115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order. The Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Blanche Gudauskas representing the Assembly of God Church of Champaign Illinois."
- Gudauskas, Blanche: "God, our help in ages past, our hope in the days to come, what is man that Thou art mindful of him? the Son of Man that Thou visiteth him? We ask a august Body of our State House of Representatives, as they enter yet another day of their many faceted responsibilities: as they serve their constituencies with elected dignity and honor; to lift our hands that hang down; to strengthen our feeble knees and to remember all those who are indeed less fortunate. them mindful that man controls only the action; that God controls the reaction. As we stand as one looking down a difficult road beyond this moment, we ask that the high places be brought down, the low ones be built up; the dangerous crooked way become straight and the rough times a bit smoother. Together we can say, 'The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want anything here; for surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life. That the Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want anything hereafter, for I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever'. In the name of Him in Whom we live and move and have our being. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you. He will be led in the Pledge today by Representative Harry Smith."
- Smith 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. Take the record, Mr.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

With 153 Hembers answering the Roll, a quorum of Clerk. the House is present. It is the intention of the House, Representative Kulas, to stay in Session until about 8:00 p.m. this evening or thereabouts, 8:30 maybe or maybe...you know, give or take a little time one way or the That, at least, is the intention at this time, depending on kind of progress we make. We've got 26 Bills on the Order of Second Reading that I would like to move and then there's another 25 or 26 that are on Third Reading we would like to move before Friday. So, we will be in Session until about 7:00 or 8:00 o'clock this evening. and we'll start early tomorrow morning and see where we are tomorrow after we come in. But, we'll probably start at 9:00 or 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. You can inform the Mushrooms of that, if you would. 8:00 tomorrow morning, is that what you want, Schneider? Probably around 8:00 tonight, depending on what kind of Ho...what kind of progress we make with the Calendar. ... on the floor. chicken. Representative Telcser, do you have any excused absences?"

- Telcser: "Representative Celeste Stiehl should be excused, Mr.

 Speaker, for official business."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty, do you have any excused absences?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may the record indicate that Representative Flinn and Representative Dan O'Brien are excused due to official business. Representative Leverenz is excused due to a death in the family, and Representative Garmisa, due to illness."
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. Representative
 Kulas, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to let you know that you don't know how happy it makes me to hear you announcing the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- schedule for today, and it's very considerate of you. And I hope that you will be as considerate for the rest of the Session, and always notify the Membership of what we...what the plans are, what we're going to do so we can make our plans. I thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "You are certainly welcome, Representative Kulas.

 One of my main goals in life is to make you happy, and I'm glad I succeeded today. Representative Greiman on the floor? Representative Madigan. Representative Getty. Who wants to talk here? Madigan. Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would request time for a Democratic

 Conference."
- Speaker Ryan: "How much time do you need, Representative? Three days?"
- Madigan: "Since this will be a Democratic Conference without the use of a hammer, it could last up to an hour."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, are you ta... We better do what could happen, then. See, Representative Kulas, this is what messes up the schedule. Now, we have to give up an hour already. All right. Do you know what room you're going to be in, Representative Madigan?"
- Madigan: "We always wait for your direction, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "All right. You're in 118. I thought maybe you had already found out."
- Madigan: "118. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "You're in 118. Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a Republican Conference in room 114 immediately."
- Speaker Ryan: "All right. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 1:30. The Republicans in 114; the Democrats in 118. The House now stands in recess till the hour of 1:30. The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their seats. On the Calendar on page 2, under the Order of

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 2191, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2191, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Arts Council. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Amendment #3 failed.

Next Amendment is Amendment #4, Braun, amends House Bill
2191."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Braun on Amendment #4."

Braun: "Thank you. Yes, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #4. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Catania - Braun, amends House
Bill 2191..."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 increases the FY'83 budget for the Illinois Arts Council to three thou...3,000,684 dollars. It increases the amount by about a million, two, and restores it to the level of funding that the Arts Council was given last year. I would say to those of you who had not been pri...privy to the Committee hearing, supporting and promoting increased funding for the Arts Council for reasons which, essentially, go beyond cultural and social value that the Arts Council provides for the citizens of the State of Illinois. that the Arts Council's activities are statewide, and that they contribute to the quality of our lives in that regard: that the Arts Council's activities go to providing

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

educational opportunities for young people. And that, too, improves the quality of our lives. But there is another aspect of Arts Council's funding which is essential to our And that is, it's economic support of this Amendment. impact or, if you will, a cost benefit analysis of the Arts Council funding. The fact of the matter is that the Arts Council funding, in and of itself, generates private funds to the tune of about three to one. So, for every you contribute, that the Arts Council puts into activities, cultural activities, that funding is matched by the private sector. Additionally, the Arts Council is a revenue producing activity of State Government in that the funding that goes for Arts Council's activities has been demonstrated to have a secondary economic benefit in that it promotes spending within the private sector to the tune. again, of 15 to 30 times over. Those dollars spent inure to the benefit of the State of Illinois. And so it is that are supporting, and I would ask your support for increased funding for the Arts Council; not only because of its contributions to the quality of our lives, but also because of the contribution that it provides for the revenues of the state. It seems to me that in fit...tight financial times it is short-sighted and indeed counterproductive and destructive to cut out those activities that produce the most for the state in terms of revenue. If we are to avoid digging ourselves into an economic pit in this state, we are going to have to see to it that as much attention is given to the revenue producing kinds of activities in this state as are given the other functions of State Government. This is a revenue producing activity and it is deserving of your support, and I would ask your support for Amendment #5 to House Bill 2191."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise to oppose this Amendment, as I would oppose the entire appropriations for the Illinois Arts Council. At. a time like this when we don't have enough money to fund education and when Members on the other side of the aisle say we're not giving enough money to the poor so they can feed their family, I think it's absolute nonsense to give three million dollars of the taxpayers money to an Council which, rightly, ought to be funded out of private enterprise. I recall a few years ago when we had some place cards that were on CTA buses in Chicago that the Arts Council paid for, and these place cards for the benefit of the people from downstate were pictures of Superman over the John Hancock Center uttering some idiotic poem. These things were placed on the CTA buses so that people hanging on the straps on the buses could read this idiotic nonsense that the taxpayers paid for. At like this. when we can't fund education and we can't give the poor people of Illinois enough noney to feed themselves, how can we afford to give three million dollars of the taxpayers hard-earned money to an outfit that paints viaducts and puts crazy poems of Superman on the CTA buses? I oppose the Amendment and opposed to the entire appropriation."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Dunn, John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Representative Braun's Amendment, as a downstater. In downstate Illinois in the past few years, we've been fortunate enough to have the Chicago Symphony tour downstate. Now, the major portion of the cost of that tour is not provided by the Illinois Arts Council, but there is, and has been, funding in the Illinois Arts Council budget

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

to help subsidize that tour. In downstate Illinois, this has been a great advantage for us. The tour has gone to Springfield, to Champaign, to Decatur, to Rockford; many, many places downstate Illinois. And when it comes in community, the Chicago Symphony acts as a draw for...and as a seed and a catalyst, for Arts Council Programs all throughout the area. The money generated by the Chicago Symphony tour, at the local level, generate enthusiasm for the arts, provides investment in other local programs, and provides for Arts Programs all throughout the community. A comment was made about the cost of education, and, yes, educational funding is in desperate condition in the State of Illinois, at this time. But, we all know that when educational funds become low, the first things to be cut are the fine arts programs music, that kind of thing. The Illinois Arts Council, over the years, has provided subsidies right into local school districts, both public and par...and parochial; and has provided money which has helped provide costuming, and background, and make-up kits, and cosmetics, and artists in residence, right in our local schools where art programs are being cut right and left. We should not drop our funding for the Illinois Arts Council, at this And, as a matter of fact, difficult as things are in our nation at this time, funding for the all throughout the United States is at a per capita level of 50 cents. This Amendment would only bring us up to the This Amendment would not say the average. State Illinois is spending excessively on the arts. All this Amendment does is say that the State of Illinois is willing to commit itself to the arts at least to the average level of all the other states in this nation. We're not a backwards state. We're an industrial state. We're

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

leader in this nation. Иe like to tell people that Illinois is a good place to come and live and work, that the quality of life is good here. How can we sell Illinois to outsiders if we want to say to people who are thinking about coming to Illinois, "We're backward. ШP don't care about the finer things in life. We don't care about culture. We don't care about the arts. spend about 25 percent of what the other states spend programs for the arts. We need to be might up there among leaders, if we're going to have a climate that we can promote in the State ٥f Illinois for industrial development, for economic growth, and for the well-being and quality of life of all of our citizens who live in this I urge an "aye" vote on this Amendment." state.

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

Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm not the least bit surprised that the Lady from Cook nor the Gentleman from Macon would offer this Amendment to add 1.2 million dollars to the budget. They are both Members the Appropriations Committee, and have been very helpful in offering many other Amendments in that Committee to further burden the budget. Now, as we all know, the distinguished Minority Leader has been speaking quite vociferously and has sent out several press releases over the fact that he believes that the Governor's budget is approximately million dollars out of whack, and should be readjusted; and that the Governor should reintroduce a new budget. the Democrat Members of the Appropriations that end. Committee have failed to vote for a single appropriation Bill out of the Committee. But, they did do something help our situation. They added 20 Amendments, or at least offered 20 Amendments which were summarily defeated by the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Republican Majority, that would have added 163 million dollars more to the budget. Now, with help like that, I say you really don't need any friends. They further answer this by adding, on the floor of this House, before you today, Ladies and Gentlemen, another 133 million dollars in add-on Amendments. That sounds like a wonderful way to balance a budget, and criticize the Governor on one side for being too high in his estimates, and then adding over 300 million dollars combined between the Appropriations Committee and the floor of this House to help us out of a jam. I say, with friends like that who needs enemies. I hope you'll all vote properly and vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Byan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan." Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Lady's Amendments, which would restore the appropriation to the Illinois Arts Council to the level of appropriation provided by this General Assembly during the current fiscal year. This Amendment is not a budget This Amendment does not attempt to provide a level of appropriation higher than what is provided for the current fiscal year for this agency. This Amendment simply attempts to leave the Arts Council in the same position that it is today, relative to its level of appropriation. I would like to address myself to certain comments which were just entered in the record on the floor of the House. Reference has been made to my public posture relative to the Governor' budget. I have said, on numerous occasions, that Governor Thompson's budget document, as offered to this Assembly in March, is not in balance. The document is not in balance; and, as such, it violates the Illinois Constitution. called I have upon the Thompson Administration to revise that budget, and I have heard not

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

one ounce of response to my request. Concerning my own action as a Member of the House of Representatives, my vote on individual appropriation Bills, both on the Order of Second Reading and on the Order of Third Reading will very clearly reflect my view as to what the budget document should provide for funding for the State of Illinois for the next fiscal year. Concerning the Arts Council, are certain comments offered today which say that this appropriation is not needed; that we are now in a economic decline. And, during a period such as this, we do not need an appropriation for the Arts Council. I reject that argument. It is precisely at a time of economic despair that we need appropriations for the arts. are education. Ιf people are born and raised in the ghetto, if they are not exposed to education, if they not exposed to the art of our culture, then there shall be no hope for them to rise in our society to levels that all Americans deserve. And, for all of these reasons, I recommend an 'aye' vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester. Well, the electrician just tells me the bad news. They just dropped some of supply. They can't turn on the mikes, and he needs 10 minutes to repair the system. And, after 10 minutes, we may repair the electrician, I'm not sure. We'll stand ease for 10 minutes, or in recess or whatever. The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their When we left for recess, we had Representative Winchester Amendment #5 to House Bill 2191. Representative Winchester. Is Representative Braun back on the floor?"

Winchester: "Thank ... "

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Braun on the floor?"

Winchester: "Thank you."

115th Legislative Day May 25, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Braun on the floor?"

Winchester: "Yes, there she is."

Speaker Ryan: "Okay. All right. Proceed."

Winchester: "Would the Gentle...Lady yield to a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates she will."

Minchester: "Representative Braun, I'm a little confused on your Amendment. I notice in the retirement line items that you have a seven percent increase for personal services...or for retirement. I understand that the standard rule of thumb that we use is 5.3 percent. Why are you using a seven percent figure when no other agency in State Government is getting that much money for retirement?"

Braun: "I'm sorry, Representative Winchester, I have to take a look at that line on this Amendment. As you know, there were three...this Amendment was intended to put back the budget as it was last fiscal year. That's all it does is make it the same as it was last year. Now, I'll check with my staff on...on that seven percent increase on retirement. I'm not..."

Winchester: "Well, while you're doing that, also, I have another question, too. I notice that the federal share to the Arts Council ... the Arts Council expects to get as their fed...federal share, roughly 448,000 dollars. But, for authorization to spend 800,000 dollars. asking What...What...Why is there such a discrepancy in that situation?"

Braun: "Thank you, Representative. I have a staff person here now, and I will be able to consult with her on both of those questions. Representative, those are the numbers that we got from the Arts Council and, with regard to the federal contribution again, I really don't have an answer to either of your guestions, because this just puts it back

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

to last year's funding level, and I'm not..."

Winchester: "Let me ask you this question, Representative."

Braun: "Okay."

Winchester: "Has the Arts Council seen this Amendment before today?"

Braun: "Yes."

Winchester: "They have seen it. All right."

Braun: "They haven't?"

Winchester: "It's our understanding that they have not seen it, and I...I think you've got some very serious problems with the Amendment. You're asking for...you know, I think you're asking for too much retirement, and you're asking for too much authorization to spend federal funds. And I think the Membership should really take that into consideration when they cast their vote. But, I, like some speakers...Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed, Representative."

Winchester: "Some speakers have indicated here today that we Arts Council. probably should not have an A 1ot Members in...on my Subcommittee, which I chair and a lot of Members in the full Committee feel the same way, that there should not be an Arts Council. But, I happen to feel differently. I do believe in an Arts Council, and I do believe that the funding that we appropriated for them, some 2,400,000 dollars is going to be sufficient amount of money for them to continue a decent, probably not what they would like, but a decent program in the area of arts. to the distinguished Gentleman from Decatur, I would like for him to know that the Chi...Chicago Sympathy...Sympathy...Symphonicthy...or whatever you call that thing, does not plan on being downstate this year. I don't know why he's making such a big argument or a big issue about how important it is to give additional

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

that the Chicago Sympathy could come monies down...downstate, when they're not going to come downstate. I think that we're in tight times, as everyone well knows. I think we have given an appropriate amount of funds to the Arts Council. It is 2,409,000 dollars. I believe that, if times get better in this state, that we should take a look at it again next year and we should give them some money: because they do and can provide some...some good services. But, now is not the Every agency in State Government is taking cuts. This is a reasonable cut. It's an appropriate cut, and I would ask that this Amendment fail."

Braun: "Representative Winchester, I would like to respond to you with regard to the retirement line. The only reason that there is any difference in retirement on this Amendment is because it takes the budget back to last year's level. Ιt avoids the devastating cut that has been put in this budget. And I...And I say to you, Representative, that for those of us who recognize the value of the Arts Council its cultural aspect, I think the strongest argument for adoption of this Amendment is the fact that it revenue-producing activity for this state. It actually brings dollars to this state. We have heard commercials on the T.V. and the radio and in the newspapers, *Come to Wisconsin. Come to Michigan. Every other state in this Mid...Midwestern Region recognizes the value of having those kinds of promotional activities. Those will be cut if this budget is cut. In terms of the Symphony touring downstate. that's a very laudable kind of an activity that Representative Dunn and others have spoken about Committee. But, the Council will simply not be able to engage in activities like that, which is not to say Symphony won't still come, if its ac...if its budget is

115th Legislative Day

Hay 25, 1982

Remember, that the touring Symphony and other like that are not funded fully by the Arts programs Council. Their dollars only provide the trigger leverage for private enterprise to come in and pick up the difference and support and sponsor these kinds of...of cultural activities. The leverage that the Arts Council's dollars give is important, because, with regard to that ... activities other than the Symphony and the like, for smaller activities, it gives those groups the initial seed money to get started; thereby attracting the private dollars in. So, I'm ... I'm submitting, with regard to this Amendment, that leaving this budget alone will do more for the state than cutting it. Leaving this budget alone will do more for the state than devastating the Arts Council's activities. *Cause, quite frankly, if you leave them with no money, then they won't be able to do the artistic, cultural and, indeed, economic kinds of functions that they perform right now. And that's why this Amendment seeks to put the budget back at last year's funding level."

Speaker Ryan: "There any further discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Having been here as long as I have been. I should I suppose, at some of the arguments not be surprised. advanced from time to time; but, this one is truly staggering. And the basic idea or concept advanced here now. and I presume will be advanced ao subsequent Amendments, is that somehow or another #e can ourselves, in the State of Illinois, into prosperity. is artfully-crafted hogwash if I ever heard it. argument that no Member of this General Assembly should buy. It simply won't work. The idea should be rejected out of hand. Now, it seems to me what the Governor is

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

saying to us is that we cannot afford, at this point time, to go back to what the budget, in these respects, was He's trying to make some reductions. year. we do so, the budget will be in balance. The point the budget is not in balance. Well, who says been made. so? The budget is in balance, according to the Bureau The Governor has fulfilled Budget. his the constitution...constitutional mandate, but he needs help. point was made, that this item in the oth...another itself will not bust the budget. Well, that's like saying that one drop of water will not fill the glass. And that may be true enough, but when the other drops of water are added to that glass, eventually, it not only will be filled, but will be overflowing. And that's what we face the series of Amendments that we have coming up. One drop of fiscal water after another until, eventually, the glass will be filled, overrunning and the state, indeed, will be in trouble and will be fiscally insolvent. would seem to me that reason would argue that we...we consider this fact, and vote 'no' on these Amendments."

