adopted and signed by the Governor, would constitute a revenue loss of 16 million dollars for Fiscal Year 1983 and a loss of 70 to 80 million dollars for Fiscal Year 1984. As the Gentleman proposes a revenue loss of million dollars for the next fiscal year, he should understand that the Governor's budget message, as offered this Assembly, is currently 150 million dollars in deficit. The Fiscal and Economic Commission of the State Illinois recently revised downward its estimates of available revenues for Fiscal Year 1983 by 150 million That places Governor Thompson's budget, proposed, for Fiscal Year 1983 in a position of being 150 million dollars in deficit. And, in light of that, Mr. Miller is offering to us an Amendment which would constitute a further revenue loss of 16 million dollars and, for that reason, I think that the Amendment should be opposed."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller, to close."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm certain the Minority Leader was inadvertent when he mentioned FY*83 as being the first year of fiscal impact. The Bill does not take effect until July 1, 1983,

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

so it's FY'84 that we're speaking of and then the impact is only sixteen and a half million dollars. I'd like to correct that. With respect to the Bill, or the Amendment I should say, I think it's long overdue that we have this type of relief being discussed and studied. And the only way to discuss it and to study it is to propose an Amendment or propose a Bill. That's what I'm doing here. I think, if you talk to your constituents, this is a Bill that they would want you to support. It's a tax that's not appreciated by any of them, and I think that you will serve your constituents well by voting affirmatively. And I seek your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to House Bill 921 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Ryan: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 975, Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels, do you want...out of the record. House Bill 1004. Representative Kellev. Representative Kelley, House Bill...out of the record. House Bill 1060, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 1108, Representative Schneider. TOR? Out of the record. House Bill 1215, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 1271, Representative Hoffman. of the record. House Bill 1317, Representative Daniels. You may be able to pass the Bill on your birthday. Bill 1346, Representative McClain. Out of the record. House Bill 1351, Representative Winchester. Out of the record. House Bill 1502, Abramson. Out of the record. Abramson in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

1527, Representative Miller. Out of the...Out of the 1543, Representative record. House Bill Representative Levin on the floor? Out of the record. of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 1733, Representative Hallock. Out of the record. House Bill 1841, Representative Karpiel. Out of the record. House Bill 2115, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 20...2204, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2204, a Bill for an Act to amend certain appropriation Acts and certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2211, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2211, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Children and Family Services, Department of Public Aid, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Mental Health and Development Disabilities and Department of Rehabilitation Services. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2221. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Only because my name was mentioned in the debate on the prior Bill relative to saying that the Governor has

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

announced the closing of the Illinois Institute for the Visually Handicapped. I have before me a document from the Illinois Department of Administrative Services. Subject: Surplus Land Availability. And on that matter of surplus land availability is the Illinois Institute for the Visually Handicapped, 1151 South Wood, Chicago, Illinois. Until there is an official document to the contrary, the position is that the Illinois Institute for the Visually Handicapped is surplus property. I've got it here. I said that because of what I've got, and it's official, it's in the record, and I want to put that in the record. I'm going to maintain that until there's something done officially to the contrary."

Speaker Ryan: "House Bill 2221, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2221, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent and distribute the expenses of the Department of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2441, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2441, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Department of Children and Family Services Fiscal Year 1982

Appropriation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2451, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2451, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2452, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2452, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading Short

Debate Calendar. House Bill 1763, Representative Telcser.

Out of the record. House Bills, Third Reading. House

Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 79, Representative

Catania. Out of the record. Representative Daniels in the

Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 139, Representative Wikoff. Out of the record. House Bill 156, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. House Bill 210, Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. House Bill 211, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 211, a Bill for an Act relating to the election of municipal officers in the City of Chicago.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, House Bill 211."

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

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

House. House Bill 211 creates a non-partisan election mechanism for the Mayor of the City of Chicago, the City Clerk, the City Treasurer. It provides, essentially, for the same kind of electoral mechanism as we have for the Aldermen in the City of Chicago. Essentially, the motivation of the Bill is that local government is, in fact, a management function, not a philosophical function, and this would have the impact of making that the case in the City of Chicago. I believe, in the long run, it will save an enormous amount of money for the State of Illinois as well. And I would move for passage of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Vinson, you seemed to mumble through that a little bit. I wonder if you would mind answering a few questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Getty: "This applies only to the City of Chicago. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I'm prepared to answer questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you."

Getty: "This applies only to the City of Chicago?"

Vinson: "Yes, it's already the law in downstate Illinois.

There's the option for downstate cities to do it. That's

correct."

Getty: "And you re... You don't represent any part of the City of Chicago, do you, Representative?"

Vinson: "Well, the first reapportionment map tried to get me in there, I think, but..."

Getty: "But you are taking this special interest in helping the City of Chicago out. Is that correct?"

Vinson: "Yes, and the taxpayers of the State of Illinois."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Getty: "Alright, do you feel that this will result in a change in the form of government in the City of Chicago? Is that your intent?"

Vinson: "Yes, I believe it will."

- Getty: "And don't you believe in the Republican Party and the

 Democratic Party being a good system of government in these

 United States?"
- Vinson: "Well, I believe that in some cases it is and in some cases it isn't, and that system of government's certainly not worked very well for the City of Chicago. I think you would agree with that, Representative."
- Getty: "Well, Representative, I...I've just...I just always thought it was a good idea for people from downstate to be concerned about downstate issues. People from the City, of course, ought to be concerned with City issues, and I think that we all ought to work together. But I'm...I'm just surprised that you're getting involved in this sort of a thing. And I'm also...I also feel it calls into question some very deep-seated convictions that I have about our political system and the two-party system in this country."
- Vinson: "I'm sure it does, Representative Getty. I'm sure it calls into question some feelings that you have very deeply."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that everyone will look very, very carefully at this. This would provide for an action that could be a precedent to make inroads in the way your local government is run. And I think before saying 'aye' to this sort of thing and imposing the will of one area of this state upon another area of this state, we ought to give a great deal of pause. This is an attack, there's no question. It's a blatant political attack, and I think it's ill-founded and ill-conceived."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Barr."

Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. the first speaker here who has some part of Chicago in his district, let me say that I support this very good Bill. This Bill has the potential, at least, to improve, dramatically, the quality of government in the City of Chicago. Ιt is not an attack on the two-party system at all; because, as we all recognize, party organizations as well as other organizations of citizens interested in their government and in their locally elected officials would, of course, participate heavily in the selection and election of candidates for municipal office in the City of Chicago, if this Bill were passed, which it should be. At the present time, the Aldermen, the 50 Aldermen, in the City of Chicago are elected on a non-partisan ballot. This merely conforms the practice presently existing with regard to Aldermen with that existing for ... with regard to the three City-wide candidates. It would give the potential for the two strongest candidates, whoever they may be, from whatever party they may come, to...to be the two with respect to which the voters make the final choice. At the present time, as a practical matter, the selection is made in the primary in which a large percentage of citizens do not even participate. Selection is made in the primary as to who the Mayor, and the Clerk and the Treasurer of the City of Chicago will be. Under this Bill, it will be the two strongest candidates whether they're both Democrats, both Republicans, both Independents, whatever mixture prevails. It will be the two strongest candidates who will go into the final election and it will insure the election οf better qualified, stronger leadership for this metropolis, which is so important to our state

93rd Legislative Day

- April 15, 1982
- important to all Representatives here, regardless whether a part of the City is in their district or not. So I would urge an 'aye' vote on this good Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield for a question."
- Speaker Daniels: "Sponsor indicates he will."
- Bullock: "Thank you. Representative Vinson, in proposing this legislation, you do several things. The previous speakers have alluded to perhaps one or two of the changes that you make. I also note that in the Bill you make changes in the number of signatures required. What's your rationale for quadrupling the signature requirement?"
- Vinson: "Well, Representative, when you...when you switch to a non-partisan election and you have one primary, you have a very different process than when you have a partisan primary. And the...those requirements are parallel to the requirements that we have for Aldermen in the City."
- Bullock: "My understanding is that the number of signatures you're requiring here would, in fact, require almost 18,000 signatures for a candidate running in the primary election.

 Is that correct? As opposed to the present 3,000."
- Vinson: "Well, what we say is there...there's a two percent requirement for Aldermen and there'd be a two percent requirement for Mayor."
- Bullock: "Okay. Well, Representative Vinson, one of the other things I note, that in your earlier remarks, you indicated that the rationale behind this legislation is that there's no fundamental question of philosophy here, and that for some innocuous reason you should not have a partisan election. Do you still hold to that statement, in light of

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

the fact that most of the budget cutting that has taken place in our society, at least at the state level and at the federal level, is in fact done by Republican administrations, and you don't see that same sort sleight of hand under Democratic administration?"

Vinson: "Well..."

Bullock: "Is there not a philosophical difference in terms of the value of human dignity?"

Vinson: "Most of the budget cutting, Representative, has been done at the federal level."

Bullock: "Well, my understanding is that to the blind and the aged and the poor, who are traumatized by Thompson's proposed closure of the IVI Institute, that that's coming from the state level. My understanding is that the individuals who have lost their jobs in this state, some 500,000 of them, under this Administration, are traumatized that the state won't pay 169 dollars a month on general assistance, but wants to pay 132. And on five separate occasions, the courts have told them you've got to pay. And that's under this state administration."

Vinson: "Well, Representative, if those are your concerns, I'm quite willing to negotiate on those concerns."

Bullock: "Well, think ... "

Vinson: "If you'll step over here into my office, I'll be glad to talk with you directly..."

Bullock: "You know, I...I think this is a great Bill. I think
you perhaps just missed one provision. I think you ought
to add a residency requirement, and the residency
requirement should apply to the Sponsor of the Bill. And I
think if you put that Amendment, that the residence
requirement in order to Sponsor of such legislation that
you live in the Robert Taylor Homes, and you sponsor this
Bill, I'll wote for it. Otherwise, I'm going to vote

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

4 no 4 a 11

Vinson: "Well, Representative, I am quite willing to spend my
weekends in the Robert Taylor Homes if you vote for the
Bill. You have my personal assurance on that."

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

Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I opposed House Bill 211 when it came before a House-Committee for the simple reason that the Sponsor did not live in the City of Chicago. I took a cursory look at the Bill. I took a cursory look at the Sponsor, and I figured something had to be wrong. However, upon reconsideration, basically did like the idea. And the only thing I found offensive was the fact that it did not...it was not sponsored...it did not come out of the City of Chicago. But, perhaps, all great ideas aren't limited to the City of Chicago. I happen to think that the idea of a non-partisan election of Mayor, and the City Clerk, the City Treasurer is not an idea that should frighten away those of us who live in the City. After all, the Aldermen are elected this manner, and we all understand that they are all, each and every one of them, 50 good Democrats. I think that changing the election to a non-partisan one, for those of us who have partisan concerns in Chicago, I think all rest assured that Chicago will remain a Democratic stronghold. However, in the interest of local politics, in the interest of aiding and abetting, as I think the independent movement in the City of Chicago, and the interest of the people who live in the City who already have a lot of confusion over the electoral process, what is a legislative post versus what is a party post, I think that this Bill is a good Bill. And, as a matter of fact, I think it is a Bill that will be well received by

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

members of Chicago. As a Representative to a district that is solidly within the City of Chicago, I support this Bill, and I would ask others in the chamber to do likewise. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kociolko."