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

Representative Win...Winchester said that this is a reasonable cut, given the economic times. I...I don't think that there's another agency in government that has taken as severe a cut as the Illinois Arts Council — a 34 percent cut from the previous year's budget. Illinois ranks 36th in per capita funding for the arts, and all that we're asking by the Amendment offered by Carol Braun is that we bring this up to a level of last year's funding. We've spent only 25 percent...25 cents per capita, while the national average is 50 cents per capita..."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich, the electrician has to go up and reset the power supply. He'll have it reset in a couple of seconds, if you'll hang on. Representative Matijevich, try that now and see if it works."

Matijevich: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."

Matijevich: "As I was beginning to say, we've been compared in Illinois very often to other states, and every often, think, in the budget message we were compared to states in the Midwest and industrial states. I might say that York gives 36 million dollars to the arts. California gives 12 million. Ohio appropriate...appropriates 10 million dollars for the arts. And, even Michigan, with its very poor unemployment problems and its poor economy does better than we do here in Illinois. And it's also been said by more...other Representatives here on the floor that this is good business. The head of the Illinois Arts Coalition, I believe he's a banker from Peoria. Committee, and he stated that a survey was done in the City of Peoria on how much added revenue was provided in the Peoria area from the arts. And it was a significant amount of added revenue. So, I think that in these times of economic difficulties, it's all the more important that we provide not more money for arts. We're not talking about additional funds in this Amendment. All we're talking about is keeping the Illinois Arts Council at the level of last year. I believe that's the least we can do, and you can do it by supporting Amendment #5."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further discussion? Representative
Wolf to close...Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a
minute. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you ver...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

House Amendment #5 to House Bill 2191. I think, for those us from downstate, we ought to particularly pay attention to this Amendment. A gentleman by the name of *Petrick*, who's the Executive Director of the Illinois Arts Council, said the most significant area that would be affected by the cuts that Governor Thompson made in the Illinois Arts Council will be from downstate; because cuts will come from travel and those extension service..." Speaker Ryan: "...on, Representative McClain. The electrician's qoing back up to reset the power. We got ... We got a new unit coming in from someplace. It will be here shortly, I understand. So, he's going up and punch your...the power back on. Representative Jones in the Chair, temporarily." Speaker Jones: "It would be nice permanent. All right. I just wanted to announce the sixth grade graduating class of *McDay* Elementary School, represented by Representative Monica Paye Stewart. Representative Ewell Representative Jesse Jackson. And, Mrs. 'Jacobson' is here them, and the son of Jesse Jackson, colleague, is a member of this graduating class. So, let's give them a warm welcome to Springfield. Would the ... With your approval, I'll put Representative Ryan back in the Chair."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Smith in the Chair."

Speaker Smith, Margaret: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I merely want to present to this august body a group of Church Women United who have come to visit us today. The president, Mrs. 'Veronica Stankas', hails from Elmhurst, Lombard, and one of Glen Schneider's fine voters is also in attendance. Will you please stand, Mrs. 'Patria', the hostess here, from Springfield. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Madigan and Representative McClain and Members of the House, the electrician now tells me that

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

the power won't reset. There's a new unit that he has, and it's going to take him, now, 20 minutes to install. So, Representative Kulas, anything that I told you earlier about the adjournment is now off, and we'll probably be in late this evening. And I think you can probably plan on that. So, we will now stand in recess for another 20 minutes. Representative Braun, I'm sorry, but I just can't help it. It's one of those things. It's got to be Madigan's fault. That's all I can say."

Speaker Peters: "The House will be in order. Representative Peters in the Chair. House Bill 2191, Representative McClain. Representative McClain, House Bill 2191, Second Reading, Amendment #5. Where are we? Did we read this? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said before, I stand in support of House Amendment #5 to House Bill 2191. I'd like to stress, if I could since we were cut off before, with the downstate Members, both Democrats and Republicans. I talked to a gentleman by the name of 'Petrick', who is the Executive Director of the Illinois Arts Council. He claims that the area that will be most significantly hurt by the Governor's cuts in the Illinois Arts Council will be downstate Illinois; because the cuts will generally be for travel and for extention services from the Illinois Arts Council. This Amendment only replaces this budget at the current, in other words, Fiscal 1982, funding level; and, saves some of those downstate programs, in a bipartisan way, for us in downstate Illinois. Иe receive a lot of benefits for and from the Illinois Arts Council, and I would urge your support for House Amendment #5."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson. Representative Schneider."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I was amused, somewhat, by one of my favorite people in the Legislature, and, as I see in front of me, three of my other favorite Republican Legislators who were talking about fiscal responsibility. I think Ray Hudson said that this is one of those cases where a drop in the glass of water will cause water to overflow. We can draw from that analogy that if you add this amount of money, that would then break the bank in Illinois. Well, I have seen in front of me now that Representative Hudson and others are sponsoring a 10 million dollar Amendment. And if this is one drop in the glass, that certainly has got to represent the Johnstown flood. So, I think what you ought to look at is that this is a service Amendment that...that deals with communities and with educational groups. have exposure to issues that we call cultural. They are things that they can other...not otherwise have. would support this Amendment. I listened to the debate, as many of you did, during the time it was piped into our offices, and it seems to me it d be one of those kinds of things that would enhance Illinois dramatically, and I would urge your support for it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I move the previous question."

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

Braun: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say to all the Members of the House, and I'm sorry that I...we've all experienced this debate being kind of fractured by virtue of the machine being out. It would have been a good thing if we could have talked about it all in one sitting, so as

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

not to have bits and pieces of information coming at you. But, I would just want to emphasize the critical elements of this Amendment. The first, all this Amendment does restore the funding to the present level. There is no increase. Second, that we are not just talking about cultural, artistic and social activities. We're talking about activities that are revenue-producing for the State which Illinois, other states have found to revenue-producing, which have been demonstrated to generate for every dollar of funding the Arts Council dollars in private contributions are generated, and 30...up 30 dollars in secondary spending is generated. to are dollars that come back to the benefit of all of the State of Illinois and to the benefit of the tre...of the state's treasury. Third and finally, I would want to you that we've all...we're all here in a very difficult position. because this is tight financially. But, the fact of the matter is that if we cut the revenue-producing activities and if we cut off those activities that improve the quality of lives, then what we will be doing is painting an even grimmer picture for our constituents than might actually The fact of the matter is, the people who enjoy the Chicago Symphony touring downstate, the people who enjoy the community arts festivals, the people that you relate to in your own rep...in your own districts, who are with educational activities that involve the arts, the visually handicapped that get benefits in...from Arts Council activities. All of those people, they don't know a Republican budget from a Democratic budget from a socialist budget from a liberatarian budget. What they do know, however, is whether or not those activities are happening or not in their areas. I say to you that, without this

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Amendment, those activities won't be happening in those areas. We have a level of expectations out there in the public now, I think it is only right, it is only sensible and it is on...and it is the only productive course to adopt this Amendment to keep this level of funding where it is this year. With that, I would like, Mr. Speaker, a Roll Call vote, and I would request your support of Amendment #5."

Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to House Bill 2191 be adopted?". Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Daniels to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very simply, anybody that's voting green on this, in my opinion, is taking money right out of the hands of education, right out on the pri...priority of educating our children. There is no other way that you can count it. There is no other way that you can answer your constitutents back home. This is money out of the General Revenue, and you know it. And how you going to tell your kids back home or the education people back home that ask you to support them?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas to explain his vote."

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you who are voting red on this Amendment have been kept in the dark too long. It's about time you woke up and smelled the roses. There's more to life than just roads and transportation and hospitals and prisons and water conservation districts. There are such things as artistic and cultural events. Now, are you going to deprive the people of the State of Illinois to their right to participate in such artistic and cultural events? Are the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

people of...in the State of Illinois worse than the people in the State of California or New York or even Michigan? All we're asking in this Amendment is to restore the funding to last year's level. We should actually double this funding, because the arts deserve it and the people of Illinois deserve it. So, let's get some more green votes up there."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, relative ... I think this is one point two million, and I was just over in the Senate during a recess, and we still have 38.8 million to work with, because they just put an Amendment on a Bill over there that calls for ... where we're going to generate 40 million dollars - here's one point two million - that we can use. But, it calls for all statewide officers and Members of the General Assembly will go without a...their salary for the first ten days of next year, and then also include, that all state employees will for the first five days of next year without a salary. so that it will generate 40 million. So, for the benefit of the Members of the House, we still have 38.8 million to work with, and anybody who's voting 'no' including myself, please give it some consideration as an opportunity to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Hell, to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, it's been said...you know, it's been said that the...I did speak in debate, Mr. Speaker, but if... Yeah, I did speak in debate. I'm sorry."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 94 "aye", 66 "nays", 2 voting "present". Amendment #5 has been adopted. Further Amendments?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

. Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Sang...Swanstrom..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Swanstrom, Amendment #6."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6, when it was drafted, was drafted incorrectly, and there are a few errors, and I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #6 is withdrawn. Amendment #7. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Catania - Braun..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania, Amendment #7.

Representative Braun, Amendment #7."

Braun: "I don't know what to do. I...I will withdraw...withdraw

Amendment #7."

Speaker Peters: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Bowman..."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For all the reasons that you have heard expressed on the previous Amendment that was adopted, I offer Amendment #8, which provides for a bottom line of 4.6 million dollars for the Arts Council. And, in response to the Gentleman from DuPage who said that we're taking this out of education, let me just point out that this is really, truly a modest sum, and that probably his own school district is not affected by more than five dollars. The Arts Council is, indeed, an educational agency that, through their programs, adults and children alike are enriched from one end of the state to the other. And for all the reasons that you've already heard expressed, I now move adoption for Amendment #8."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Bowman, the last Amendment the General Assembly

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

added 1.2 million dollars in unbudgeted funds to the...

How much additional is this, now?"

Bowman: "1.4 on top of that."

Wolf, J. J.: "Another 1.4? You sure you got enough?"

Bowman: "Would you...Bould you like to offer another Amendment,

Representative?"

Wolf, J. J.: "No, I wouldn't. But, while you're offering, I thought, why don't you make it a few more million dollars?"

Bowman: "Well, let's take care of Amendment #8 and then we"ll discuss that."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Winchester."
Winchester: "Well, of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, is the Amendment in
order in light of the fact that we have adopted Amendment
#52 Is Amendment #8 now in order? Or, is it in order?"

Speaker Peters: "...the opinion of the Chair that it is in order."

Winchester: "All right, can I speak on...on the Bill?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Winchester: "All right. Well, similar remarks to Bill...or to House Amendment #5, when someone said that it was time that we did something for the people other than fund education and transportation. But, what about the poor people in the State of Illinois that I constantly hear about from that other side of the aisle? The poor people who are looking at us and what we're doing today with arts and laughing at us and wanting to know why we're not taking care of the needs of the poor people, instead we're giving it to an Arts Council to run around throughout the state so a...a certain group, a special class of people, who are going to be able to enjoy what this agency will We're now talking about an Amendment that s going to bring to 2,245,000 dollar increase over the way the Governor recommended it, over the way the Appropriations

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Committee recommended it to this General Assembly. This is getting ludicrous. And, in light of what the distinguished Gentleman, the Minority Leader from Chicago, has been telling us about the 145 million dollar shortage in General Revenue Funds, I can't believe that he would condone this type of action, let alone even vote for it. I think we ought to vote this Amendment down."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, if this Amendment is adopted to the Bill, will you vote for the Bill?"

Bowman: "Would you repeat..."

Vinson: "If this Amendment is adopted to the Bill, will you wote for the Bill?"

Bowman: "Sure."

Vinson: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Excuse me. I'm sorry, Harry, I didn't see your light. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I had one question for the Gentleman before he closes. I was on the Executive Committee and, Representative Bowman, you appeared before the Executive Committee in support of a Resolution which seemed to indicate that your revenue estimate was that the Governor's revenue estimate was 145 million dollars high. Then, we have 145 million dollars less...left to play with, and you were calling on the Governor to come in with a new budget. Was it your suggestion that, at that time, that he ought to increase this area? And, if so, what areas should he

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

decrease by the 145 plus 2 million, 147 million dollars that you claim he is short?"

Bowman: "Well, Representative Leinenweber, I believe you will recall that in arguing on the Resolution which, by the way, a separate piece of ... of Legislation, so we probably should not even be discussing this. But. if...if persist, in arguing on that Resolution, I suggested that the...the budget is so grotesquely out of balance, that the Governor needs to reestablish priorities and come the General Assembly and provide a little leadership on this. I think this is a very modest addition. It is less than ... or about one percent of that particular figure. It is a...an Amendment which, unlike what the previous speaker suggests, does benefit all the people of Illinois. fact, would be very drab without ... without the arts, even ... even for poor people. And I would just submit amount of money we're spending here is not very much different from the kind of money that the Governor spends legal fees to try and argue that poor people should be getting less general assistance, and the kind of money that the Governor spends on legal fees to help him draft that don't go anywhere. So...So, I think that if we can throw that kind of money around, that we ought to be able afford a measly amount like this, to make sure that the arts in Illinois are not starved to death at this time."

Leinenweber: "Well, then, what you're telling us, that this is really a...an Amendment that isn't seriously to be considered by us; that you're trying to make a point that the Governor's wasting money in other areas and, therefore, let's pile it on every possible chance we get, so that we can waste money in every area."

Bowman: "Well, Representative Leinenweber, I think you are anticipating too much. This is the first Bill that we've

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

taken up. I think we ought to take the Amendments one at a time. I think we ought to take the...the issues as they come."

Leinenweber: "Bell, are...are you..."

Bowman: "I think you're just anticipating. I don't see how you can make an argument on one..."

Leinenweber: "Hell, I am anticipating a little bit, because our staff has, very nicely, given us a list of all the Amendments that you have proposed. And I haven't been able to total them all..."

Bowman: "I have proposed?"

Leinenweber: "...but, they're...they're probably equal to the amount of shortfall which you have indicated that the Governor has overbudgeted already. Mr. Speaker, very briefly on this Amendment. It's a ridiculous Amendment. The Gentleman, I think, intends for us to take it that way. He's trying to make a point, apparently, that there's a lot of waste in the budget, and why not add, every single chance you get, some more waste so that by the end of this particular Session, we will have so far overgone our possible revenue estimates, that everything will have to be cut down by the Governor during the Veto Session. So, let's go along with the Gentleman. Do what you want with this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz."

MR. Speaker, I think that in viewing the arts, that the distinguished Gentleman who you just heard is taking a very narrow view. The fact of the matter is that arts really bring an enormous sum of money into Illinois for several reasons. In the first place, the arts are a major tourist attraction in Illinois. We wote all sorts of money for McCormick Place and we vote all sorts of money for museums. And, the fact of the matter is, that the reason we do it is

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

we recognize that industry in Illinois can very well stand impact of all of the tourist money that's attracted in Illinois, due to the arts. Second of all, the number of people who are artisans in Illinois, who participate in different aspects of the Art Program, is not really thought You don't really stop to think that all people, each one of them, each individual who's engaged in making jewelry or painting or engaged in this art or this they are small business people. They, in fact, are out there making money, supporting themselves, in business, and the State of Illinois makes money when they are constructively employed. And so, I would urge the Gentleman, with his distinguished background, having gone to the University of Chicago, I know, where he had a tremendous sense of the importance of culture, will not turn his back on that wonderful background he had; but will support Representative Bowman's program to try to adequate funding in the arts - both, because the arts are important to human life and survival, but they re also important to the economy of Illinois. And we should support it for both reasons."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the sheer hypocrisy I was talking about last week. Here, we have a Senator, a Member of his party across the rotunda of the House of Lords, that's going to cut everybody's salary, he's going to renegotiate the contract, the labor contracts, because we haven't got any money. He's going to save the mo...the state some money. And here we've got the Arts Council with eight or nine or 10 or 12 more Amendments, possibly, adding one or two million dollars to this Bill. And I don't know, maybe they haven't learned yet or haven't been down here long enough

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

that you can put all the Amendments on, and I recommend to those people on this side of the aisle that want to make points with the Arts Council, let's put all these Amendments on, let's throw these millions of dollars on to this Bill, because it's all going to end up on your desk that last night of the Session on a Christmas tree package, on a omnibus Bill with all of this cut out. And, if it isn't, the Governor's going to veto it, and you're going to be working on a Veto Session. So, those of you who want to make points with the Arts Council, go along with these hypocritical Amendments that we're getting here today."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallock."

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

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of Bowman: I take offense that the ... at the suggestion that this is not a serious Amendment. It is Amendment. The state of the arts in Illinois is serious. It is important to our tourist business. It is important as an educational component to the school programs all over Most of the museums have at least some free days on which students and others who cannot afford to to...the entrance fee to come there and to...to enjoy the museums. This is, truly, an Amendment for all the would recommend to you that the people who were...who 1 spoke in opposition to the Amendment were not really to the issue em...embodied in this Amendment. Most of the people who spoke are well-known Arts Council haters. They speak against the Arts Council budget regardless of what the level is. If we put in a dollar*s

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

funding, they would be speaking against that as being too much. They just don't like the Arts Council. Now, I submit to you, don't be taken in by people who simply have it in for the Arts Council; who want to see it close up shop completely. This is an Amendment which does not give the Arts Council everything that it's been seeking, but it does provide for a move—ahead program so that we can continue to support the Arts in Illinois to the level that our citizens are demanding. So, I am serious about this Amendment, and if you're serious about the arts in Illinois, you'll support it too."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 to House Bill 2191 be adopted? . Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. The Gentleman, joined by Representatives Bowman, Greiman, Katz, Alexander and Laz The question is, Shall Amendment #8 Murphy. That's fine. to House Bill 2191 be adopted? .. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 63 voting "aye", 91 voting "nay". Amendment #8 to House Bill 2191 fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Braun, amends House Bill 2191..."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the points that may have been made during the debate, but I'm not sure that it was, is the fact that Illinois, based on last year's budget level, was funding the arts at the level of 25 cents per capita. That is approximately half of the amount that's devoted to the arts in other states. The national average is 50 cents per

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

capita. Amendment #9, which is for 5.5 million dollars, represents 50 cents per capita funding for the arts in Illinois. However, under the circumstances and in light of the adoption of Amendment #5, it is my intention at this time, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw Amendment #9..."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #9 is withdrawn."

Braun: "...so that...so that this issue can be...my support of this issue can be clearly seen as something that perceives from an interest in the arts, and not from any kind of partisan wrangling, Representative Conti notwithstanding.

Thank you very much, and I withdraw Amendment #9."

Speaker Peters: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. House Bill 2194, Representative Wolf. 2194. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act making certain reappropriations to the Department of Transportation.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any further Amendments? Pardon? Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #3 by Representative

Van Duyne."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Van Duyne on...what is it
a...just...Motion to table Amendment #3. Representative
Swanstrom. It's on a Motion of Representative Van Duyne to
table 3. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this Amendment; first of all, because it...the Amendment was put on...on this Bi...the appropriation Bill by a fellow, Representative Bikoff, who...who lives...his district is...is approximately 100-125 miles away. Secondly, it's frivolous in nature. I don't believe it's necessary, number three, because the Department of

5...

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Transportation is prohibited by law from doing anything contrary to law, which this Amendment alleges. This is a...This is a 12 year, on-going program, and we're now engaged in the appropriation for the second stage of this, and it really doesn't do anything, as I said before. It just makes it a little bit more ambiguous, and I think that it's just an attempt, somebody, to throw a little fecal matter into the game. And I...I just don't think it's necessary, and I'd like to ask you for an 'aye' vote on the tabling Motion for Amendment #3."

Speaker Peters: "On the Motion, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I...I join the Gentleman in urging an "aye"

vote on this Motion to table. It is an Amendment that adds

substantive language to an appropriations Bill, which would

cast some question as to its legality. So, I...I think

it's...it seeks to add substantive language, which we all

know is inappropriate in an appropriations Bill. So, I

join the Gentleman and urge your "aye" vote to table."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, let me explain a few things, notwithstanding my two running mates. Representative Wikoff put this Amendment on in Subcommittee, at my request, because I'm not a Member of that Subcommittee. The full Committee, then, adopted the Amendment by a voice vote. Representative Van Duyne was in the Committee that happened, and only raised the objection a little bit This Amendment was later on. negotiated Department of Transportation Division of Water Resources, who agreed to the Amendment. And the truth of the is, Representative Van Duyne is quite correct. Ιt can't ... What ... What he ... What the Amendment seeks to ďο can't be done without the federal and state permits, anyway. So, the truth of the matter is, Ladies

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Gentlemen. despite what Representative Leinenweber and Van Duyne have said to you, we have an on-going problem in Will County that this Amendment addresses, and I can suggest to you there was no opposition in Subcommittee or in Committee this Amendment. I can also suggest to you that the language is consistent with other language that is also put appropriations Bills that restricts the language...or restricts the use of monies being spent without necessary permits being issued. And it's a simple thing. Ιt means...It has little consequence to what Representative Van Duyne and Leinenweber would seek me, to do, and I would suggest that the to...excuse Gentleman's Motion to table be defeated, and that Department of Water Resources and the Department of Transportation's wishes, along with mine and other residents in Will County, including the county board, be adhered to, and that this Amendment be left on. I implore you to vote 'no' on the Motion to table."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is true that this was supported on the ... a voice vote in Committee. However, Representative Van Duyne, just as very often happens to many Members after something sails through very quickly, was going to question this Amendment, and it was too late. The Amendment had been adopted. with both Representative Leinenweber and Representative Van Duyne that we are going beyond what we can do, by bv adding substantive language to an appropriation Bill. And I would hope that the Members would agree with both Van and Leinenweber on that issue. And, therefore, I think it is the only responsible thing to do, that we can now table the Amendment; table the action of the Committee. That's the only thing we can do, and I would urge to...you

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

to so do."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, in the event that your Motion succeeds and the Amendment is taken off of the Bill, will you vote for the Bill on Third Reading?"

Van Duyne: "Well, first of all, we're not on that, Sam. And I'm not going to answer that question, because that will come later. I'm just arguing the fact that this should not be on it. As you know, there are other agencies of government that are...are involved in this. And, with the election coming up and priorities being set with different people being elected and whatever, and I don't want any more ambiguousness put into the Bill; besides the fact that it really isn't necessary because they're prohibited by law'from doing it anyway. And, if it's necessary to vote for the Bill, I probably will."

Speaker Peters: "Representative..."

Vinson: "What was that last sentence?"

Van Duyne: "I said, if it's necessary to get the Hou...the Bill out of the House, I probably will."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion to table Committee Amendment #3. I think this was pretty well discussed in the Committee. It was adopted in Committee, and I would just urge everyone to vote 'no' on this Motion to table."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, Representative Van Duyne to close."

Van Duyne: "I would just like to rebut Representative Davis in that I did object. Representative Swanstrom presented this

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Mo...this Amendment in Committee, saying it was nothing more than a technical Amendment. And, when the voice vote was taken, I was in the ... in the process of looking up the Bill. And when I read the ... I mean the Amendment. I read the Amendment, I immediately objected and made a Motion to reconsider, taking the position that I voted in the affirmative with the Majority. And I was ruled out of order by our Chairman, Representative said. at that time, that I thought it was a sneaky thing: even though it doesn't really do a lot of things to the ... to the Bill ... or the appropriations, but it does create a certain am...ambiguity to it. And. when other people read this back home, they may take a different version, other than what we take of it here on the So, in...in essence, what I'm objecting to is that it does create a certain graininess in this appropriation to our local forest preserve back home, which they may interpret a lot differently than we do. So, I still pray for relief, and I ask every Nember of the House to join me in the...an 'aye' vote in tabling this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #3 to Bill 2194 be adopted? . Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. Gentleman requests a Is he joined by five others? Representative Van Duyne, Levin, Dunn, Henry and Beatty and Leinenweber. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to House Bill 2194 be adopted?1. Those in favor will signify bу 'aye'...tabled, I'm sorry. *Shall Amendment #3 to House Bill 2194 be tabled? . Those in favor will signify voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, I... I rarely do this, Mr. Speaker, but I'm going to

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

rise on a point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate and I...

Speaker Peters: "Proceed."

Davis: "...and I think an insinuation was...was made by my colleague from the other side of the aisle that something sneaky was done in Committee. This Amendment was put on in full view of everybody in the Subcommittee. explained thoroughly by the maker of the Amendment, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee in the full Committee. objection from my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle occurred some 30 minutes after that Amendment was adopted; and which he voted for first time around. The Department of Transportation agreed to this Amendment in principle, and in language and, in fact, drew the language for the Amendment. So, I can simply say to you, there was nothing sneaky about anything, and I resent the fact that my integrity has been questioned by my distinguished colleague from the other side."

Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 86... Take the record. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye', 76 voting 'nay', and Amendment #3...Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "A Parliamentary Inquiry, for my later action, do I need 89 votes or ... or is it simple majority?"

Speaker Peters: "Simple majority."

Van Duyne: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Motion to table Committee Amendment #3 prevails.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Winchester ... "

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester, Amendment #6."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 simply makes some technical changes that were requested by the Comptroller. I believe, on page 6, line 4, we're deleting the word 'appropriations', and inserting the word

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- "reappropriations". On page 17, line 14 deleting the word
 "sums", and inserting in lieu of the word "sum". And I
 would ask for a favorable vote on the "do adopt" Motion."

 Speaker Peters: "Discussion? There being none, the question is,

 "Shall Amendment #6 to House Bill 21... Representative
 Dunn. John Dunn."
- Dunn, John: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since we tabled the previous

 Amendment, is...a point of inquiry. Is this Amendment in

 order?"
- Speaker Peters: "Do you have a specific objection you wish to direct to the Chair, or is that just a general question?"

 Dunn, John: "Well, in view of the tabling of the previous Amendment, I wondered..."
 - Speaker Peters: "Do you have a specific item you wish the Chair to review, or just...is that just a general question?"
- Dunn, John: "That is a question about the Amendment for consideration at this time. Is it in order, Mr. Speaker?"

 Speaker Peters: "The Chair rules it's in order. The question is,

 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 6, adopted. Any
 - Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

further Amendments?"

- Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. House Bill 2195, Representative

 J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2195, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4,5 and 7 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Hotions filed."

Speaker Peters: "Any further Amendments?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments #6, 8, 9 and 10 lost in Committee.

Ploor Amendment #11, Rigney, amends House Bill 2195..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Rigney, Amendment #11."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. this is the anti-diversion Amendment. I have quite a personal interest in this, since back in 1979 I was one Sponsors of Senator Shapiro's legislation that sought to end the various diversions that were practiced with our road fund historically through the years. And we set up a timetable, at that time, and we have gone along with timetable in very admirable fashion up until the present time. We have phased out the diversions to the Department of Health, the student and senior transportation, the Judges' salaries, the law enforcement, except the rail subsidies have been phased out. Department of Administrative Services: and this year 60 percent of state police salary was to be phased out, under the terms of that legislation, or a total of about 38 million dollars. Now, as the Bill was introduced, this 38 million dollars will still be taken out of the road fund, want to end that practice. We want to stay by our statutory provision. And so, this Amendment puts the 38 million dollars back in that, rightfully, should have been in there in the first place. Now, next year all of the various diversions about the...the total of about 130 million dollars worth of diversions will all be ended. Aside from that, I would say, other than the legal question I think we have a chance to show whether or not we are committed to a good highway system in this state, are will...are we willing to stand up and to put that 38 million dollars back into our road system. And I will say that, being one of the 45 who, here last week, voted for an increase in the gas tax and increase in license fee, I feel

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

that I certainly have to make this effort now, to try to preserve that 38 million dollars for Illinois highways."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matiievich: "Well, I'm going to support the Gentleman's Amendment #11. We could have used you in Committee, Harlan. Wе couldn't get any votes from your side of the aisle. Ne feel that the Governor should have followed his own law: if you recall, when they passed the Thompson -Byrne transportation package, this was enacted and that was part of the package. Remember all those nice promises that were made to everybody about different highways that were us...you were going to get, which none of you have gotten yet? And also, that you downstaters, going to give you an anti-diversion Amendment, or a we're law; and that law's got to be followed, because it's to be in the statute. So, that was given to you. And now, the Governor has chosen to violate the law. So, we just think it's very important that when you make a deal, that you...and then you put that deal into the statute, at least you've got to follow that law. Or, the only other thing you can do is repeal it. I haven't seen the Governor come in and say to the Legislature, 'We think we ought to repeal the law. and monies from the road fund ought to be diverted. We think they shouldn't be; and, therefore, I commend Rep...Representative Rigney. I'm sure he's not doing it for any political reason. He believes in it, and I'm going to support him and I hope that others do on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendments. I was, back in 1979, also a Sponsor, a Cosponsor with Representative Rigney, to end all

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

diversions. Unfortunately, we have gotten to a period in time where we ha ve eliminated almost 80 percent, but there's still that remaining 20 percent that we have to address; and only address it because of the tough economic times that we are having in the State of Illinois. would mean 38 million dollars for the Otherwise, it would have to come out of the General Revenue We can't afford to take it out of the General Revenue Fund. Everyone knows we can't afford to take it of the General Revenue Fund. That side knows, even more than this side, because they're the ones telling us that we're 145 million dollars in the hole already. So, you know, while the intentions are good, we are losing...we are not losing 38 million dollars in the road fund; because the Department of Transportation, with own...within it's own internal bureaucracy, has been able to cut back on some areas, and put an additional 45 million in the road fund, over and above this 38 million. argue that will be over 75 million, but still, we're going to have to take the 38 million out of the ... out of the General Revenue Fund. He cannot afford it, and I would ask that we vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One point that we should all remember in the discussion of this Amendment is that we, really, are not talking about the funding of the state police. I don't think there's a Member in this room who isn't willing to fund the state police, and to fund them at an adequate level and provide for their needs so that they can do as they have in the past; have done a very professional job for all the citizens of the State of Illinois. The question is, while the state police are out in their squad

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

cars enforcing the laws of the State of Illinois, will the people in this room encourage the Governor to follow state...the laws of the State of Illinois. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, in 1979 in connection with the famous Thompson - Byrne passage...or package, we passed an anti-diversion Bill, which is now in Chapter of our statutes. It's in Section 144.3, and that Section provides that, beginning with Fiscal Year thereafter. 40 percent of the funds appropriated for the state police is the maximum that can be diverted from road fund. Forty percent, not 100 percent, as the Governor has provided. So, the Gentleman is offering an excellent Amendment, an Amendment that will provide money for the road fund. It will not take any money away from the state police, because they will be funded. It just, and simply straightforwardly, means that the rest of the funding for the state police, the remaining 60 percent, 38 dollars. will have to be found elsewhere and from general That was the directive of the Illinois General revenue. Assembly in 1979. It is the law of the State Illinois...the State of Illinois, at this time. flexibility. The statutory language is shall. 'may'. We have no discretion. We must follow the law. T+ good law. The Road Fund is badly in need of money. The Gentleman has offered an excellent Amendment, and would urge everyone here to support this Amendment to provide money for the road fund, and to make an honest out of the Governor of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of this Amendment. This is something that has been brought out here that was agreed on several years ago — to phase this out. And this should

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

have been phased out as of this year. We talk about, this is going to have to come out of general revenue. Well, the general revenue, we know is in bad shape; but I believe the Highway Department and the Road Fund is much worse. Therefore, I think it's a good Amendment, and we should all support it and keep our word in an agreement we made a short time ago."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of House Amendment #11 to House Bill 2195. As the previous two speakers have stated, Mr. Rigney is only complying with the existing law of the Illinois revised statutes. 1 to you that the House Democratic Members in the Appropriation Committee asked for the Attorney General to provide us with an Attorney General's opinion as to the Governor's proposed budget for the Department Enforcement. Although the Attorney General, in his wisdom, not responded yet. Our preliminary findings from the Attorney General is that the Governor's budget is only a proposal. Only the Illinois Legislature can violate the If you defeat Mr. Rigney's Amendment, we will be in violation of the law. If we accept Mr. Rigney's Amendment. we are according to law, as Mr. Dunn so ably pointed out. So, contrary to Mr. Winchester's comments, I stand in support of Mr. Rigney's Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, J. J."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
Ordinarily, I would probably be supporting this Amendment;
however, what this amounts to is a one-year delay in the
phase out. This is exactly what we've done, in principle,
with certain pension funding. We went to 70 percent level,
although the statute calls for additional. We have to,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

because of the the times that we're in right now, certain delays and certain decisions which we may not want to do totally. But, I would ask you, this is 38 million dollar budget-buster out of general revenue. And I submit to you, where are we going to get the money? Where are the Amendments to cut 38 million dollars out of GRF elsewhere? There are a few token Amendments filed here for a few thousand dollars. I see reductions, which don*t really amount to much. We already, just a while ago, added 1,200,000 dollars to the Arts Council. It seems that mood of this General Assembly is not one to cut. And, if you're going to make these kinds of add-ons, I submit. Speaker and Members of the House, correspondingly, we must make cuts. We can't be doing that and then going around yelling that the Governor has a budget that is out of I would ask for defeat of the Gentleman's balance. Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for those of you who are interested in supporting this Amendment, and Representative Wolf is wondering where we're going to get the other 38 million. I told you about the Senate Amendment that they hung on over there that was for 40 million, by going without salary for ten Members of the General Assembly and the statewide officers and all state employees. It will generate 40 million dollars, if we only use 1.2 for the Arts Council, so there's still 38.8 million left. And I think we can that. So, I would encourage you to consider that in casting your vote."

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

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I recognize that the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

General Fund budget has its problems; but I don't think that gives us any license to steal. The statute's very clear about this. This diversion is to end this year. I am pleased to see, Representative Winchester pointed out, that 45 million will be saved by the Department of Transportation internally. That's their job. I'm...You know, if they can save 45 million, fine. They should have done it years ago. I ask you, what fund is suffering any more than the road fund? It's...It's probably at its all time low in recent history. So, I merely ask you for a 'yes' vote for this Amendment."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #11 to House
 Bill 291...2195 be adopted?". Those in favor will signify
 by saying "aye", those opposed. Amendment 11 is adopted.
 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, Leverenz, amends House Bill 2195 as amended."
- Speaker Peters: "Wait a... It's adopted. The Chair ruled it's adopted. Next Amendment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Leverenz, amends House Bill 2195 as amended and so forth."
- Speaker Peters: "How...How has the Gentleman been injured? How have you been injured? Amendment 12. Read the Amendment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Leverenz, amends House Bill 2195 as amended and so forth."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Wolf,
 Amendment #12. The Sponsor of the Motion is not here."
- Wolf, J. J.: "I move to table Amendment #12."
- Speaker Peters: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #12. Those in favor... Representative Dunn, on that Motion."
- Dunn, Jack: "Mr. Speaker, I was still concentrating on the last
 Amendment in which I was denied a Foll Call. I would like
 to know what this Amendment does."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- Speaker Peters: "The Sponsor is not here. There is a Motion to table. Representative Getty on the Motion."
- Getty: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, the Representative who is the Sponsor this Motion is officially excused today, due to a death in his family. I think in the ... in the sense of that another Member should be permitted to put that Amendment, not to hold up the process, and if...if the Chair would rule otherwise, then, I think, that it would be appropriate for us to ask for a Roll Call on the Motion to table. I think where a Member is absent due to no fault of his own, because of a death in his family or similar circumstances, that certainly either the Minority Spokesman 10 some other Member designated would handle the Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "On the question, Representative McClain."
- HcClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conjunction with Mr. Getty, Mr. Zito is fully capable of handling this Amendment. I think..."
- Speaker Peters: "I...I'm sure he is, Sir. If you would indicate to the Chair, so that we do follow the rules, where the Chair is empowered to call upon another Member of this House to present argument on another Member's Amendment, I will be happy to do it. Just so...Just so that the Chair is following the rule. I'm not aware of that kind of a rule. I'd be happy..."
- McClain: "Mr. Spea...Mr. Speaker, typically, the Chair has always granted that as a courtesy when a Member has been excused from Session date. It's been a courtesy that every Speaker has always done previously."
- Speaker Peters: "On the Motion, Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was just last week that the Parliamentarian ruled that if there wasn't a rule specifically denying something, then the...then the Speaker

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

could do it. Now, it seems to be that you're making the ruling to be that unless the...the rules specifically allows you to do something, then you can't do it. I would hope that you and your Parliamentarian would get together and decide which one of your rulings is going to take place."