Kociolko: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the first Gentleman from the other side of the aisle to speak on this issue offered a truly amazing approach to the concept behind this Bill. He criticized the downstate Legislator for presuming to offer legislation which affects the City of Chicago, and he said that it would preferable if downstaters would concern themselves with downstate and Chicagoans concern themselves with Chicago. I find this to be extremely interesting. It sounded to me, for a moment, as though he said that a great Chinese wall should be erected around the City of Chicago, which I have always...always understood the Members of the City to be opposed to, particularly during the recent reapportionment. This certainly isn't what we were told last year during the transportation crisis, when we were told that the humblest Hamlet in the State of Illinois would stand or fall with the economic situation in the great City of Chicago. So, I find it really unusual that now we're being told that there must be this regional dichotomy: that only Chicagoans understand the needs of the City and only downstaters understand the needs of downstate. I hope that we will remember this concept in the future when the Chicago School District goes bankrupt, or their transportation system goes bankrupt, or their Housing Authority goes bankrupt, or some other well-managed engine of government in the City of Chicago falls upon hard times. Let's all of us from the suburbs and downstate remember this when the next great

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

- crisis faces the City of Chicago. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

 Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question, please? Is he there?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"
- Currie: "Well, I would have asked him, if he were there, how they elect the Mayor of Clinton, his own city; whether he's concerned about elections in Elgin, and Peoria and all the many other cities of the state. I don't understand, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, how somebody who, yesterday, on this House floor talked about the importance of uniformity in the way we do business in the State of Illinois, could be proposing this special interest, special target legislation that is the very substance of House Bill 211. If he were talking about establishing new rules for all mayoral elections in the State of Illinois, perhaps this Assembly should take the proposal seriously, but he isn't. He obviously had some kind of hidden agenda, and I think we should all vote 'no' on House Bill 211."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, do you care to respond to that question?"
- Vinson: "Yes. The Mayor of Clinton is chosen in a non-partisan election, Representative. And Representative Tuerk advises me that so is the Mayor of Peoria."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to close."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Repeatedly we are asked, as Legislators from around the state, to sit in consideration and deliberation on the budget of the City of Chicago, on the budget of the Chicago School District, the Park District, on budgets of the BTA and the CTA. I have, repeatedly, voted for various subsidy

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

measures, designed to help those units of government. I've one state, done that because this is interdependent state, that all of us have a responsibility for. There is no way this state can be a great state economically, governmentally, culturally or in any other unless each of us cares about the whole state. one of the things that's important, I believe, when my constituents and tell them that I found it home to necessary, on some particular issue, to vote to expend money that will be expended in the City of Chicago, one of the things I've found it necessary to do, or to respond to, are their questions about the efficiency of operations in the City of Chicago. And I have to, as a result of that, offer legislation at times that will improve efficiency of operation so that I can continue, in good conscience, voting for the necessary financial subsidies for the City. That's what this Bill is all about. It's a Bill for efficiency in government. It's a Bill for government. I am somewhat stunned by any criticism of this Bill from people from the City of Chicago, because it's the system of government, the system of elections that we use to select Aldermen in the City of Chicago. Now how can somebody suggest that this is some terrible thing? If, you select Aldermen up there, why is it such a bad way for selecting the Mayor of the City of Chicago? I think it's a simple, straight-forward, good government Bill. urge everybody to move 'yes' on it, and I would move passage of House Bill 211. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 211. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 211 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan to explain his vote. One

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Hadigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'no' vote on two grounds. Number one. provides for special legislation for one part of the State of Illinois. Today, in general, mayoral elections throughout Illinois are conducted along partisan lines. This Bill would provide that throughout all of Illinois except for Chicago, we would continue with the partisan method of selecting mayors; but in Chicago, we would move to a non-partisan system. Number two, and even more important than number one, this Bill, in effect, would reduce the amount of participation in mayoral elections by making it more difficult for a candidate to file nominating petitions. As of this moment, the number of signatures required for a candidate in a Democratic primary in 1983 would be 3,504. Under this Bill, the requirement for any candidate in a non-partisan election would be raised to 17,000. So for that reason, more than the first, I rise in opposition to the Bill, because it would make more

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk, to explain his vote. One minute, Sir."

difficult participation in the electoral process."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the Sponsor has brought forth to this Body a truly legitimate and logical type of Bill to consider. I consider it to be an affront to most of the Members of the Body to put a red vote on this. I think it's one of those types of proposals that should be given a good airing. It should be one that gives the City of Chicago an opportunity to improve its efficiency of government. I think that the mayor of many of our larger cities in this state are elected on the non-partisan basis as well as other offices throughout the

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

state. And I think it's just...it's pure logic to give the people that opportunity. I...I think that...that many more people who are either not voting or voting 'present' on this Bill should give it some serious consideration, and let's get up to the 89 number so that we can have enough to pass this out of the House and give it to the Senate for its consideration to a good...good government type of Bill, and I would urge your support."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from McLean,
 Representative Ropp, to explain his vote. Your timer's on,
 Sir."
- Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under the new redistricting, I now represent a sizeable metropolitan area that has been electing their public officials in this manner for many years. It's been a very effective approach in providing for good government in our cities, and I think it ought to be given a try in certainly a heavy populated area as the northeastern part of our state is. Certainly the experience in how to operate DOOD government efficiently and effectively has been very well displayed in central and downstate Illinois. And for that reason, that's why I'm voting green."
- Speaker Daniels: "Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick, to explain her vote. One minute, the timer's on."
- Zwick: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I would just like to explain that the reason, as someone who is not from Chicago, I have mixed emotion on how to vote on this Bill. However, when I consider the fact that we do deal with so many Bills that come from Chicago, and that Chicago affects us so much in almost every vote that we make in this House, and on all the appropriations that we vote on, I think we all do have a right to vote on this Bill and to vote "yes", as I'm

93rd Legislative Day

- April 15, 1982
- voting, so we can get some more control in Chicago and some more realistic government there. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take
 the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 78

 "aye", 68 voting "no", 10 voting "present". Gentleman from
 DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Would you Poll the Absentees, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman asks for a Poll of the Absentees.