Speaker Peters: "Last time, you had a less than strict constructionist of the rules of the Chair. Representative Matijevich on the question."

Matijevich: "Yes, I was going to urge the Chair to bend the rule, as we often have done here. In this case, it's an important project in the Legislator's area and, I think, other Legislators from that area. Also, as a Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee, I was not aware that Ted Leverenz was going to have a problem and there was going to be a death in the family. He has some Amendments in other Bills. And, because...if you persist in I would just plead with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, when we come to those Bills where Leverenz is listed as a Sponsor of an Amendment, if going to persist, that we take that Bill ... or those Bills out of the record; because we tried to have some order to the Amendment process in giving the Sponsorship to the Amendment to someone who is intensely interested in that appropriation Bill. Otherwise, I think the...the better thing to do is to let some other Member of the Committee, who is also knowledgeable in that issue, handle the Amendment for him. I think we could progress in orderly fashion, if you would, quote, bend the rule. not trying to hurt anybody. We're just trying to do this in an orderly fashion."

Speaker Peters: "...will procede as follows. If the tabling

Motion is before the House, that is what will be

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

considered. If the tabling Motion passes, that ends that. If the tabling Motion does not pass, then the matter is...continues to be before the House. The Chair will recognize the Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee, which I think is the proper individual to, then, recognize in order to expedite this matter, given the sec...circumstance of the Representative's absence because of a unfortunate circumstance in the family. Now, Representative Wolf, J. J., on the Motion."

- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the death in the family. So, in the spirit of...of harmony, I would withdraw the Motion. I hope we can just kill it on the vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. The Chair recognizes Representative Matijevich on Amendment #11."
- Matijevich: "Yes, I appreciate the...the gesture by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In fact, that's why I'm going to his...his..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative Matijevich. Amendment #12, I want to get that straight in the record. Proceed, Sir."
- Matijevich: "All right. Amendment #12 was offered Representative Leverenz, and appropriates 6.3 dollars in CDB funds to the Water Resources Division. order to provide for the excavating, loading and transport of material from retention bases...Basins 102 and the Des Plaines flood control area in Cook County. T am aware, in discussing this matter with Representative Leverenz, that this is a very critical problem in his area. I know Representative Zito ran to my desk when he was aware that Leverenz could not be here, because it is such a crucial issue to their area. So, I'll...I'll yield the rest of my time to Representative Zito, to indicate the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

importance of this issue in their area."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Zito."

Zito: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although this appropriation is 6.3 million dollars, let me remind the General Assembly that for the last two fiscal years, we have carried a 10 million dollar appropriation this same...this same line item, never being used because of the land acquisition of a certain That parcel of property could no longer be purchased, so we lowered that to...and it's an reduction of 3.7 million to dig retention basin 102 and 106, and the already started Des Plaines flood control area in Cook County. This is... This project was started several years ago to combat some of the flooding problems in the The 10 million dollars that was carried on the line item for two fiscal years prior to this was for the acquisition and purchase of a quarry in Elmhurst. quarry is no longer for sale, and we've reduced this to dig the basins and alleviate our problems with the backfill. I would urge and ask for support of this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor, whomever you may designate that to be, would yield for a question."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, in the event this Amendment is adopted, will you vote for the Bill on Third Reading?"

Matijevich: "You know, I learned a long time ago, Sam, I learned a lot of this even, you know, I came here before you did, but boy, I'll be darned if I haven't even learned some things from you. I've learned some things from everybody that's here...that's here in the Assembly. I've learned never to commit myself until I hear all of the debate on an

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

issue. You never get in trouble that way. And even though I'd like to respond 'yes', because it's coming from you, and I probably even owe you one, I'll have to wait until I hear all of the debate on Third Reading. And I may even join in that debate."

Vinson: "Representative, does the Bill....Would the Amendment provide for increased spending over the Bill, as it presently stands?"

"That might be, but let me tell you. All I've heard about the Amendments that Democrats have offered increase spending in the Appropriations Committee. Much as I like the Committee Chairman - he and I are good friends - he adds something like the Illinois Conservative does. In other words, we've offered sometimes Amendments, virtually the same Amendments, and one has failed. And we've offered another one similar and they add all...they add all of those up. That's much like the Arts Council adding all of those Amendments when only one adopted. Another thing, I've yet to hear anybody say, for example, we had that reapprop Bill on the Department Transportation. I've yet to hear anybody say, do you know that that Bill came in three hundred million dollars more than the Governor's budget? Three hundred million dollars Now, that wasn't Democrats that introduced that That was the Republicans. Three hundred million dollars. Now, what are you doing by that particular gimmick? Are you going to offer three hundred million dollars more, even though it's in reapprop, to later make the Governor look good? I don't know. You know, so don't get all excited about it ... "

Vinson: "Representative, I'm posing questions to you. Now, do you know of any Member of the House who will vote for this Bill if the Amendment's adopted?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Matijevich: "Well, we'll have to wait. I.. I never want... I never want to vote for anybody else. I.. I think that question..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich, excuse me.

Representative Kane, for what"

Matijevich: ".. Doesn't ... doesn't ..."

Speaker Peters: "...Purpose do you seek recognition?..."

Matijevich: "...Doesn't relate to the Amendment..."

Kane: "I think we're supposed to be addressing the Amendment, not the Bill. If the Gentleman would confine his guestions to the Amendment I think then we could get on instead of raising these hypothetical questions..."

Speaker Peters: "If both the questions and the answers are confined to the substance of the material before the House, we will all leave in a reasonable or relatively unreasonable hour..."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker ... "

Speaker Peters: "Your point is well taken. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "To the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "I would make the point that no one has identified themselves or stepped forward who says they'll support this Bill if the Amendment is adopted. And for that reason, I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment. It, obviously, is not sufficiently important to anybody to say they'll commit to vote for the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "On the Amendment, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with all due respect to the Gentleman, Representative Zito, I'd like to correct him on a few things because I'm sure he inadvertently made a misrepresentation to the House. This Amendment does not affect the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Quarry. This does not alleviate the flooding problem in that area. Just two weeks ago, the Legislators from our area attended a meeting sponsored bγ the various municipalities in the area, and they presented an alternative to the purchase of the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry. That alternative is estimated to be in the cost of somewhere in the neighborhood of two million dollars, versus the estimates for the purchase of the quarry, which would range upwards of twenty million dollars. will be supported by the Legislators from the alternative area affected through the flood control projects. This project, Amendment #12, is a completely new and different project. It is a nonexistent quarry project. different from the Elmhurst-Chicago Flood Control Project that is now being presented by DOT, and one that unapproved. For that reason, because it's new money in the area of six point three million dollars, and because of the shortage of our funds right now, I stand in opposition to this."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf, J. J."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I, too, would join my colleagues in opposing this Amendment, and for the reasons that there is no money included in this Bill for water resources capital projects due to the capital freeze, and I think that is sufficient

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 to House
Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by
saying 'aye'...The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call.
Representatives Zito, Darrow, Dunn, Schneider and Giorgi.
The question is....Representative Zito to close."

reason enough for everyone to vote 'no', and would so ask."

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

I'm not so sure the Representative from DuPage, although I

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

was not in attendance at that meeting....The purpose for Representative Leverenz and myself working on this Amendment was for the longest time for the last two project has laid dormant because we weren t...although we had the ten million dollars appropriated, able to purchase the property that was located in Elmhurst. that was a stone quarry. What we though would behoove the project even more is to The Stone Quarry was going to purchased so that we could take the landfill from basin 102, which has not yet been dug, and 106, and put landfill in the quarry. Rather than do that, with the six point three million dollars that I would like to this Bill today, we will be able, not only to dig those retention basins, but remove the landfill. It's ... It is a savings of three point seven million dollars, and I would ask for a Roll Call and your support of this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "For purposes of the record, Representatives Matijevich and Zito ask leave to handle Amendment #12 to House Bill 2195 due to the absence of the Sponsor, Representative Leverenz, and they moved the suspension of the appropriate rule. Is there objection? There being none, leave is granted. The guestion now is, 'Shall Amendment #12 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Birkinbine to explain his vote."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've gone through two Bills and part of a third. There are seven more Amendments on the third Bill. We know that they're pork barrel projects that are important to certain people in their districts. We probably know already how we're going to vote on these various projects. We know what both sides of the aisle

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

feel about most of the Amendments that are being offered on Second Reading Bills. We also know that if they go beyond the Governor's budget, he's going to veto them. They'll come back to us and the vetos will probably be upheld. So let's...If those people who seem to always get up on these Bills and like to hear themselves talk, maybe they can get together in a side room and they can all talk together. But why don't we cut this down a bit, because we're not changing anybody's minds."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fauell to explain her vote."

Fawell: "I'd just...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to echo Representative Daniels'...what he said. We did have this meeting. The IDOT has come up with a new project. It will cost considerable less amount of money. If the Representative on the other side would like to get details of that project, he'd be more than welcome. The problem is they didn't put in three gates in 1962 that they were requested to, and that should solve the problem of the 'Salt Creek'."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 87 voting 'nay', 72 voting 'aye', and Amendment #12...Representative? Record Representatives Mautino and McGrew as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 87 voting 'no', 74 voting 'aye'. This Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, John Dunn..."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #13, Representative Dunn? John Dunn."
Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #13 is identical to the
Amendment previously offered by Representative Rigney, and
I will ask leave to withdraw Amendment #13 and just ask for
a point of inquiry with the Chair about the circumstances
under which a Member is entitled to a Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Amendment #13 is withdrawn. Now, Representative

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- Dunn, John: "I just would like clarification from the Chair about the circumstances under which an elected Member of this Assembly is entitled to a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The...As soon as the Parliamentarian is here
 we'll refer you to the appropriate rule, Sir. My
 recollection...My recollection was that you spoke on the
 positive side. The Chair ruled that the positive side had
 won."
- Dunn, John: "Well, the reason I had asked for the clarification,
 Mr. Speaker, is that your comments then and your comments
 now are fairly consistent, and I see nothing in the rule
 book about whether an Amendment is prevailing or whether an
 Amendment is losing or whether a Bill is prevailing or
 whether a Bill is losing..."

Speaker Peters: "Well ... "

- Dunn, John: "...And whether you're entitled to a Roll Call..."
- Speaker Peters: "...Then, Representative, let me indicate that..that before the Chair called you to make your statement, we had moved to the next Amendment and it came late..."
- Dunn, John: "Well...I...I. disagree with you about that, Mr. Speaker, but I'm asking for clarification now for the...for the future. I wonder if I am correct that Rule 45 (c) governs, and if a Member is joined by four other Members that that Member is entitled to a Roll Call, and there's no discretion about it."
- Speaker Peters: "That, to the best of my knowledge, is the rule."

 Dunn, John: "Now, I would respectfully admonish the Chair to

 follow the rules in the future then..."
- Speaker Peters: "The Chair...The Chair is respectfully admonished by a pristine Member of the Assembly who always follows the rules. Representative Greiman. Your light is on, Sir. It

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

was on. It is on."

Greiman: "Just for further clarification of that point, Mr. Speaker. The right to the Roll Call is not a rule. It is in the Constitution, and ..."

Speaker Peters: "...Got ...:

Greiman: "Section 8-C, is a Constitutional provision that gives

Mr. Dunn his rights to a Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The ... The Chair glories in the clarification.

Representative Jones, Emil, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for the purposes of an introduction. I'd like to introduce to the Body here a very good friend of long standing, a product of the Southern Illinois University, a great track star, a internationally known comedian, who is here in Springfield with us, talking to our good friend in the back row, Taylor Pouncey, and that person is none other than Dick Gregory, who's with us today. Let's give him a round welcome."

Speaker Peters: "Welcome to Springfield. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, McClain - John Dunn
Bradley..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #14..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Dunn, do you wish to call the Chair's attention to another rule? Oh, I'm sorry.

I thought...Oh...Alright. Representative McClain. We can be selective, Sir. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #14 to House Bill 2195 is concerned with the Amtrak service routes in the State of Illinois. At present, President Reagan has tendered a program to the Illinois...er..to the Congress of the United States, which

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

would delete all subsidies for Antrak services. Ιf President Reagan is successful, the three Amtrak routes in Illinois would be under-funded upon the Governor's request. This money that is appropriated through this Amendment would triple the amount of money that's now part of the Amtrak service and would provide for those three routes stay in existence. Those services are very needed for those communities served by those Amtrak services. Tf. indeed, President Reagan is not successful, then the Governor can easily amend out this appropriation. Tf President Reagan is successful, then this appropriation will be necessary for the Governor to keep these three routes in existence. On that, I ask you for a favorable vote, and a Roll Call, Mr. Peters."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

McClain: "And a Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Oh, absolutely, Sir. Representative
Leinenweber? Further discussion? Representative
Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative McClain, if we appropriated this money and all of it was necessary, what would be the per passenger subsidy for each rider, based upon the recent statistics, or the most recent statistics you could come up with?"

McClain: "Well, Mr. Leinenweber, I don't have those figures.

It's....The state subsidy which would replace in the federal subsidy would cost about half of what the actual cost of the ridership would be, and I don't have the per passenger cost."

Leinenweber: "All right. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the precise figure for these particular routes, but I can tell

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

what it is for many Amtrak routes. For many of the routes the cost of subsidy per rider is so great that we give them an airplane ticket to go from the particular route they want to go and back again without charging them anything. The whole reason why they're cutting out these particular subsidies is because of the tremendous cost per rider. People just aren't riding these trains regardless of the subsidies. throwing hundreds of dollars per rider. If you really want to waste money then vote 'yes' on this Amendment, which is five point two million. Hopefully Congress will have the sense enough not to follow the President's direction not appropriate this ... your federal tax dollars for this purpose. It's absolutely insane to pay people a hundred dollars to ride a train and charge them about five or seven dollars for the ticket and then have the taxpayers pay one hundred dollars in order for them to be able to ride these If people want to ride the trains, they will, and they'll be able to pay the way. So let's vote 'no' on this ...this Amendment and even though according to Representative Ebbesen's figures there's still thirty-five million left, but this is not the place to blow it all."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Representative McClain, is it true that Congress is still deliberating the federal funding formula for Amtrak?" McClain: "Yes, that's the reason why this Amendment. Our appropriation process will end before the Congress has the...has the opportunity to make a decision, so, this is purely discretionary money. If Congress does not accept the President's recommendations, then the Governor can veto

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

out this money. There will be no harm done. If Congress does delete all these federal subsidies, then we want to keep the Amtrak services from...like Chicago to Joliet, to Bloomington to Springfield, on down to St. Louis, and the other two routes."

- Winchester: "Don't you think, though, really we're getting ahead of ourselves? Wouldn't it be better if we waited and ...and address the issue once Congress had made a determination as to the funding formula and then come back with maybe a..a supplemental appropriation?"
- McClain: "My information says it will be too late. That if, indeed, the President and the Congress concur in removing these subsidies, it'd be such a crisis that the three routes would just terminate. So, we won't have the money for the subsidies. Otherwise, the reason for this, Winchester, this is just good management. And if it's not successful. if the President is not successful, unnecessary, then the Governor can remove it, and it goes back in the General Revenue Fund. If the President successful, then it keeps those three routes alive. It's a bipartisan issue."
- Winchester: "Okay, the five point two million, General Revenue

 Fund money, that you're asking for, Art, isn't that really

 ...doesn't that really exceed the needs for

 inter...inter-city rail at this time?"
- McClain: "Those figures came from the Illinois Department of Transportation."
- Hinchester: "Hell, I find that not to be a correct statement,

 Representative. I....They tell me that that's not true

 and that you're asking for more. Well, to address the Bill

 briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is another case where we're

 taking money out of the General Revenue Fund. It's five

 point two million dollars, clearly comes out of the General

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

Revenue Fund. We don't really need the money at this point because we don't know what the Congress of the United States is going to do when they address this issue. It is an important subject, but it's something that we can always address at a later time, perhaps when we have more money in the General Revenue Fund. But we have to bear in mind what everyone on this side of the aisle has been making...has been stating ever since we started the Second Reading process, that we just simply don't have the money in the General Revenue Fund to continue to take money out of it and fund various projects and that's what we're doing again here. Five point two million out of the General Revenue Fund. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, McClain, in the event that this
Amendment is adopted will you vote for the Bill on Third
Reading?"

McClain: "I think the Chair has already ruled on that issue."

Vinson: "I didn't hear the response, Mr. Speaker."

McClain: "I think the Chair's already ruled on that issue."

Vinson: "No, the Chair can't rule on how you'll vote on Third
Reading. I'm just asking you. Do you care enough about
this concept to vote for the Bill on Third Reading if the
Amendment's adopted?"

McClain: "Will that get your vote?"

Vinson: "Well, it would make a big difference."

McClain: "If that will get your vote and your side of the aisle's vote, which really should not be a political issue anyway, and that will get the Amendment on, I'll think about it."

Vinson: "Thank you."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas?"

- Kulas: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Vinson is going to get up on every Bill or Amendment and ask the Sponsor if he's going to vote on the Bill, he's out of order. We're addressing the Amendment right now, not the Bill."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson on a question...point of personal privilege. You...Your point has not been privileged. Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in response to one of the questions asked by one of the Members as to what the per cost per person, per rider was and was unable to answer that, and I don't have the answer either. But I do know that just recently we have seen a station and a stop by the Amtrak train going through the City of Normal to pick up students that...from Illinois State University. And it's a heavy ridership from that University alone going both to St. Louis and to Chicago. That happens to be one of the most heavily ridden Amtrak trains that we have in the country from Chicago to St. Louis, and I would like to see this supported so that we can continue to supply the transportation to those students as well as the other people up and down the track that use that particular Amtrak railroad. Thank you."
- Speaker Peters: "On Amendment 14, Representative John Dunn."
- Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker, we seem to be doing quite well on this

 Amendment. I would like a Roll Call, if I can be joined by
 the requisite number of other Members."
- Speaker Peters: "It's...I'll.. Representative, I will have to check with the Parliamentarian and Representative Greiman when that request is appropriate. We are now on Amendment #14."
- Dunn, John: "I'm asking for a Roll Call on Amendment #14, Mr.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker."

- Speaker Peters: "I see. Any further discussion? Representative Harry Smith."
- Smith, Harry: "Move the previous question."
- Speaker Peters: "Doesn't want a Roll Call. Representative Harry Smith."
- Smith, Harry: "Move the previous question."
- Speaker Peters: "There you are. The question is, *Shall the previous question be put? . Representative Dunn, a Roll this question. Is he joined by five Members? Representative Greiman. John Dunn. Dick Kelly. Balanoff. One more. Kornowicz. And, Wolf. The question is... question is, 'Shall the question to close the debate be put? . All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. No, Representative Dunn, you wanted this dilatory Roll Call and you're getting The Chair distinctly asked whether you wanted a Roll Call and you said 'yes'. My God, let us be fair to the Chair. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 115 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'nay'. And the Motion prevails. The question now is...Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "After we proceed with this Roll Call, can we have a Roll Call on being fair to the Chair?"
- Speaker Peters: "Happy to give you any kind of Roll Call. The question now is, 'Shall the previous question'...No, no, no, no, no, no, no. This is moving too fast. Representative McClain to close."
- McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I'll make a deal with you. We'll accept that Roll Call and that you're fair if you'll accept that Roll Call on Amendment #14. It's okay?"
- Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain, you and I know what's going to happen. It's alright with me."

McClain: "Okay."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

McClain: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Leinenweber's question was directed really towards Amtrak service from Chicago to Peoria when there had been many newspaper articles about the cost effectiveness individual route. That route is no longer existence. The three routes that would be accomplished the Quincy to Chicago, the Springfield to Chicago, the Decatur to Chicago, which goes through Champaign. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not a political Amendment. This is..should be a bipartisan Amendment for those people that receive these services from Amtrak is a necessary item for many people in downstate Illinois. It's much used by the Universities and nothing to do with politics. All this Amendment does is provide for monies to be in the appropriation in case the Pederal Government does away with subsidies for these services. If they do, it's good management that funded it. If Federal Government continues the subsidies, then the Governor can easily veto the monies out there's no harm done. This is just good management, should be bipartisan. And I ask for an 'aye' vote and a Roll Call, please."

Speaker Peters: "With leave, I forgot the point of order.

Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Speaker, I just would like to serve notice right now on all these Amendments coming up. We're on a Third Bill here. It's five o'clock. I don't know how many more Amendments we've got here and how many more Bills we've got to do. The Chair has been most lenient. I say the votes had better be on the Board. I'm going to ask for a verification. I would ask that everybody vote their own switch on all these Amendments. It would save a lot of

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- time. I'd like to get out of here tonight."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #14 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 84 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'no'. Representative Wolf?"
- Wolf, J. J.: "I would ask for a verification of the Roll."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for a verification.

 Representative Vinson, for what purpose?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, there in the Speaker's well, I would like to introduce 'Mr. Emil Verbin', the living symbol of the Chicago Cubs. Emil Verbin."
- Speaker Peters: "Welcome, Mr. Verbin. Representative McClain?"
- McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Poll of the Absentees.

 And if there are more 'nos' than 'ayes', after his verification, I would verify the Negative."
- Speaker Peters: "Okay. Poll of the...Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees: Abramson. Barr. Bullock. Capparelli. Cullerton. Domico. Ewell. Flinn. Katz. Kucharski. Leverenz. Garmisa. R. J. Meyer. O'Brien. Satterthwaite. Stearney. C. M. Telcser. Terzich. No further."
- Speaker Peters: "Record Representative Barr as voting 'no'.

 Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose?

 Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Telcser, 'no'. Capparelli, 'aye'.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Poll the affirmative."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Saltsman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Saltsman: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified?"

115th Legislative Day

- May 25, 1982
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, the Gentleman seeks leave to be verified. Saltsman. Alright. Donovan? Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Capparelli."

 Speaker Peters: "Hold on. Katz, 'aye'. The Gentleman asks leave

 to be verified. Representative Wolf? Leave granted.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Currie.

 Deuster. DiPrima. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Farley.

 Findley. Getty..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Tate?

 Representative Wolf, Mr. Tate seeks leave to be verified.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Hoffman. Huff..."
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk? Record...Change Representative

 Hoffman from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Jackson. Jaffe. Johnson. Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Levin. Loftus. Madigan. Martire. Natijevich. Mautino. Mays. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Neff. O'Connell. Murphy. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Tate. Topinka. Van Duyne. Turner. Vinson. Vitek. Wikoff. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And. Zito."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative? Representative Terzich? Record Representative Terzich as 'aye'. What is the count, Mr. Clerk? There's 87 'aye'...Representative LaHood from 'no' to 'aye'. Count is 88 'aye', 76 'no'. Representative Wolf, proceed."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Breslin."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Breslin's in her seat."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Farley?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Farley? The Gentleman's in the rear."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Peters: "Giglio? He's in his seat."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Giorgi."

Speaker Peters: "Giorgi, he's here."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Hannig?"

Speaker Peters: "Hannig is in his seat."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Jones?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jones? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Kane?"

Speaker Peters: "Kane. Representative Kane? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Catania?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania is in her seat.

Representative Jones has returned. Return him to the

Roll, Mr. Clerk."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Laurino?"

Speaker Peters: "Laurino? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Bonan?"

Speaker Peters: "Ronan, is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Steczo?"

Speaker Peters: "Here, Ronan is here. Put him back on."

Wolf, J. J.: "And I believe we had an agreement on Mr. Garmisa.

But was he here?"

Speaker Peters: "Re's not voting, Sir."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Stuffle?"

Speaker Peters: "Stuffle, is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Here, he's back. He just walked in the back. Put him back on."

Wolf, J. J.: "White?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative White? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Beatty?"

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry."

Wolf, J. J.: "Beatty."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Beatty is in his chair."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Johnson?"

Speaker Peters: "Johnson is in his seat."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Findley?"

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman's in his seat."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Mays."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Wolf, J. J.: "I believe Mr. Tate had ...had leave to be verified?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Topinka?"

Speaker Peters: "The Lady is in the chamber."

Holf, J. J.: "Wikoff?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman's in the chamber."

Wolf, J. J.: "No further."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk, what's the count? On this question there are 85 'aye', 76 'no'. And the Amendment #14 to House Bill 2195 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #15, Giorgi..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think anv Department of Transportation budget ought to be allowed to get out of this House without an Amendment on FAP 412. This Amendment doesn't authorize any new bonding authority. does is take some of the Amendment money that the Governor's authorized for the transportation bond issue A reserve some of the money for PAP 412, which is the notorious and infamous North-South highway. I was visiting with Representative Neff a couple of minutes ago telling him, 12 years ago he needed three votes to pass Governor Ogilvie's transportation bond issue and the three votes that he got were Senator..were Senators Simms, who's now Senator Simms, Representative North and Representative Giorgi and 12 years ago we were promised a North-South highway to I-80. This year we might get the North-South highway opened at Rochelle. That's 12 years, 12 miles. A mile a year is all we've been getting. Last week I was one of the 45 Members that voted for the gas tax increase roads and I've always been in the forefront for roads and for anything that we might need to build highways. about three years ago, Senator Hickey and myself were override a Governor Thompson's veto of 44 million dollars and he didn't spend a dime of that money, not I've been around here for 12 years supporting road programs, supporting any road program the RTA and the CTA, and I feel this money ought to be put into this budget so

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

that the Governor can be made to be a man of his word and either veto it out or grant it. And I move the adoption of the budg...of my Bill (sic, Amendment)."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, I stand in opposition. This is a typical piece of legislation for the distinguished Gentleman from It's so ridiculous we really shouldn't even be considering it, but I will address it very seriously. There is 20 million dollars already in the appropriation Bill for the Department of Transportation for highway By ...by adopting this Amendment, that means that there will be 50 million dollars less appropriations being spent for other road projects around the State of Illinois that have already been earmarked bу the Department . of Transportation. Each one of us will lose projects in our district so that the Gentleman from Rockford can have project, which already has 20 million dollars, which will mean a total of 70 million dollars. And I don't there's any need to go any further, Mr. Speaker. This...This Amendment should receive a unanimous *no* vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Roehler."

Koehler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I ask the Representative a question, please?"

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

Koehler: "Representative Winchester.."

Speaker Peters: "That's not ... That you can't do."

Koehler: "Oh, okay. Well, may I...Oh...Representative Giorgi, perhaps you could tell us where the 20 million dollars that has been included is going to be spent?"

Giorgi: "That's ...Representative Koehler, that's another of the will-o'-the-wisp method of budgeting that Representative Winchester's so good at. Not to cast any aspersions on any

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

party. That 20 million dollars is contingent on federal funding. Let me tell you what happened about federal funding. Congressman Martin, Senator Percy and Reagan were in Rockford telling us we're going to get money for the North-South highway. We didn't get a dime. Nixon and Anderson were standing beside highway 51, the North-South highway. We still haven't got a dime. We're not going to get any money from the Federal Government."

Koehler: "The 20 million dollars then it is your understanding..."

Giorgi: "...It is not in the budget..."

Koehler: "...Would not be spent in the area, the Illinois Valley area?"

Giorgi: "Not at all. It is on a come back with the Federal Government."

Koehler: "Thank you very much. The...This Amendment is very important to the Illinois Valley area. As the Representative has said, we have been waiting patiently and sometimes not so patiently for about 12 years for the building of the highway 51 and FAP 412. Not only would our area benefit by this Amendment, but also would the entire State of Illinois because highway 51 is a major North-South artery in our state. We would appreciate your vote on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, having been elected from a district that includes six precincts in the City of Rockford, the second biggest city of the State of Illinois,

I join with my colleague, Representative Giorgi, and I'm sure with other Members of the House who represent the center part of Illinois that every now and then you have to drive up and down this state. You get sick and tired of hearing from Representatives where you'd have to shoot a

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

cannon to hit a cow, never mind a car, on some of their beautiful highways in some certain parts of this state who happen to have been lucky enough to have been able to be represented by people who were able to bring home the bacon years ago. But in Northern Illinois and in part of the State of Illinois, we aren't that fortunate. We have the people; we have the traffic count, but we don't have the roads. I support Representative Giorgi and the people of the central part of the center corridor of Illinois in trying to get good roads for all the especially in the areas where the people happen to reside in Northern Illinois, from Rockford down south at least to Interstate 80."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino." Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I, too, stand in support of Amendment #15. T+1s ironic that this Amendment is labeled #15 because it's been years since the start of Route 51, Federal A 412. been promised by the has last three Governors completion. Currently that provision now goes down into Winnebago...south of Winnebago into Lee County. Amendment will at least continue for the 22 miles for connection of those bridges that we've already put in. Ιt will implement the hub for the nation as it pertains to interstate highways with the connection of Interstate Route 80 with Federal A-412. It seems to me that we were not very fortunate with the existing Congressman within this district to get additional federal funds. It seems to that the funds went down south, basically from the Danville Decatur provision, with the additional 25 million dollars. It's imperative that we show our priorities that started 15 years ago for completion of Federal A-412, known Route 51, and I stand in firm support of as this

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand in support of this Amendment. I think it's an excellent Amendment, and I would think that the people who .. who...there's just so many dollars to go around in the other geographical areas of the state would look upon this as benefit to themselves because the people in Northern Illinois, the concentration of population is up there. That means concentration of the automobiles and that certainly means the consumption of most of the motor fuel. And we haven't had those dollars, the transfusion, matching or otherwise. over the last 15 years, has been brought out. I really think that people in the other districts of this state should...could support this Amendment and should support it, because, until we get a freeway, an interstate freeway. up and down the central portion of this state from Northern Illinois down to the central area. below, that certainly it's going to affect the entire economy of this state. It's difficult as it is. is a good Amendment, and I think maybe if we could send a message down to the second floor maybe the Governor would reassess where those dollars are being spent and perhaps we'd get the money for this. It's a very, very important interstate highway. I would encourage an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Hould the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "It's a different question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, the terms of your Amendment,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

where...what is the southern extreme that construction could be had on under your Amendment?"

Giorgi: "I thought, Representative Vinson, that when we wrote legislation that the..the Executive would recognize the limits of that legislation. My answer to you is, three years ago both Houses overrode the Governor's veto of 44 million dollars, and he didn't spend a dime of it. This says the money should be spent up to I-80 where all the engineering has been completed. The road bed has been ready for pouring. All we need now is concrete, nothing else. Beyond I-80, nothing has been done. But that doesn't preclude the Governor from spending some of this money past I-80, because he's done it in the past."

Vinson: "But under the terms of your Amendment, the money that you're specifically appropriating in this Amendment, it could not be spent south of I-80. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "In pract...In ...in your..."

Vinson: "Other money might be, but not this money."

Giorgi: "In your vernacular, it shouldn't be, but it will be."

Vinson: "It what?"

Giorgi: "In your vernacular, it shouldn't be, but it will be spent beyond 1-80."

Vinson: "You could not...With this Amendment, with the money appropriated in this Amendment, you could not spend something on the bridge over the Illinois River. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "Well, it's..it says here in Section 1, under the heading, '...Central Offices Division of Highways...', which would indicate to me anywhere on that Corridor. And then for example..."

Vinson: "Anywhere on the Corridor?"

Giorgi: "...In that Corridor. I would guess that the Governor's

Office, the Governor writes the final checks."

115th Legislative Day

- May 25, 1982
- Vinson: "You're saying that under your Amendment, he could spend money, say, in Decatur?"
- Giorgi: "Yes, it's theoretically possible he could spend between

 Decatur and...yes."
- Vinson: "So, you're not even guaranteeing that the money could..would..would be spent at the northern end of the highway. Is that correct?"
- Giorgi: "I...My understanding..."
- Vinson: "...It could all be spent in my district. Is that right?"
- Giorgi: "My intent is...you know, they built the most beautiful bridge in the world over the Kiswaukee River. It is being advertised all over the world as the..the Ecology Bridge. It doesn't disturb the ecology one iota. We're not going to be using it for 20 years if we don't put some concrete up ..from..to it and from it. Did you hear about the bridge?"
- Vinson: "It's a good Bill, Mr. Speaker. I would just make the point that appropriations this year in the budget include ten million dollars in state funds and ten million dollars of federal funds for the Route 51 Corridor. I would like to see more spent, but frankly, the money is not there, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Winchester: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My name was used at least three times in debate by the Gentleman from Rockford."
- Speaker Peters: "Proceed."
- Winchester: "He did make a misleading statement a few moments ago
 to Representative Koehler which I think the Gentleman from
 Clinton may have corrected. But there is 20 million
 dollars in the appropriation Bill for Route 51. Ten

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

million is state, ten million is federal. And, I must reiterate to all the Membership that if this Amendment is adopted and it gets...survives the Governor, that that's 50 million dollars worth of road projects throughout the State of Illinois that we're going to lose because that money is going to have to be earmarked for 51, and the rest of us are going to lose road projects when they've already got 20 million dollars set aside."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I move the previous question."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate. This is within the authorization Governor's bonding authority for transportation bonds. This is not a new authorization. The second thing is, Winchester's talking about ten million dollars of federal funds; we won't know until after October whether that's ever going to be available. Now, I repeat, the Governor vetoed...Both Houses overrode his veto of million dollars. He didn't spend a dime. I'm not saying he's going to spend this money, but I think the people in the central Corridor of Illinois ought to know that that money's available for the Governor if he wants to be a of his word. And I urge your support."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, Shall... Representative Giorgi requests Roll Call. a You*re by Representatives Van Duyne, Hanahan, Christensen Preston. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #15 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Collins to explain his vote."

115th Legislative Day

Slape?"

May 25, 1982

- Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously I rise to oppose this But I'd like to point out that the Gentleman I Amendment. believe said that this money could be spent south of Interstate I-80 or I mean Interstate 80. Now. by the Amendment itself, I suggest he read his own Amendment. Τż says only south to Interstate 80. So apparently the money could not be spent anywhere except where he would desire it to be spent. So I hope that these people in Decatur and others that thought it might be spent in their district would not be misled. The Amendment is obviously Ogle County and south to Interstate 80."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Tate to explain his vote.

 Representative...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
 who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative
 Collins? Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification." Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 79 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'nav'-Representative Collins requests verification of the affirmative vote. Hang on. Just on. Mr. Clerk? Add Representative McAuliffe who wishes to be recorded as voting 'no', Representative Davis who wishes to be recorded as voting 'no', Representative Satterthwaite Rho wishes...Mr. Clerk, Representative Satterthwaite wishes to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. What? All right. Proceed. Mr. Clerk. Representative... Representative
- Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, can I have leave to be verified,
 please?"
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Collins, Representatives Slape and Jaffe request leave to be verified. Representative Collins, leave, Jaffe and Slape to be verified, and Braun, especially. Fine. And Stewart. Leave? Leave granted. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

115th Legislative Day

Stewart.

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Affirmative: Alexander. Balanoff. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Beatty. Bullock. Capparelli.

Carey. Chapman. Christensen. Currie. Deuster..." Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk? Hold on one second. Hang on. Jack? Clerk. Hold on. Okay. Mr. Clerk, before we...Mr. Clerk? Representative Macdonald 'no'. Representative Peters. 'no'. Representative Jake Wolf, 'no'. Proceed." Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative: Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Dovle-Ebbesen. Farley. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallock. Hanahan. Henry. Hoxsev. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Jim Dick Kelly. Koehler. Kornowicz. Kellev. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Levin. Madigan. Loftus. Matijevich. Mautino. McGrew. McPike. R. J. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. Olson. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Rhem. Richmond. Rigney. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith.