 Mr. Clerk, poll the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Davis. Deuster.

 DiPrima. Epton."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative DiPrima as 'no'.

 Representative Conti? Representative Younge? Record

 Representative Younge as 'no'."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Absentees. Epton.

 Ewing. Grossi. Hoffman. Keane. Leinenweber. Ted Meyer.

 O'Brien. Peters. Reed. Schneider. Telcser. Vitek.

 Wikoff. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis? Record Representative Davis as 'aye', Representative Reed as 'aye', Representative Grossi, 'aye'. Any further? There are 81 voting 'aye', 70 'no', 10 vot...10 recorded as 'present'. Representative Vinson?"
- Vinson: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman places it on Postponed Consideration.

 House Bill 281, Representative Deuster. Out of the record.

 House Bill 519, Representative Hoxsey. Out of the record.

 554, out of the record. House Bill 555, Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 556, Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 615, Representative Swanstrom. Out of the record. 618, Representative Topinka. Out of the record. 658, Representative Collins. Out of the record. 668,

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Representative Catania. Out ο£ the record. 703, Representative Watson. Out οf the record. 710, Representative Klemm. Out οf the record. 711. Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. 714, out of 730, Representative Pierce. the record. Out of the record. 745, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. 798, Representative Hannig. Out of the record. Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 842. Representative Rigney. Out of the record. 845. Representative Grossi. Out of the record. 859, Representative Karpiel. Out οf the record. 869, Representative Reilly. Out of the record. 891, out of the record. 918. Representative DiPrima. Out of the record. 943, Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 964, out of the record. 1003, Representative Birkinbine. Out of record. 1023. Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 1035, Representative Kociolko. Out of the record. 1078. Representative Bower. Out of the record. 1120. Representative Preston. Out of the record. 1154. Representative Stanley. Out of the record. 1158. Representative McPike. Out o£ the record. 1162, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. 1178, out of the...Representative Steczo. 1178? Out οf the record. 1180, Representative Ropp. Out of the record. 1208. Senator Macdonald'. Out of the record. 1219, Representative Stearney. Out of the record. 1222, Representative Bowman. Out of the record. 1244. Representative Currie. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "May I have leave, Mr. Speaker, to bring this Bill back

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

to Second for purposes of an Amendment?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Lady asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Any objections? Hearing no objections, Second Reading, House Bill 1244. Is there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Currie Hallock, amends House Bill 1244 on page one and so forth."
- Currie: "Amendment #3 to House Bill 1244 is to take into account changes in the federal tax incentive program for historic preservation and renovation. Legislation that passed the Federal Congress between the time this Bill was introduced into this House and now, means that industrial and commercial properties, which were included in House Bill 1244 for purposes of incentive programs to encourage historic preservation, no longer need the provisions of House Bill 1244. So Amendment #3 is only to restrict the program to residential property. I would be happy to answer questions, and I would urge adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 1254, Representative Keane.
Out of the record. 1260, Representative Wikoff. Out of
the record. 1261, out of the record. 1268, Representative
McAuliffe. Out of the record. 1296, Representative Bell.
Out of the record. 1338, Representative O'Brien. Out of
the record. 1345, Representative McPike. Out of the
record. 1442, Representative Telcser. Out of the record.
1520, Representative Rea. Out of the record. 1551, out of
the record. 1590, Representative Donovan. Out of the

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

record. 1600. Representative Keane. Out of the record. 1605, out of the record. 1607, out of the record. 1621. Representative Stanley. Out of the record. 1624. 'Attorney General' Pierce. Out of the record. 1655, Representative Yourell. Out of the record. 1768. Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record. 1785, Representative Davis. Out ο£ the record. 1873. Representative Breslin. 1873? Out of the record. ₩e*ve been through the Calendar on House Bills Third Reading. Does anybody want to call their Bill, House Bills Third Reading? Good day. Have you all filed your income tax returns? Help state revenues and file early. Committee Reports."

Clerk Leone: "Representative McMaster, Chairman Committee on County and Townships, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 14, 1982 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: pass' House Bill 1320: 'do pass' as amended House Bill 1321. Representative Sandquist. Chairman from Committee on Registration and Regulation, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 14, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: "do pass" as amended House Bill 468: Interim Study House Bill 367. Representative Tuerk, Chairman from the Committee on Labor and Commerce, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 14, and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 2274."

Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following
Senate Joint Resolution, adoption of which I am instructed

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 82, adopted by the Senate April 15, 1982., Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, T directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to wit: House Joint Resolution 77, concurred in by the Senate April 15, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to wit: House Joint Resolution 79 concurred in by the Senate April 15, 1982. , Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Daniels: "Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 82, resolved by the Senate of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 15, 1982, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 20, 1982 at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 82 is hereby adopted. Speaker Ryan in the Chair."
- Speaker Ryan: "On page 13 under the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading appears HJRCA #7, Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. HJRCA #20, Representative Friedrich. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15. 1982

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #20 provides for amending Section 2 of Article X of the State Constitution relating to the Education Superintendent of Public Instruction. It has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. On the Calendar on page eight under the Order of Senate Bills. Third Reading appears Senate Bill 88, Representative Getty. Out of the record. No. no. I'm sorry. Page ten under the Order of Senate Bills. Second Reading appears Senate Bill 60. Representative Krska. Out of the record. House Bill 501. Representative Yourell... Senate Bill 501, Yourell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 507. Representative Priedrich... Representative Pullen. Senate Bill 507. Out of Senate Bill 674, Representative Macdonald. record. Out of the record. Senate Bill 707. Representative Mulcahev. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Terzich. Senate Bill 730. Representative. understand you just filed an Amendment that has not been printed and distributed, so we'll have to take it out of the record. Out of the record. House (sic, Senate) Bill 740, Representative Terzich. Want to move that one? the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 740, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Terzich, amends Senate Bill 740 on page one line and so forth."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich on Amendment #1."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 deletes the raise in the multiplier of the Chicago Firemen's Pension Code, and Amendment #1 provides for an ad hoc adjustment for retired

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

firemen who retired prior to September 1, 1959. The proposal has a minor fiscal impact, and I would move for its adoption.

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "I wonder if the Gentleman would yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "I'm ... He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Terzich, would you mind telling us what that minor fiscal impact is?"

Terzich: "Surely, there's approximately 500 retired firemen that retired prior to 1959. And what the Amendment does, it provides, on an ad hoc basis, of one dollar increase for each year of credible services of which is not to ex...it's between 20 and 30 dollars, and that's just for those retirees."

Getty: "In the prior form of the Bill, I believe, our cost analysis indicated it was some 395 thousand per year."

Terzich: "That was...No, that was the multiplier, increase in the multiplier, which was taken out."

Getty: "All right. So, as it is now, the cost is greatly reduced. Is that..."

Terzich: "Oh, yeah. All...figured out, it's approximately 100,000 dollars."

Getty: "100,000 dollars for every year, is that correct?"

Terzich: "Correct. That's...no, it diminishes because it will not get any greater. All...as these people die off, it just decreases. That's the maximum. There's only 500 members who have retired prior to 1959, so that's almost, you know, 20 some years. So they would die off; it decreases."

Getty: "Does this have the support of the City?"

Terzich: "It...I'm sure it will have."

Getty: "Will you check and ... "

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Terzich: "I am checking, Representative. You know I would..."

Getty: "And you'll let me know for sure on Third Reading?"

Terzich: "I have checked with Steve Brown, and we're in the process."

Getty: "I'll be happy to see that."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Do you care to close, Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "Yes, I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption...moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 740. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1029, Representative Woodyard. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1029, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 was tabled, #2 and #3 were adopted previously in Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendments #2 and #3?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House (sic, Senate) Bill 1049,
Representative Bbbesen. Out of the record. Page 13 under
the Order of Constitutional Amendments Second Reading
appears HJRCA #27, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill,
Mr....the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #27

proposes to amend Section 11 of Article IX of the State

Constitution relating to revenue limitations on total of

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

state taxes, has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2607, Griffin, a Bill for an Act regarding the regulation of airport taxi cab services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2608, Griffin, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2609, J. J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horseracing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2610, Leverenz — Dwight Friedrich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2611, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution ... "

Speaker Ryan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that we go to the order of business to take up House Bill 608."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks to suspend the appropriate rules to have House Bill 608 heard on the Order of Consideration Postponed. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Johnson, do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "Yes, I object to that. This is a very controversial

Bill that we've defeated 16 other times, and I object to

going out of order and going to that order of business. I

objected before the Chair announced that there were no
objections."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15. 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bullock, do you seek recognition?"
Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't object to what the
Gentleman's trying to do, but I thought that the Body was
entitled to some explanation as to what the Bill does."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, it really doesn't matter at this point, we can't hear it. Out of the record. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution...House Joint Resolution 81,

DiPrima — et al. House Resolution 789, Miller. House Resolution 790, Schneider — Kane. 791, Madigan — Kucharski — Beatty. 794, Davis. 795, Dick Kelly — Giglio. 796, Bullock. 797, Ryan — et al. 800, Richmond. 801, Richmond.

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti on the Agreed Resolutions." Conti: "Rouse Joint...Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Joint Resolution 81, DiPrima - Ryan - Madigan - Conti - et al. The Senate...we recognize and we those gallant men and women from the State of Illinois who are the recipients of the Purple Heart Medal Award. Joint Resolution 789, Miller - Woodvard - Stuffle. Benson Jewell is a native of Hammond, Indiana has been the captain of the swimming team for a number of years. conference records for 100 yard backstroke and has won three consecutive years in swimming and water polo at Northwestern University. We join the members of Danville community in congratulating Mr. Jewell on the occasion which was bestowed upon great honor outstanding and unselfish work on behalf of his fellow man. House Joint ... House Resolution 790, Schneider - Kane. House takes pleasure in announcing the birth of an eight pound thirteen ounce baby boy to Matthew Robert Von Behren, who took his first breath on February 9, 1982. House Resolution 791, Madigan - Kucharski - Beatty. The Clearing Branch Library of the Chicago Public Library is