Speaker Peters: "Representative...Did we conclude, Mr. Alright. Now, hold on. Hold on. We'll get around to everybody here. Where ... Where are we at. Mr. Clerk? Alright. Representative Oblinger wishes to be recorded 'no'. Changed from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Giglio wishes to be recorded as voting "aye". That s a new vote. Representative Ozella wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Zwick?"

Swanstrom.

Terzich.

Zwick: "You change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Stuffle.

Shite. Younge. Yourell. And, Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Wishes to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. The count, Mr. Clerk? The count, Representative Collins, is 82 in the affirmative, 79 in the negative. Proceed." Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bullock."

Steczo-

Vitek.

Turner.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock? Is the Gentleman in the

chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Collins: "Capparelli."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Capparelli? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Collins: "Domico."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Domico? How's the Gentl...Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Collins: "Kane."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

Collins: "Katz."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Katz? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him and restore Representative Bullock to the Affirmative Roll. Restore Representative Katz to the Affirmative Roll. Proceed, Sir."

Collins: "Levin."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "McGrew."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew? Is the Gentleman in the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "McPike."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Collins: "Roland Meyer."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Roland Meyer? Is the Gentleman

in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Pechous."

Speaker Peters: "Pechous, is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Restore
Representative Levin."

Collins: "Saltsman."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Saltsman? No."

Collins: "No, he wasn't."

Speaker Peters: "No. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "White."

Speaker Peters: "White. Representative White, is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Hallock."

Speaker Peters: "Hallock? Representative Hallock? The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Collins: "Beatty."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Beatty. The Gentleman is in the chamber."

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

Collins: "Christensen."

Speaker Peters: "Christensen, is the Gentleman in the chamber?

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

Collins: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Lechowicz?"

Collins: "Here he comes."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in the chamber as always."

Collins: "I see him. Jaffe."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe received permission to be verified."

Collins: "Oh, yes, he's been verified. I'm sorry. Jackson."

Speaker Peters: "Jackson's in the chamber."

Collins: "No further questions."

Speaker Peters: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 73 'aye', 79 'nos', and Amendment #15 is lost.

Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #16, Mautino..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino, Amendment #16."."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #16 is a very unique Amendment and it will be one of many. This Amendment does not add any money to the appropriation process. But I believe, after sitting on the Appropriations Committee for quite a few years, and now, not serving on it, but having the opportunity to take one of the other Member's place, I once again that line item 1245, which contractual service item for professional and artistic contracts has once again gone up in almost all departments. What I have done with Amendment #16 is to reduce the contractual service line item in this Bill. Basically what does is reduce by is 28 thousand from central

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

administration and 50 thousand from the information processing contractual service line items. Basically these funds, I believe, were to be used from the Road Fund, so therefore; what we're doing is putting this money back Road Fund and reducing the contractual service line If, in fact, anyone in this House is looking for item. area where we can put to much better use 61 million dollars overall for all departments, the government you can do it by starting with this first Amendment which will appear on many of the appropriation Bills that will be appearing before us on Second Reading. Ι ask for an affirmative vote. If, in fact, you're truly interested in cutting governmental costs and putting them into the areas General Revenue Fund for, let us say, education, Human Services, or whatever."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "Indicates he will."

Winchester: "Well, Representative Mautino, as you know, I have the greatest of respect for you, and if, by some miracle, your side of the aisle gets control of the House, I would hope that you would be the Speaker. But I can't help but think that you've got some ulterior motive in offering this Amendment. Is it because you dislike somebody who has a contract in the central offices and maybe someone who has a contract in informational processing division? Is that why you're offering this Amendment?"

Mautino: "Mr. Winchester, I thank you for your most kind and thoughtful remarks. I have no personal problem with anyone who has these contracts. Anyone who has served in the Appropriations Committee has known over the years that I have opposed this process, when departments come in with the...for example, no definite line item for contractual

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

services. It seems to me that that area of government has been increasing over the last six or eight years under both Governor Walker and Governor Thompson. I don't know who has these contracts. But I do know that line item 1245 from the Comptroller's Office lists about 61 million dollars in contractual services, professional and artistic, that we authorized here, in the General Assembly. If, in fact, you're really looking for areas to cut fat and waste, this is the area in which you should be doing it."

- Winchester: "But why the figures of 28 thousand and 50 thousand if we're talking about 60 million? I don't understand how you come up with the specific numbers of 28 thousand and 50 thousand. Why not more or less?"
- Mautino: "Well, there will be more. These...These Amendments are going to appear on ..on many Bills, and you'll have the opportunity to vote on it at least ten or twelve times. The Department of Corrections, the Department of Revenue, Department of Transportation; and I think we're going to bring this to the forefront. It's about time someone had better realize how much we're spending on contractual services in the area of professional and artistic..."
- Winchester: "And this is Road Fund money and not General Revenue Fund money? We're not putting more money back into General Revenue; you're just leaving money in the Road Fund. Is that correct?"
- Mautino: "That's right. These are the funds that were listed under their budgetary request, the Appropriation Department, under line items and that's why we're addressing those..."
- Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Amendment, I'm sure that the distinguished Representative probably has some good intentions, but there appears to be some ulterior motives behind it. But maybe not. But both staffs,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Republican and Democrats, have worked very hard on the Transportation Bill as it was passed out of the Appropriations Committee, and at no time did they ever recommend that there be any additional dollars taken out of contractual services or taken out of information processing division or whatever. I think that we ought to reject this Amendment and let the Bill go out as the two appropriation staffs have recommended it to ..to the full Committee and we're now recommending it to the full House. So I would ask that we defeat Amendment #16."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, move the previous question."

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

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker. In closing I would like to make mention for the record that there is no alternative motive for this Amendment. Basically as a downstater, I want to see the funds returned back to the Road Fund. the dispersion of those funds into other areas I think should be stopped as was presented originally Representative Rigney's Amendment. And what I'm saying with this, if you really want to do some cutting, this area that you should start. I'm giving everyone the opportunity. This does not increase any appropriations. money back from whence it came into the Road Fund, and I think it's a step in the right direction. is nothing new for anyone who has served with me on the Appropriations Committee. It's something that advocated for quite some time. And I believe that those funds could be better utilized back where they belong. I move for an affirmative vote."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2195...'...Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "I move for the acceptance of Amendment 16 to House Bill 2195."

Speaker Peters: "The question...The question is, 'Shall Amendment #16 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor...Roll Call vote, Sir? The Gentleman's joined by five Members? One, two, three, four, five. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #16 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have guestioned the Sponsor of the Amendment in debate. I didn't have the opportunity. As far as I read the Amendment, and the Amendment in objective might be laudible, the problem with the Amendment is that after Mr. Mautino deletes the money in the lines he's talking about, he never puts it back into the Road Fund. And the Amendment is defective on its face for the purpose he suggests. For that reason, I would suggest a 'no' vote until we have a proper Amendment before us that does what he really wants to do."

Speaker Peters: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 102 voting 'aye', 58 voting 'nay'. Amendment #16 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #17, Preston..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston, Amendment #17."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #17 to House Bill 2195 appropriates seven million dollars from the Road Fund for the widening and resurfacing of Ridge Avenue in Chicago from Howard Street on the north to Peterson Avenue. This does not represent

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

a single penny of additional funds. This project is right now included in the Department of Transportation's projects for 1983, for Fiscal Year '83. And we just wanted to separate this out so it's clear that this money would be This particular road is, I think without question, in worse condition than any road in the State of Illinois. It is incredible to drive on this...on this particular area being a state highway, the city...and yet being City of Chicago, the City of Chicago has been reluctant to spend money on maintaining this property, State of Illinois for the past 15 years has been reluctant to expend any money to maintain it since within the City of Chicago, and it's been much of a Catch-22 situation. Last year this House passed an appropriation for this which ultimately died in the Senate. this year because of the wisdom of the Department of Transportation, this is included in their budget and represents not so much as one additional penny. I ask for your *aye* vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is...it's my understanding it is not included in the Governor's road program. Gentleman is correct there. But if we add seven dollars that's just going to be seven million dollars worth road projects that's already in the projected Road Fund that we're not going to be able to fulfill in other areas the state, including the City of Chicago, the collar counties and all of downstate. So, what we're doing is perhaps helping the Gentleman with an importance in his district, but it's not considered a priority item by the Department of Transportation, yet. But it will cost the rest of us to lose valuable road projects that are already designated for construction and

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

this seven million dollars just won't allow them all to be completed. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Barr."

Barr: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm a Cosponsor of this Amendment. I would just like to assure Representative Vinson and any others who are concerned that I hereby promise that if this Amendment is adopted, I will vote for the Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "I'm persuaded by my County Chairman. I urge all Republicans to vote "aye" on this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think one of the previous speakers earlier was in...a bit confused. This is right now in the Department of Transportations" fiscal year *83 program. This is not additional money whatsoever. With...Frankly, with or without this Amendment, it is designated for this purpose in the exact..exact amount for the exact purpose. So this doesn't add one penny, nor does it detract a penny from any other program whatsoever. So I, please, ask for your *aye* vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #17 to House Bill 2195 pass? . Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Peters, 'aye'. Oh. 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'. Amendment #17 is what we're voting on. Correct the record. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? wish? Take the record. Clerk. On this question there are 68 voting 'ave', 90 voting 'nay'. Amendment #17 is lost. Further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "John Dunn? Representative John Dunn? Read the Amendment, Mr....Did we do that? Representative Dunn, John."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, John Dunn - Mulcahey..."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this Amendment is to provide you with an opportunity to do something about highway maintenance and potholes. This Amendment would restore the maintenance positions in the DOT Department for highway maintainers to the level it was in 1981. The...This...yes, this...At the present time we have 366 fewer highway maintainers than we did just a couple of years ago. potholes are worse. We had a terribly difficult winter. We need these people on board to fix and maintain highways. Now you might say, 'Well, that's nice, but where are we going to find the money to add people to the payroll?'. Well, we've taken care of that also. This Amendment would transfer four million two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars inside the Road Fund equipment line items for cars and trucks to the personal services line item in the appropriation for the service requirement of these highway maintainers. time like this, when we need people on the road to fix potholes, certainly we can do with a little .. a smaller number of new equipment, cars and trucks, for just one year to provide the personnel to do the jobs on the highways. Sales are off in Detroit. The reason is we are all driving our cars longer; we're getting more miles out of them. The State of Illinois ought to be able to do the same. All the state has to do is do what we do, and they will have enough money to provide for the employment of these new highway I would urge a favorable vote on Amendment maintainers. I'll be happy to try and answer any questions. would like a Roll Call."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Winchester."
Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To comment to the Bill,
this is a Bill (sic, Amendment) that I would like to

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

support because it does add two hundred and seven highway maintainer positions. And I know Representative McCormick and I would be able to get our fair share in Southern Illinois. But still, you know, I've got to look at the practicalities of the issue here, and what Representative Dunn wants to do is take funding away from the new cars and truck purchases line item and when he does that it's going to cause the loss of one hundred and forty-one new snow plows that have already been ordered and the old are...have some eighty thousand miles plus on them, and are falling apart. And if we don't have the equipment for our existing highway maintainers to take care of the roads, what good is it going to do to add new maintainers with not...with the lack of equipment to do the proper job? I don't know the purpose of the Gentleman's Amendment, is some hidden ulterior motive for offering it, I'm sure, other than providing two hundred and seven maintainer positions that could be used by the Republican for patronage. party So, just on that flag alone, we should all be careful. But the main point is is that this would result in the loss of a hundred and forty-one snow plows that we so desperately need for the existing highway maintainers to use in the necessary work that they have to do on our state highways. And I would ask for a 1 no vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Matijevich."
Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, there's really no ulterior motive for this
Amendment. All this Amendment is trying to do is trying to
make the administration, if you will, live up to the
commitment of maintaining our highways and roads. If
you'll look at the maintenance positions as of June 1977
fiscal year, there were two thousand nine hundred and

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

ninety-eight and FY '83, end of year, their objective, based on the budget would be a two thousand six hundred and seventy-seven, in other words, in six fiscal years going backwards to that amount. Now, the Sponsor of Amendment, therefore, is saying that on the one hand vou cannot say that we're going to place a greater emphasis on maintaining our roads, on taking care of the potholes, taking care of the damage to our..our roads, and then on the other hand, very severely crippling that part agency's appropriation. I don't see anything in the agency's appropriation getting rid of those people who are planning for a road program that we don't have. Instead we're getting rid of, if you will, the low level employee that is doing the job and can do the job of maintaining our I've long been an advocate of trying to keep up highways. and maintain the highways that we have. The Governor, T think, knows that that's a popular political stance to have. But he's just making the stance and not backing in his own appropriation Bill of the Department of Transportation. So, I think it is a very responsible Amendment. Ιf you really believe in fixing highways, I think you ought to be prepared to support this I commend Representative Dunn for offering it, and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, Representative John Dunn to close."

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There were comments made that if we adopt this Amendment we may not be able to buy snow plows. Well, I would direct the Membership to the fact that we are now in the month of May and the months of June, July and August are to follow. We don't need snow plows in May, June, July and August. And if we don't maintain the roads and fix the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

potholes, by next November and December and January we won't be able to find any new snow plows when they fall into the potholes. We've got to address ourselves to this problem. We've got to take care of the problem. And the Gentleman who said he suspects an ulterior motive is only repeating a matter that was brought uр in Appropriations Committee. Some of the Members on the other side of the aisle expressed concern about our offering this Amendment when we know, we know as a fact, a matter of fact, that we will not be able to put any of these people on the payroll. But we want the potholes fixed. We don't care who they are. We want them out there on the roads and the highways; we want them doing this maintenance work; to show the voters of the State of Illinois that we have a sincere commitment to highway maintenance and fixing potholes in this state. And we have offered a responsible Amendment, as the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriations Committee has indicated. The Amendment is a transfer. There is no new money involved. All the Amendment asks you to do is to support an Amendment that would provide for a delay in the purchase of new equipment, to make funds available to maintain our highways in the State of Illinois. We had, as of June of 1980, three thousand thirty positions in the State of Illinois for highway maintenance. As of February 28 of this year, we had two thousand eight hundred and four positions for highway maintenance. As of the end of the next budget year that we are talking about now, we will be down to two hundred...two thousand six hundred and seventy-seven highway maintainers, three hundred and sixty-six fewer people, a 12 percent reduction in personnel, for this purpose. I ask you, if we leave the budget alone, are we meeting our commitment? Can we look the people in the eye back home and tell them that

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

we're for fixing potholes? We cannot if we support a reduction in staff in this category. If, however, we support this Amendment, we can say that we're going to add two hundred and seven people onto the payroll this summer to get at the business of fixing these potholes and maintaining our highways and move ahead with the business of the State of Illinois. Respectfully request an 'aye' vote and I again request a Roll Call vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #18 to House

Bill 2195 be adopted?". Those in favor will signify by

voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'.

Representative Daniels to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, the previous Gentleman expressed to us, *how can we go home and look at our people in the eye talk to them about highways and jobs. Well, I suggest to you that the very nature of this Amendment destroys the operation of government on a carefully balanced budget that have right now. Four million dollars, four million dollars this Gentleman is talking about taking from one area, giving to another. He talks of one minute about potholes; he talks in another minute about adding patronage jobs, which this Gentleman is sponsoring, and look at the Sponsors of the Amendment. Representative Brummer, you're on this Amendment as sponsoring and favoring patronage over the repair of highways. And yes, some of Gentlemen up there like Representative Bowman supported this Bill in Committee and supports the Amendment These Gentlemen are people that are against the reduction of patronage level in government today. When the Governor has balanced this budget carefully and he is going to fill the potholes right now, fill them with existing staff, and yet you want to add four million. But what

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

happens if the new cars and trucks and snowplows break down? Where are you going to take if from, Gentlemen? Education? Sure, you're going to stand up pretty soon and talk about our education budget. Let's look at the level of government that we want to support. Let's keep the level and the maintenance crew where it belongs right now and not add them."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we required to sit here and listen to a political speech from the Gentleman from DuPage constantly?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes. Representative Jones. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to urge some more red lights up there. Ιt seems ludicrous to me additional patronage employees. can't T understand. These are the same Gentlemen who was to putting on revenue collection officers and auditors which would bring dollars into the state, and now he wants to put on patronage employees onto the Highway Department and take away the money for the trucks, which haul the asphalt, the paving materials. And if these...this equipment breaks down, you're going to have a lot of employees sitting around with nothing to do except drawing their paychecks because we don't have the equipment to get the job done. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McAuliffe to explain his vote."

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just for one moment. I would just

like to look into the future. Possibly eight years from

now and the same situation was prevailing and maybe twelve

years from now when the Governor's name was Ronan, I wonder

if Governor Ronan would wonder where the money was coming

from if he was in a tight re-election race, or would he

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

just hire the people? Then, if he lost the election, let the other guy worry about it in November. This is typical of Republicans. We ought to be voting for this Bill. I'll support the administration. If we ought to be voting for this...If you think back to that Governor in New Jersey who lost by 89 votes, wouldn't he like to have ...had two hundred and eighty extra people put on the payroll in the six months before the election? I venture to say if he did, he would have been a winner. But the Republicans are usually short-sighted when it comes to patronage and that's why we usually end up on the short end of the vote count."

Speaker Peters: "Representative...Representative Brunner."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my 'yes' vote and just to point out that shiny new cars and trucks don't repair potholes.