93rd Legislative Day

April 15. 1982

celebrating 40 years of outstanding service to the community. We'll skip House Resolution 793, and we'll go to House Resolution 794, on...by Davis. On April 30, 1982. Lewis University οf Romeoville. Illinois will celebrating its 50th anniversary. House Resolution 795. Kelly, Dick - Giglio. The Reverend Thomas Gorman, founding Pastor of Holy Ghost Parish in South Holland, is retiring this year. House Resolution 796 by Bullock. It comes to the attention of the House that The National Association of Black Accountants will hold its 11th Annual Convention from June 30 to July 3. 1982 at the Hyatt Regency House...Hotel in downtown Chicago. House Resolution 797. Ryan - Republican Leadership, Whereas, Pfizer Inc., a worldwide research-based company interrelated business in health care, agriculture specialty organic chemicals, as well as diversified interest in consumer and materials science products, on this occasion of its 100th year of service to Illinois. recognizing its 100 years of service to Illinois. Resolution 800, Richmond. Gene Seibert will be honored a retirement party at the Flight Restaurant in Southern Illinois Airport on April 23. House Resolution 801. Elliott Ketring will be honored at a retirement party at the Flight Restaurant, Southern Illinois Airport on April 23, 1982 with his friend, Gene Seibert, with whom he worked with closely over the years. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, outside of House Resolution 793, which is going to be read by the Clerk, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further resolutions."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 793, Ewell - et al. Whereas April 14, 1982 marked the 36th birthday of Representative Larry Bullock of Chicago. Whereas Representative Bullock has selfishly (sic, selflessly) dedicated himself to serving his constituents since his election to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1978 by an overwhelming margin: whereas. he was born in Winstom-Salem, North Carolina and graduated from Catawba College in Salisbury, Carolina, where he received a Bachelor's Degree in and Political Science and Pre-Law. from Roosevelt University in Chicago, where he received a Master's Degree Public in Administration; and whereas much οf Representative Bullock's professional career prior to his election to the General Assembly involved work at the state and national levels as a Health Care Lobbyist with the Illinois Hospital Association and: whereas he served as Director of Public...Health and Planning and Accounting Programs for the Blue Cross Association, and as Health Planning Consultant for the Illinois Optometric the University of Chicago's Comprehensive Association. Sickle Cell Center, and the American Medical Records Association: and whereas prior to lending his enormous and diverse talents to the health care field, Representative touched many young lives as a teacher and a coach Bullock at Evanston Junior High School and Evanston School; and whereas the imaginative leadership qualities which he has...which he has come to display as a lawmaker was already evident in 1971 when he accompanied six black senior student-athletes on a tour of various college campuses in the South and earned college scholarships for of each the six student-athletes: and Representative Bullock has received numerous awards his many accomplishments, including the Distinguished Public

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Service Award from the Illinois Citizens for the Performing Arts Foundation, Community Service Award from the radio station WGRT, William L. Dawson Excellence Award for young...from the Young Democrats of Illinois, and Man of the Year Award from the Cook County Young Democrats; whereas, his outstanding work in the Legislature on behalf of the citizens of Illinois is exemplified by his selection the Top Lawmaker by the Illinois Association of Community Action and as the Outstanding Legislator by the Illinois Podiatry Society; therefore be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we extend our heartfelt and most sincere congratulations to our colleague, Larry S. Bullock, upon celebrating his 36th birthday and that we commend him for his many dedicated and dedicated service to the people of his district and the people of the State of Illinois, and we wish him continued success and happiness in the future. And be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Representative Larry Bullock in recognition of our high esteem for him."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, before we have just a word from Representative Bullock here, my friend and seatmate, those of us who were coerced...forced to sign this Resolution would like to withdraw our names so that it...so that it also might be exemplified among the Brian Duff Resolution Awards. But, let's have a word from Larry Bullock and congratulations on his 36th birthday."

- Speaker Ryan: "Happy birthday, Representative Bullock. Turn on Representative Bullock on his 36th birthday."
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'm speechless. All I want to say...All I want to say is that my birthday was yesterday, and

93rd Legislative Day

April 15. 1982

Representative Daniels' birthday is today, and it is appropriate that on income tax day that the man who is taking tax dollars from all of my people should celebrate his birthday today. But I want to thank him anyway because I'm going to vote for his birthday Resolution next week."

Speaker Ryan: "I don't know if he's got a friend that's going to
put one in for him. It's also Representative Laz Murphy's
40th birthday today too, I understand. Representative
Conti. Representative Friedrich on this issue?"

Priedrich: "No."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I move for the adoption of all the Resolutions. That completes it."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the House Resolution 793. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Now, Representative Friedrich, did you seek recognition?"

Friedrich: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the Members who introduced Bills today that it's imperative that you fill out slips requesting exemption. The Bills will probably be posted tomorrow. Unless you get them in before you go home, it may be difficult to get them on the list. The other thing I would announce is a meeting of the Rules Committee in room 114 as soon after the Session as we can get it put together. There will also be a Rules Committee meeting next Tuesday after Session, so that will probably be the final meeting for House Bills."

Speaker Ryan: "General Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 799, Bell - Polk - Darrow - Swanstrom."

Speaker Ryan: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions."

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 798, Darrow, in respect to the memory of Judge John Erhart."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti moves for the adoption of Resolution 7...792...793...no, wait just a minute."

Conti: "793. 793."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti moves for the adoption of House Resolution 798 (sic - 793). All in favor will signify by saying "aye", all opposed "no". The "ayes" have it, and the Resolution is adopted. We now have House Resolution 792 which is a Death Resolution for a former Member. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 792, Cullerton - Telcser - et Clerk al. Whereas, the distinguished Illinois jurist and former Member of this august Body, Mr. Kenneth R. Wendt, passed away in January of this year; and whereas, a Democrat from the 10th District, Kenneth Wendt served his Chicago constituency well from 1952 to 1962 in the House of Representatives and during those five terms, he ablv chaired the Education Committee and was a member of the School Problems Commission; and whereas, upon retirement from the Illinois General Assembly, Mr. Wendt was elected to the Circuit Court bench by the voters of Cook County where he devoted his keen legal mind and grasp jurisprudence to the jurisdiction of many narcotic and felony criminal cases; and whereas, a renaissance man of endless talents. Kenneth Wendt was also...has also received All-American honors as a quard on Marquette University's undefeated football team of 1929 and played for the Chicago football Cardinals; and whereas, a native of Chicago, Kenneth Wendt attended St. Vincent DePaul Grade School, DePaul Academy and Marquette University and, upon his graduation from John Marshall Law School in 1948, he became active in 46th Ward Democratic politics under John

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Joseph) L. Gill; and whereas, a devoted husband, father and grandfather, Kenneth Wendt was also a charter member of the Lake View Citizens Council and an usher for more than 50 years in the Mt. Carmel Parish; therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we mark with sadness the death of Kenneth Wendt, one of our most respected former colleagues and a true and noble servant of the citizens of this State, and that we convey our sincere sympathy to his grieving family and friends; and be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of this Resolution be presented to bis widow, Mrs. Eleanore Wendt."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen οf the House. Judge Wendt was a very good friend of mine. He represented the district that I now represent for ten years. He had an only daughter who is a fine lawver Chicago, Mary Jane, and a very loving wife. politics. He was very knowledgable in politics. He was man that just was full of life every day of his life. very compassionate Judge, and he had thousands of people come to his wake in Chicago; and it was almost, in many cases, in a way a happy occasion because of all reminiscing of all the fun that this man brought into people's lives. It was really a loss. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm probably the only Member on this side of the aisle who had the privilege of serving with this man. As the previous speaker said, he celebrated every day as his last day. He was just...In the legislative process and in social life,

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

when Kenny Wendt was around, he made everybody just feel very much alive. Very much respected on this side of the aisle. He's been more than a colleague of mine. He's been a teammate. He played with the Chicago Cardinals a few years before I did, and in his athletic promise he was just as great in the legislative progress...promise that he showed and displayed on the floor of this House. He will be missed by some of us Republicans that have known him and have had the opportunity to work with him."

- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 792. Representative Cullerton asks leave to add all Members as Cosponsors. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. All in favor of the adoption of the Resolution will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Telcser on the Adjournment Resolution. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, allowing the

 Clerk enough time to do whatever work is necessary, I now

 move the House stands adjourned until next Tuesday, April

 20, the hour of noon."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the House stand adjourned until designated hour and date next week. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House now stands adjourned."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #20, resolved by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Section 2 of Article X of the Constitution to read as follows: Article X, Education. Section 2, Superintendent Public Instruction. A Superintendent οf Instruction shall be elected by the electors of this state and shall hold office for four years beginning the second Monday of January after his election. TO he eligible to hold the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 25 years old and a resident of this state for three years representing...preceding his election. Any vacancy in the Office of Superintendent οf Public Instruction shall be filled in a manner provided in Section 7 of Article V. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be Chief Educational Officer of the State, general supervisory responsibility in relation to public elementary and secondary schools and shall accept, as limited by law, establish goals, determine policies to provide for planning. elevating education programs recommended financing... evaluating education programs and recommended financing. The Superintendent shall have such other duties and powers as provided by law. Transition period: if this Amendment is approved by the electors of the general election in 1982, a Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected at the general election in 1984 for a term of four years and shall take office on the second Monday of January, after his election, at which time State Board of Education shall cease to exist. Thereafter, a Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected in 1988 and every four years thereafter for a term years. Third Reading of the Constitutional Ωf four Amendment. The Resolution is held on Third Reading and the record. of House Joint taken out Resolution Constitutional Amendment #27, resolved by the House

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state, for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at months after the adoption of this Resolution. proposition to amend Section 11 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IX, Section 11, Limitations on Total of State Taxes on the Share Committed to Local Governments and on Advalorem Property Taxes; Prohibition of Mandate of Local Programs without State Funding: Provisions of Mandate of Local Programs without State Funding: Provisions for the Transfer of Programs. A) There is hereby established a limit on the taxes imposed by the General Assembly for any fiscal year. The state shall not impose taxes of any kind which, together with all other revenues of the state, exceed revenues received from the Federal Government... except revenues received from the Federal Government, revenue received by the state Revolving receipts from the sale of general obliqation bonds Funds. and contributions to and earnings of trust funds in custody of the State Treasurer shall exceed 8.5% of the average annual personal income of Illinois of the next-to-last full Calendar year preceding the Calendar year in which the fiscal year begins and the prior two Calendar years. Personal income of Illinois is the total income received by persons in Illinois from all sources, including transfer payments, as defined and officially reported by the State's Department of Commerce or its successor agency. Expenses of state government shall be incurred any fiscal year which exceeds an amount of revenue limit established by this Section. B) For any fiscal year, in the event that total revenues of the state exceed the revenue limit established in Subsection A of this Section,

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

this excess shall be transferred to a Budget Stabilization Fund in the State Treasury. Emergency expenditures from the Budget Stabilization Fund may be made only if all the following conditions are met: (1) The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency. (2) The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency the dollar amounts of the emergency, and (3) the General Assembly, thereafter, declares an emergency in accordance with the Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by three-fifths votes of the Members elected to each House. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds for emergency must be passed by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each House. Total revenues of the state means all public funds received by the state but does not include revenues received from the Pederal Government, revenues received by the state's Revolving Fund, from the sale of general obligation bonds, contributions to and earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer. If it is determined that the amount in Budget Stabilization Fund is less than the amount needed to meet an emergency situation, taxes in excess of the limit established in Subsection A of this Section may be imposed and collected only if all the following conditions are met: The General requests... the General... The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency. The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency and the dollar amount of the emergency and the method by which the emergency will be funded, and (3) upon receiving the request, the General Assembly declares an emergency in with the specifications of the Governor's accordance request by a Joint Resolution adopted by two-thirds of a vote from the Members elected to each House. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds for the emergency

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

must be passed by two-thirds vote of the Members elected to The emergency must be declared in accordance with these procedures, prior to incurring of any of expense which constitutes the specific emergency request. The revenue limitation may be exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is declared. In subsequent fiscal years, the revenue limit of Subsection A of Section shall again take effect. An emergency shall not be declared in two successive fiscal vears without approval of a majority of the qualified electors of the state voting thereon. Income earned from the funds maintained in the Budget Stabilization Fund shall accue (sic, accrue) to the Fund. () For any fiscal year, in the event that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund exceeds 2% of the revenue limit established for Subsection A of this Section, the General Assembly shall provide for distribution of the excess funds in the form of reducing or the rebating of state taxes. D) There is hereby established a limit on the ad valorem taxes real property by units of local government and school districts. The total yield resulting from the application of the tax rate, for any tax year, to the assessed valuation of real property is finally equalized for that value of new construction excluding the year. and improvements in property added by annexation, shall exceed a percentage increase over the yield in the previous the first year of implementation and the maximum yield computed for the current year, under this Subsection, and each subsequent year, in excess of 75% of the average percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index, all items from the United States, as defined and reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States' Department of Labor or its successor agency, for the last full

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

Calendar year, prior to the date the unit of local qovernment or school district levies such taxes in the prior two Calendar years. If the total yield exceeds this the tax rate applied to the equalized assessed valuation shall be reduced to produce the yield which reflects no more than the limit established by this Subsection. A revised tax rate shall then be applied the equalized assessed valuation of new construction and improvements in property added by annexation. A limitation of this Subsection shall not apply to taxes imposed for the payment of principal and interest on bonds or other evidence of indebtedness or for the payments of assessments contract obligations in anticipation of which bonds are issued which were authorized prior to the effective date of this Section. The limitations of this Subsection shall apply to home-rule units; however, a home-rule unit may, by a majority vote of the qualified electors of the home-rule unit voting thereon, determine that the provisions of Subsection do not apply to their home-rule unit. home-rule unit may subsequently determine the provisions of this Subsection shall apply by a majority vote of the qualified electors of the home-rule unit voting thereon. The tax rate of a unit of local government school district may be increased to yield revenue exceeding the limits established by this Subsection only with the approval of the majority of the qualified electors of the unit of local government or school district voting thereon. such an increase is approved, then the total yield, including the new tax rate, shall be used to determine the limitation in the succeeding year. The governing board of a unit of local government or school district may, two-thirds vote of the members elected or appointed, declare an emergency situation. The declaration of

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

emergency shall be specific in nature containing the dollar amounts necessary and the method by which the emergency will be funded. When an emergency is declared, taxes excess of the limit established by this Subsection may be imposed and collected. The revenue limitation may exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is In subsequent fiscal years, the revenue limit of this Subsection shall again take effect, as though the emergency had not been declared. An emergency shall not be declared in two successive fiscal years without the approval of a majority of the qualified electors of the unit of local government or school district voting thereon. Whenever, by law or by court order, the responsibility for defraying the cost of a program is transferred from one unit of government to another unit of government, the total established by the Section for the unit of government, to which such responsibility was transferred, be commensurately increased in the total established by this Section or the unit of government from which such responsibility was transferred shall commensurately decreased. F) The General Assembly shall, by law, prescribe the manner by which any unit of local government or school district created after the effective date αf this Section. shall determine the limits established in Subsection D of this Section, during first year of its existence. No new unit of local government or school district shall be created effective date of this Section, except by the approval of the majority of the qualified electors of the proposed unit of local government or school district voting thereon. G١ For any fiscal year, that portion of the state expenditures paid to all units of local government and school districts shall not be reduced below the portion paid to all units of

93rd Legislative Day

April 15, 1982

local government and school districts in fiscal year 1982. H) The state shall appropriate funds for each unit of local government and school district to determine reimburse it for the full cost for mandates enacted, after the effective date of this Section. However, where the General Assembly is required to enact legislation or comply with the federal mandate, the state shall be exempt from the reimburse... from the requirement of reimbursing a unit of local government or school district for the cost of mandate. State mandates. for which funds are not appropriated to reimburse units of local government and school districts, are void until such time as the required funds are appropriated. No unit of local government district shall be required to implement any mandate enacted after the effective date of this Section unless the mandate is the result of a federal or court mandate. funds are appropriated for the unit of local government or school district for the cost of the mandate, as determined the General Assembly. The limits established Subsection D of this Section shall not apply to expanded federal or court mandates. J) The General Assembly shall provide, by law, for the implementation provisions of this Section. Schedule: If approved by the electors, this Amendment takes effect July 1 next occurring after its adoption. Third Reading οf the Constitutional Amendment. The Amendment will be held on Third Reading and taken out of the record. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 2612, Terzich -Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bi 11 2613, Terzich - Topinka, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."

04/27/82 10:37

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

PAGE 1

APRIL 15, 1982

| HB-0089 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 4 |
|-----------|----------------|------|----|
| HB-0211 | THIRD READING | PAGE | 25 |
| HB-0921 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 11 |
| HB-1244 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 39 |
| HB-1244 | RECALLED | PAGE | 39 |
| HB-1244 | THIRD READING | PAGE | 38 |
| HB-2204 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 23 |
| HB-2211 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 23 |
| HB-2221 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 24 |
| HB-2441 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 24 |
| HB-2451 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 24 |
| HB-2452 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 25 |
| HB-2607 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2608 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2609 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2610 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2611 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2612 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 60 |
| HB-2613 | FIRST READING | PAGE | 60 |
| SB-0740 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 42 |
| SB-1029 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 44 |
| *HJR-0020 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 41 |
| *HJR-0020 | THIRD READING | PAGE | 53 |
| *HJR-0027 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 44 |
| *HJR-0027 | THIRD READING | PAGE | 54 |
| SJR-0082 | ADOPTED | PAGE | 41 |

SUBJECT MATTER

| HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN | PAGE | 1 |
|---------------------------------|------|----|
| PRAYER - REVEREND REEDER | PAGE | 1 |
| PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE | PAGE | 1 |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE | PAGE | 1 |
| REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR | PAGE | 25 |
| COMMITTEE REPORTS | PAGE | 40 |
| MESSAGES FROM SENATE | PAGE | 40 |
| SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR | PAGE | 41 |
| AGREED RESOLUTIONS | PAGE | 46 |
| GENERAL RESOLUTIONS | PAGE | 50 |
| DEATH RESOLUTIONS | PAGE | 50 |
| A DJOURNMENT | PAGE | 60 |
| | | |