People with shovels in their hands do. We need more of them out there to repair those potholes, and that's why everyone should be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Actually this is a point of personal privilege because my name was mentioned in debate. I am shocked at the speakers on the other side of the aisle because I have sat here for several weeks and heard that Republicans don't know how to use patronage, that there is no patronage the present state administration. And I am shocked to find out now that there is patronage in the Department of Transportation. Could it be? I'm not supporting this particular proposal because of any particular jobs that it might provide. In fact, when I voted for this I taken the Republicans arguments at face value that there is patronage in this particular administration. And so. I had no fear that I would be giving the Governor any patronage jobs. I'm very concerned about the state of our highways and Ridge Avenue. Some Representatives from the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

other side of the aisle were supporting patching the potholes on Ridge Avenue in our district. This is..seems to me, truly an issue that cuts across district lines. It is a good government vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, I would like to clarify for the Members that this is a transfer. There is no new money added by this Amendment. This is a transfer and the transfer involves a transfer from the equipment line to delay the purchase of new cars and trucks, to provide the money for these two hundred and seven positions in the Highway Department, none of whom we feel, of course, will be employed by Democrats. But nevertheless, we want the potholes fixed. Let them all be Republican. All those people who say the Republicans aren't fit to fix potholes are wrong. We think they're fit to fix potholes. Let's put this Amendment on the..on the board and let them try."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm rather shocked at some of the statements the other side has made. I'm shocked because they can't even recognize as well as the tire companies that when summer comes, winter can't be far behind. You're going to need those snow plows to clean off the roads. We're coming winter shortly and we need those..those snow plows to clean the roads. We need to be able to put out as many contracts as we can to patch the highways in the state. This Amendment would defeat that intention. It would slow down our ability to resurface the roads. substantially delete our ability to deal with the highway crisis in the state in a comprehensive fashion, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill (sic, Amendment)."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins to explain his vote."

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

Robbins: "I've been County Chairman now about ten years, and I just want to know the meaning of that word, 'patronage'.

And secondly, I would like, also, to thank all of these people that are so interested in filling potholes that would not vote to provide a little increase in the gasoline tax so that they would have the money to do it. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huskey to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
we're wasting a lot of time here because I find in my
district the only thing I have to do to fill a pothole is
to call the Department of Transportation and within 24
hours they have a truck out and the pothole's full. I
think if you would try using that system rather than this
system here you might have better luck. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino to explain his vote."

- Mautino: "To correct the record, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Previous speakers mentioned the fact that snow plows would be under this provision. Specifically line item 22 is very specific for equipment and it's a purchase of cars and trucks. It says nothing about snow plows. Snow plows could not be covered under this specific line item, and I think that basically misinformation was given by one of the previous speakers on that question."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 77 voting 'aye', 85 voting 'nay'. This Amendment failed...Representative Dunn. Is it alright? It's alright."
- Dunn, John: "It's okay. We've got a record. That's all we need."
- Speaker Peters: "Okay. Has..On this question there are 77 voting

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

'aye', 85 voting 'nay'. Amendment #18 fails. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19, Fawell ... "

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell."

Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker. I originally was planning on withdrawing this Amendment until my colleague got another thirty-eight million dollars added to the budget..added to the nineteen and a half million dollars in the cigarette tax that we got the other day that grand total of seventy...fifty-seven million dollars that have been added to the Transportation Act. What Ι would like to do is get this Amendment passed. Ιf those Amendments do not stay on the Bill, or if the Bill fails, I would be willing to withdraw anything like this over in the Senate. But this road was originally promised to the 1968 and they were promised that it County of DuPage in Right now, we have five would be completed by 1969. hundred and thirty-eight acres taken off of our tax rolls. a lot of it dating back to 1968. A lot of us feel could get one decent road going north and south in the county and the Highway Department would quit playing around with widening 83 and widening 53, which is not going to accomplish that much, we would be content then. I feel this road was promised us since 1968. I think DuPage entitled to it. This has the backing of the entire County Board through a Resolution, plus the Mayors and Conference in DuPage County. As long as the money has been in by the use of Sam Vinson's Bill, plus my colleague, Mr. Rigney's Amendment, I would ask for a 'yes' Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "I have some questions, Mr. Speaker. May I ask them of the Sponsor?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Peters: "The Lady indicates she'll respond."

Schneider: "Bev, last year you had House Resolution, I think, 45

to explore the possibilities of this becoming a tollway.

How is that study going?"

Fawell: "My understanding, Glen, is that because of the high interest rates with the bonds, we were...It doesn't look too good right now."

Schneider: "Well, how would that change your proposal here? The high interest rates are there whether it's a tollway or a highway, isn't it?"

Fawell: "No, Sir. We're talking about appropriating the money.

We're not talking about bond issues here. We're talking about the Road Fund."

Schneider: "Oh, General Revenue Fund?"

Pawell: "No, the Road Fund."

Schneider: "Cash though."

Fawell: "The Highway Fund."

Schneider: "Ten million dollars will build us what at this rate?

This is PAP 431..."

Fawell: "It would build it from Army Trail Boad down to 55. fact, it really would not take that much, I don't think." Schneider: "Well, I want to ... I have some numbers from the Illinois Department of Transportation. The cost of a highway from Decatur to Rockford is three hundred and fifty million dollars. The cost of the eighteen mile highway that you're talking of from Army Trail to I-55, which is eighteen miles, comes in, according to the Department, at two hundred and minety million dollars or about sixteen million dollars a mile because of a couple of things. One is the high cost of urban property. Secondly, that property includes purchasing homes and businesses. think the real figure of this will develop into two hundred

and ninety million dollars, and keep in mind that that

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

compared to the highway from Decatur to Rockford is three hundred and fifty. You can almost build a road across the Our problem in DuPage is that it's very expensive state. land. And you're not going to build anything with ten million bucks. You might be able to get away with a little of a cloverleaf at Army Trail and 53. That might get you something for ten million bucks, but the opposition I have to this is not only the money, which is not there, but as Sam Vinson and Birkinbine like to tell me, and certainly Representative Hudson is against this Amendment, ten million bucks is a lot of dough and I think we ought to be opposed to it. But don't forget, the program is not changed yet on the 'Arboretum' and it's still has not changed on the proximity to homes that were built along that right-of-way. So, I think you ought to take a look at the numbers. I think the Members ought to vote 'no'. 1 after all, the Governor's budget is sacrosanct. ought to protect it against the invasion of the Motor Fuel and certainly ten million bucks will build us a couple of schools and it certainly won't hurt I encourage you to vote 'no' on this Amendment." Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the Lady, Representative Pawell, to close."

Fawell: "Glen, I'm certainly glad to hear that you're going to support the Governor's budget. What you do not take into account is that, as I said, five hundred and thirty-eight acres of this land has already been purchased and has been off the tax rolls since 1968. We have a great deal of this land already bought. As far as Morton Arboretum concerned, I wish you would take a look at the aerial photographs of where this road is coming through. is coming through east of Findley ... just west of Findley Road. It has swung around east, way east, of Morton 'Arboretum'

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

for the simple reason that Morton Arboretum ten years ago went to Washington and asked specifically for it to be swung east. I live within blocks of Morton Arboretum, as you well know. There is no way it's going to touch Morton Arboretum."

Schneider: "It's a dialogue. It's an exchange."

Pawell: "And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Schneider: "Bell, she wasn't closing. She was responding. And

I'm responding to that..."

Speaker Peters: "Bell, I think she..."

Schneider: "She's part of the ..."

Speaker Peters: "I think she closed. The guestion is, shall Amendment #19 to House Bill 2195 be adopted?". Those in favor will signify by voting "aye", those opposed by voting "no". Representative Wolf, Peters "aye". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 10 voting "aye", 145 voting "nay". This Amendment fails. Amendment #19 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20, Johnson..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Johnson, Amendment #20."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not noted for intelligence in some areas, but I can count. And, accordingly, I'd ask for leave to withdrawn Amendment #20."

Speaker Peters: "#20 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Vinson, what purpose do you seek recognition? House Bill 2196, out of the record. House Bill 2199, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2199, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Office of the Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendments #1, Schneider ... "

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider, Amendment #1."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Back to the budget now, this is not going to do you any damage. This is in the Governor's bud...is not Governor's budget, but it's a very simple Amendment. Not too long ago, the Governor Office opened a section within his Office which allowed for the Hispanics to have a hotline...or rather to have...yeah, a hotline to connect the Governor and the Hispanics throughout the State of Illinois. That number, however, was a 793 number. are at the...in the Governor's Office under this line item, approximately three employees and five...five telephones. With a 793 number, the number of calls per day in Hispanics find that they have a need to contact the Governor's Office, there are about 10 phone calls. this Amendment does is to introduce before you and into the Governor's Office a li...a item within the Governor's budget that provides, for 3,000 dollars. 800 It's an 800 number. When I contacted Andy Martines, who is head of the Governor's Hispanic affairs, he said that...before he knew that I knew the number, he said he thought perhaps the reason they did not have an 800 number was that it was too expensive. Now, if you're going have a hotline, it ought to be an 800 number. The cost is 3,000 dollars. If you're going to put those people in office to work, you ought to put them to work so that

people are picking up the phone and answering the concerns

Haukegan, or, let's say, Addison, this is a good service.

The average call from Aurora to Chicago for a Hispanic to

have a district like Aurora, or

Hispanics. If you

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

have his or her needs responded to is about a dollar. Ιf the unemployment rate continues at least at the rate that it is in Aurora, not many people, much less Hispanics, going to have a dollar to make that phone call. So, what I have asked you to add to the Governor's budget is something that will help him in the fall. McAuliffe may be right, that the Governor doesn't even know how to use patronage. He should know how to use services. And so, this is a very legitimate service. It's only really about 2,600 dollars. I put in 3,000 dollars to connect with the unemployment As it goes up, so will the phone calls. And so, I think we can afford 3,000 dollars. I ask your support of the Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Schneider, is...is this a unique service to Hispanics, or do we have the same service available to Lithuanians and Estonians and various other minorities?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "I don't make any judgements about the distinctions the Governor draws in establishing hotlines. All I know is that, as I look at what are his priorities based on what he thinks are groups that are left outside the circle of the mainstream of America; if he thinks that group has an extraordinary need, that's probably why he established the service. But, let's not make it a bogus service. Let's make it a real service. Let's have a hotline functions and, for a few dollars, you can do that. And I think we render a valuable service in that respect."

Johnson: "Why...Why can't we simply allow people taking advantage of this service, whatever its merits are, to place a call, like anybody else would, to a governmental entity?"

Schneider: "Tim, I can't...again, I can't respond to why the Governor made that choice."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Johnson: "No, I'm asking why should you have a ... "

Schneider: "I think what you ought to do is talk to the Governor and ask him, if you're unhappy, that you don't make the distinction among Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Polish people, German people and so on. If you can't make those distinctions, then he ought to withdraw that as a service.

But, I think that would be a cruel service, a cruel idea."

Johnson: "My...My...My question was, what this Amendment would do

is to allow for a toll free line. Is that right?"
Schneider: "Right."

Johnson: "Well, my question was, if the Governor has made a value judgement there ought to be a special line, for whatever reason, why...why does it have to be toll free. Why can't the individuals who avail themselves of it, make a call like anyone else would?"

Schneider: "Because, it then not...does not become a service. because it's very difficult for persons who are on the lower economic part of the scale to make those kinds αf economic sacrifices. A one dollar call from Aurora complaining about improper treatment in a bait and switch situation, let's say, at a furniture store, becomes a problem for a family of that nature. Don't forget, all of us came as immigrants, and I'm not a Wop, but the immigrant movement has brought Hispanics into our society at the lower scale, as most of the Hispanics. We've looked to government to remedy some of our problems. We've looked to government, perhaps, to give us all an equal start. It 1s one of these small services that makes that possible. The Governor made the judgement. I think it's a judgement. I think you ought to, however, make it possible for all of those individuals to contact that office. can't have three people on fives lines for ten calls a day. 800 With an number, it becomes more rational

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

serviceable."

Johnson: "Well, I don't want...I don't want to belabor the question, but I think the service that the Governor's Office is providing, which I question the value of, is a special recipient for a special people calling. My question is, I quess you're assuming, by this Amendment, that...that all the individuals who would use this line are low income and underprivileged. I suppose there are some statistical validity to that, but I'm also sure there is a good many Hispanic-Americans who, or other people, who would use this line who aren't of that classification. Do you have some kind of statistics on the economic need?"

Schneider: "Hi."

Johnson: "No, you don't have. Right?"

Schneider: "I can't...Tim, I can't...I'd be glad to talk with anybody about that if I had, you know, thought that there would be an extended debate on the nature of the lower part of the economic scale of America."

Johnson: "Okay. No, I just..."

Schneider: "You're asking for statistics about people at an economic station I'm not familiar with, and I won't mis...misrepresent anybody's position on that."

Johnson: "Okay. Thank you."

Schneider: "So, I can't give you that answer."

Johnson: "That's all right. Thanks."

Schneider: "As usual, I'll be glad to provide it later, if you're interested."

Johnson: "Okay."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf, J. J."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would concur with the remarks of the Gentleman from Champaign; however, the Governor has seen fit to put the...a hotline in there, although it is not toll free. This is a 3,000 dollar

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

expense that the Governor does not wish added to his budget. I would suggest that the Sponsor of this Amendment, then, prevail upon the Governor to do it out of his existing dollars within his budget. I'm sure that if it's a very noteworthy cause, he could certainly find 3,000 dollars within it, and I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ted Meyer."

Meyer, Ted: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Meyer, Ted: "Representative Schneider, wouldn't the State of Illinois be paying for out-of-state toll calls, for example, if people from St. Louis or Gary or Milwaukee, who had listened to the ... to the media that is dispensing the information and all the good advice? And wouldn't we be paying for these calls automatically?"

Schneider: "I'd prevail upon the Governor to make sure that it's an in-state number."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich to explain it...

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Chairman...or Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize that, traditionally, we have not, quote, tinkered with Governors' budgets. But, I really don't think this ought to be a partisan matter. A dollar to poor people, sometimes, can make a matter prohibitive, really. It's very difficult for some people to understand, you know, when you're poor, you're poor. And, I think it's service that all of us, really, ought to be for. The Governor needn't worry. I'm sure that if we put this measly 3,000 dollars on his budget, it's not going to go to any Conference Committee. I'm sure the Senate would go along with a measly item like this, and...and that would be the end of it. We're not doing this, and I...you know, I

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

didn't have a part in it. This was Glen Schneider's idea. And I think it's a noble idea. If you're really going to have a service, let's make it an available service for the people who...to whom it is intended. And I would urge the Members, both Republicans and Democrats, you know, we've stomped on minorities. We've stomped on the Hispanics Let's do something that makes some common sense, and let's support this. It'll never come back to House, I'm sure. The Governor needn t worry about that. We're not playing politics with his budget, and I would urge the Members... With his own appropriation, I'd better limit that. We're not playing politics with his appropriation Bill. I can assure you that, and I think this merits your support."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Peters: "Thank God. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, close vote.

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "I certainly want to get my...have my constitutional right on this for a Roll Call before we begin. It is only 3,000 dollars. And Matijevich's right, it's not a reason of play...you know, you're playing with the Governor's budget, you'd be talking about taking the caviar out of the mansion. We're not talking about that. We're just talking about a judgement by the Governor to say we need a hotline. We talking about a judgement that says that people in need of that service are probably low income, and it's designed to address the needs of people who are Hispanic, you're from Waukegan, Aurora, Joliet, Addison and so on. Chicago certainly has the largest population. We need that line for...to render those kinds of services. The Speaker has a

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

hotline, if you have a call to him. So, there's no reason why we should have any trouble with adding 3,000 dollars to the budget of the Governor for this purpose. And I would encourage you to vote 'aye' on a Roll Call vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Absolutely. Representative Schneider, the Chair feels impelled to indicate that the Constitution clearly provide that five Members are entitled. So, you, singularly, have...do not have that constitutional right. If you're joined by five Members, of whom I see, to this point, one, Representative Getty. All right. Now there's Right. And the operative word is 'may', 'may'. doesn't say 'shall', 'may'. However, we will...we then it says 'may' after the five. will...and But we'll...we'll figure out what all that means later. question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 2199 be adopted?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'ave'. those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 78 voting 'aye', 76 voting Gentleman asks a Poll of the Absentees to which he is entitled, by our rules, singularly."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Braun. Cullerton. Ewell. Flinn. Garmisa. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Huff. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Laurino. Leverenz. Martire. Murphy. O'Connell. Pechous. Pullen. Reed. Stearney. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Telcser. No further."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich, from 'aye' to 'no'. On this question there are 75 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no'.

 Amendment #1, Representative Schneider, fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Peters: "Third Reading. Representative Daniels in the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2201, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2201, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Schraeder..."

Speaker Daniels: "Bepresentative Schraeder, Amendment #1."

Schraeder: "Withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2203, read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2203, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Revenue. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Matijevich..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #4."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #4 to House Bill 2203 reduces the contractual services and operations of auto line items within the Division of Administration. The breakdown by line item and Fund are, under contractual services, a reduction of 5,400 dollars of GRF monies, 2,800, motor fuel. Under the operation of auto line item 19,700 dollars under GRF funds, a net reduction of 27,900 dollars. The contractual services line item, in many of the Department of Revenue's divisions, has been utilized as a method to provide funds for deficiencies in

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

other line items. This practice allows the Department to circumvent legislative in...intent. And, therein, later use that for transfers within that line item. Although there was not a significant transfer out in this division, it is recommended that this line be reduced by a similar percent, as was transferred - the 17 percent. Department had requested a 28 percent increase for gasoline: however, based upon the Department of Administrative Services' estimates, a four percent increase is allowed. And, therefore, that is why I introduce and offer and move for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 2203."

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Representative J. J. Rolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yeah, we would concur with this Amendment, and urge a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Matijevich..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #5."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 to House Bill 2203 is an Amendment to reduce the appropriation for the Department of Revenue by 199,100 dollars. The staff has researched a...a pattern within the Department, and it has transferred significant amounts of funds from the printing line item. It is felt that the recommended level will eliminate this practice of high transferability, and will not preclude the Division of Administrative Services from providing essential services. This Amendment reduces the printing line item in the General Revenue Fund by 193,300 dollars, and the Motor Fuel

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Tax Fund by 5,800 dollars. I offer and move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Will,
Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I think the ... the Amendment is well meaning, Representative. The distinguished Minority Spokesman is trying, where he can, to cut the budget and live up to his fiscal responsibility. However, there was a lower than ordinary bid this year on tax booklets that are mailed to every resident that pays taxes in the State of Illinois...has them There is no reason to believe that that anomoly will continue to occur, and that that same low bid will come in This amount is in the printing line for the year. eventuality that the bid will be significantly, 15 percent, higher, which is anticipated or can be anticipated through prior negotiations with the number of printing companies. So, I would suggest to you that, if you reduce line, you may have a lot of people not getting tax booklets next year. And I think that's one service that we really should not cut back on. So I would recommend the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "I respect the Gentleman's position, and if this were a one-time case, I...I could tend to agree with him-However, this is a situation that occurs time and time again. According to our...our research and the printing line items as one that has, habitually, been used year in and year out to use as transferability. And I, frankly, believe that it does subvert the appropriations process, and I would ask for your favorable support. I...I know that the tax booklets are going to go out. This, in no

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- way, will hamper that, and I would urge your support."

 Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment

 #5. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed
- #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Amendment #5 fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Leverenz Matijevich..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment... Or, excuse me. Who's on Amendment #6? Representative Matijevich, Amendment #6."
- Matijevich: "Yes, according to our gentlemen's agreement, it's Leverenz, and I'll handle it for him."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."
- Matijevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 to House Bill 2203 is a reduction of ... a net reduction of An expansion of 14 professional and support personnel for the Legal and Investigative Services Division has been attributed to the Tax Enforcement Improvement Program that we've heard so much about. However, the Department was not able to pro...provide sufficient documentation warrant an additional 10 technical to advisors. The recommendation for personal services related line items eliminates funding for the phase-in of these 10 positions, and allows the Division to hire the four clerical positions requested. On this one, I think, I would be joined. I... We feel, after our research, that it is a responsible Amendment and a responsible reduction. this one I would ask, and I'm sure I'll be joined by four additional Members and ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Will,
 Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Hell, once again, Mr. Speaker and Members, I would respectfully disagree with the Minority Spokesman. As painful as the subject may be of auditors and collectors,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

after the recent controversy surrounding that particular function, the truth is that more and more tax improvement or tax collection and...and running down of cheats and those who are not paying their taxes is occurring. that always, inevitably triggers litigation. positions are being put on board to handle the litigation that's going to be involved in trying to resolve the tax disputes, so that the coffers of this state can And if you want to take them away legitimately enriched. and allow an overworked litigation staff to defend the kind of tax...tax incentives and...and to try and prosecute tax cheats and collect that money that can go to education, you would vote for this Amendment. I think it's a Amendment and poorly thought out, and I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Matijevich, to close."

Matijevich: "Only in response to that, if they were so important,

I think the Department should have justified them to our

staff; and then, thereupon, we Members rely so much on the
information that the staff provides us. I don't feel that
they have been justified and, therefore, I would urge the
support of Amendment #6."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by voting *aye*, opposed by voting *no*. The voting*s open."

Matijevich: "Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Yeah. You have it, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 79 'no', 70 voting 'yes'. Amendment #6 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #7, Matijevich..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- Matijevich: "On Amendment #7 to House Bill 2203, this is a next..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me...Excuse me, Representative. For what purpose does Representative Davis rise?"
- Davis: "We accept the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich. Further discussion?

 Being none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment

 #7 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have

 it, and Amendment #7... You were so perfect in your

 presentation. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',

 opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #7 is

 adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Van Duyne..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne, Amendment #8.

 Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I do not see the Gentleman in the chamber.

 I move to table Amendment #7."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #7...#8.

 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 Gentleman's Motion prevails. And, on the Motion, Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."
- McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Mr. Davis' Motion, Mr. Van Duyne had this Amendment, which would have deleted the second highest appropriation for any office in State Government for the Lottery Supervisor."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative McClain. Gentleman,
 Representative Van Duyne is not on the floor, and that's
 the purpose of the Motion. Please limit yourself to that
 Motion."
- McClain: "Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "All right. Gentleman's Motion to table,

 Representative Davis. All those in favor signify by saying

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Mautino..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino, Amendment #9."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #9 to House Bill 2203 basically reduces the contractual service line item Audit and Collections Division by one million dollars. Of that total reduction, 792,000 dollars represent General Revenue Funds and 208,000 represent motor fuel tax dollars. This reduction eliminates the proposed contract with a private collection agency. This contract, which proposed as a component of the Tax Enforcement Improvement Program, that was passed by this House about two weeks with a supplemental appropriation, will be utilized to collect small delinquent accounts. It is felt that those employees that we put in the Department of Revenue and the additional 3,200 personnel that is in those divisions should and can handle this in-house work. It seems to me that the duties of the auditors and collectors Department of Revenue is to audit and collect, as presented by the legislation approximately two weeks ago that passed out of this House, went through the Senate and was signed by the Governor. This is another of those contractual line item services that I discussed in previous legislation. puts the money back in General Revenue Fund, where it is needed and, of course, back in to the Motor Fuel Tax Fund the roads. Ι think those people working for the Department of Revenue, under the proposed supplemental that we passed out of here and signed by the Governor, should be doing the auditing and collecting. That's their job. Therefore, if you're looking, once more, for an area to cut additional dollars yet get the job done, I have nothing

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

against whoever has those contracts. There's no other alternative motive, but I mentioned I would present these contractual line items for consideration by the Membership in this House, and I certainly think that this million dollars could be spent much better by the employees, who we have to pay anyway, and the contractual line item is not needed, since the appropriation was signed. And, if you want to reduce funds in a Department and not hurt anyone, this is the way to do it."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I... I voted for the Gentleman's Motion on a previous Bill on contractual, and I think he's probably on the right track. However, this is not quite what he would have you believe. This million dollars budgeted and would only be spent on a contingency basis for collection agencies to collect small sums of money that are due to the State of Illinois and to its coffers on a 25 percent basis. Now they...he would argue that there 788 agents, but we certainly can't put them out running around for 40 and 50 and 60 dollar type of claims that collection agency could well, within its purview, do on a contingency basis. It's not only cost effective, it is way to return more dollars to the state treasury that we're not getting because it's not economically feasible to pursue it. And, Mr. Speaker, I want a Boll Call on Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very good Amendment, and I compliment the Sponsor for this Amendment. What this basically does is it relieves the Department of Revenue

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

from private contracting sources, in particular, after they have now hired these new auditors and collectors. The sums are no longer needed. We now have given them the employees they have requested, and funded those legally that employees. This is a...an amount of money that's no longer It replaces three-quarters of it back into the needed. General Revenue Fund and another...about a fourth of it into the Road Fund, which will repave one mile of blacktop. So, for downstaters, I urge an *ave* vote. people that had the good fight on collectors and auditors, this is a very good Amendment and ought to be supported."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. I don't believe anyone in this Assembly can truthfully believe that what they did two weeks ago when they passed a Bill to fund those 788 auditors and collectors. I believe that every Member in this House knows that if you are in the agency to collect and audit sales tax, ROT tax, whatever, that your job. There is no rational. reasonable idea. no rational, reasonable position to say, now, that you must also contract with a private collection agency, as the State of Illinois cannot do the job with 3,200 employees. of which we just funded 788 people last week. I don't buy that, and if any of you have...have the opportunity to work with a collection agency, they get 25 percent of what Why should the State of Illinois and collect. Department of Revenue pay an outside contractual percent to get what they we got coming and what we appropriate for under personal services for the employees of the Department? I stand before you and ask for a 'yes' vote on a reasonable proposal that you can all live with. your heart, you know you can. I ask for an 'aye' vote on Amendment #9 to 2203. Roll Call, please."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #9. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Bock Island, Representative Darrow, to explain his vote. Timer's on"
- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very reasonable Amendment. Most of us who deal with collection agencies from one side or the other realize that they usually send out two or three letters, and then they threaten a lawsuit. I think this can be handled by using State of Illinois stationery and the power of the Attorney General's Office, by saying if they don't pay, the Attorney General will come after them. We have our own attorneys. We have our own staff, and I'm sure that the more conservative Members of the Republican Party on the other side of the aisle would go along with this. All it amounts to, for a collection agency, as I said, is some correspondence and some threats for an attorney. And our Department of Revenue can do that. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "If the 'no' votes on this Amendment prevail, I respectfully request that you poll the absentees and if the 'no' votes prevails, that I verify the 'no' votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Same request on the affirmative, should that be the case."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

 There are 76 'aye', 84 'no', and the Gentleman requests a

 Poll of the Absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Capparelli.

 Cullerton. Ewell. Garmisa. Flinn. Jaffe. Leon.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Leverenz. Martire. Pierce. C. M. Stiehl. Terzich. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Nautino, requests a

Verification of the Negative Roll. Proceed with the

Verification of the Negative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alstat. Barkhausen. Barnes-Barr-Bartulis. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Deuster. Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Favell. Findley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Priedrich. Griffin. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hastert. Hoffman. Grossi. Hoxsey. Huskey. Johnson. Karpiel. Dick Kelly. Hudson. Klemm. Kociolko. Koehler. Kucharski. Kustra. LaHood. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Margalus. Mays. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCormick. McMaster. Ted Meyer. R. J. Meyer. Miller. Neff. Nelson. Oblinger. Olson. Peters. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Sandquist. Harry Smith. Irv Smith. Stanley. E. G. Telcser. Steele. Swanstrom. Tate. Topinka. Tuerk. Vinson. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard and Zwick."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Leon as 'aye'. Questions of the Negative Roll? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "May I have the starting count, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "77 'aye' and 84 'nay'."

Mautino: "Representative Conti."

Speaker Daniels: "You want to get into that?"

Mautino: "No. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Okay. Tate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tate. The Gentleman's here."

Mautino: "Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Mautino, Senator Watson requests leave to be verified. Okay. What was your question, Sir?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS 82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Mautino: "Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Stanley. Right here on my right."

Mautino: "E. G. Steele."

Speaker Daniels: "E. G. Steele. Gentleman in the chambers?

Representative Steele. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barnes. Jane Barnes.

in the chambers? How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove her."

Mautino: "Ewing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing. Gentleman in the

chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as yoting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Bell."

Speaker Daniels: "Bell. He's here."

Mautino: "Bianco."

Speaker Daniels: "Bianco. Representative Bianco. Is the

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Pullen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen. The Lady in the

> chambers? Representative Pullen. How's the Lady

recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove her."

Mautino: "Bower."

Speaker Daniels: "Bower's here."

Mautino: "Rigney."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Rigney. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Harry Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Harry Smith. Harry Smith.

Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Dwight...I'm sorry. I see him come in. Ted Meyer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ted Meyer. Ted Meyer.

Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Ed Kucharski."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kucharski. Is the Gentleman in

the chambers? Kucharski. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no."

Speaker Daniels: "Bemove him."

Mautino: "Kustra."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kustra. Is the Gentleman in the

chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe. He's here."

Mautino: "Mar...Margalus."

Speaker Daniels: "Margalus. He's here."

Mautino: "McBroom."

Speaker Daniels: "McBroom is here."

Mautino: "McMaster."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster. Tom McMaster.

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Neff."

Speaker Daniels: "Return Representative Pullen to the Negative Roll, and Representative Neff is viewing the process from the gallery."

Mautino: "Eartulis."

Speaker Daniels: "Bartulis. He's here."

Mautino: "Barr."

Speaker Daniels: "Who was that?"

Mautino: "Representative Barr."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr is in the back."

Mautino: "Robbins. Oh, I'm sorry. I see Mr. Robbins. Cissy
Stiehl."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stiehl. How's the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as not voting."

Speaker Daniels: "Would you care for her to vote?"

Mautino: "Whatever."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Further questions?"

Mautino: "Yes. Leinenweber."

Speaker Daniels: "Leinenweber. Harry Leinenweber. The Gentleman in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting "no"."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Mautino: "Telcser."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here. The Majority Leader is always here.
...questions? No further questions, Sir?"

Mautino: "We have two Gentlemen that want to get on."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Kelly, 'no'? Record Representative Dick Kelly as 'no'. He's already recorded as 'no'... How is the Gentleman recorded?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "That's how you want to leave it, Sir? Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'."

Mautino: "Craiq Findley."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here. Further questions, Sir? No further questions. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? All right. Wait. Representative Jim Kelley, you wish to be recorded as 'no'? From 'present' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 79 'aye', 73 'no'. The Gentleman, Representative Davis, requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Proceed with the verification."

Davis: "I think, at the suggestion of one of the Assistant
Majority...or Minority Leaders...Majority, freudian slip,
Assistant Minority Leaders, we probably ought to verify
who's here. Representative Schneider."

Speaker Daniels: "Schneider. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Davis: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Kane. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'ave'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified."

Davis: "Absolutely. Bring my list back over, will you?"

Speaker Daniels: "Further questions, Representative Davis?"

Davis: "Yes, Representative Laurino."

Speaker Daniels: "Laurino?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Davis: "Representative Preston."

Speaker Daniels: "Preston. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Daniels: "Domico. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Daniels: "Bullock, He's here."

Davis: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Daniels: "Stuffle. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Daniels: "Pechous. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Daniels: "Krska. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Daniels: "Rea. How's the Gentleman recorded? Rea is

here."

Davis: "Representative White."

Speaker Daniels: "White. He's here."

Davis: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Daniels: "Murphy. Laz Murphy. He's here."

Davis: "Representative Donovan."

Speaker Daniels: "Donovan. He's over here."

Davis: "Representative Breslin."

Speaker Daniels: "Peg Breslin. She's here."

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

Davis: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Daniels: "Katz. Harold Katz. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative...I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. They removed him?"

Speaker Daniels: "Katz was removed."

Davis: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Daniels: "Christensen. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Daniels: "Van Duyne. Van Duyne. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Richmond. Or did I say that?"

Speaker Daniels: "Richmond?"

Davis: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "McGrew. He's here."

Davis: "Representative Sam Wolf"

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

Davis: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Daniels: "Huff."

Davis: "He's there. I see him. Representative Farley."

Speaker Daniels: "Farley. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

115th Legislative Day May 25, 1982

Davis: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Daniels: "Keane. He's here."

Davis: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Daniels: "Ronan. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Davis: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Daniels: "Satterthwaite. How's the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove her."

Davis: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Daniels: "John Dunn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Davis: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Wait a second, Sir."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn is recorded as voting "aye". Remove him."

Davis: "Rep...Do you give up? Rep...We've got a half a dozen more. If they give up and surrender, why... Withdraw the Amendment, Dick. Let's get it over with."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Davis: "...keep going. The white flag is up and waving, Sir. I think they're surrendering. Whoop. Here they all come back. Let's continue. Representative Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Let's see now. Return Representative Stuffle to the Affirmative Roll. Representative Richmond.

All right. Stuffle, returned to the Affirmative Roll.

Return Representative Richmond, Farley and Ronan. That's it. I don't know who you're pointing to. I can't...I can't tell by your point."

Davis: "I think they're up to 36 now. We'll keep going. You want to end all this, Dick? Representative Capparelli. Capparelli. That's it. That's all, Sir."

115th Legislative Day

- May 25, 1982
- Speaker Daniels: "On this question, there are 67 "aye" and 73 'no", and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2205, read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2205, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #3 and 4...1, 3 and 4?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #4 by Representative
 Braun."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun, on the Amendment to table...a Motion to table Amendment #4."
- Braun: "I move to table Amendment #4, and defer to Representative

 Kustra with regard to Amendment #6."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #4. Is there any discussion"? Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Well, just...just indicate that the Lady's Motion is in order. A subsequent Amendment, Amendment #6, is going to be offered by Representative Kustra."
- Speaker Daniels: "Lady moves to table Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is tabled. Further Notions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Matijevich..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #5."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Members of the House, #5 is purely a technical mend...Amendment. It changes the word 'perfonce', whatever that means, to the correct word

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- 'performance'. I move for the adoption."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no". The 'ayes' have it, #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Kustra Braun..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kustra, Amendment #6.

 Representative Braun, Amendment #6."
- you, Mr. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Braun: "Thank Speaker. House, Amendment #6 restores the funding to...for Unified Delinquency Intervention Services Program, commonly known as UDIS. The UDIS Program has proved to be the last chance that we have been able to provide to young who have been adjudicated delinquents. It keeps them from going directly to jail, and gives them job training And most of them have straightened up. other placement. Representative Wolf is telling me to speed it up. Τn anv a cost effective program, and I it's would appreciate your support for Amendment #6."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Lady moves for the adoption...Representative Levin, again."
- Levin: "Thank you...Thank you, Mr... Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield? Okay. Okay, I support your Amendment, but I'm very disturbed... I'll wait. I'm very disturbed by my understanding that the Department of Corrections, as of March...May 16th, bas cut off this program without legislative authority. Is that correct?"
- Braun: "I'm not altogether certain, Representative, of the facts pertaining to the phase-down in operations for the UDIS Program. I understand that it was being phased out. Adoption of this Amendment, however, I believe will go a long way toward reactivating and continuing the life of that program during the change over to fiscal years."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Levin: "Now, it's my understand that the cost of incarcerating a kid is 26,000 dollars, whereas the per capita cost into this program is 4,000 dollars, or a difference of 22,000 dollars. And, that there are currently 50 juveniles who would, otherwise, have been eligible for this program who, because the program was clo...closed down early last week, will have to be incarcerated at a cost of about a million dollars. Is that correct?"

Braun: "Representative, again, I'm not altogether familiar with how many youngsters would be necessarily forced into a prison, because it's not necessarily a one-to-one exchange with regard to the clients of UDIS. However, it is likely that, even if only a fifth of those eligible to go to jail were sent there, it would cost in excess of a million dollars."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Levin: "I think we have another example here of a cut that is not cost effective. I cannot understand why the Department of Corrections wants to eliminate the program at all, certainly before June 30th, when there's an opportunity for the Program to be transferred, under this Amendment, to the Department of Children and Family Services. There was a headline in the Sunday Sun Times that the shutting down of this Program early is going to cost about a million dollars, because there are 50 juveniles who would otherwise be eligible for this program. This is not a cost effective on the Governor's part. I can't understand motivation for it. I think this is a good Amendment. think it should be adopted, but I'm appalled by the action of the Department of Corrections in acting early to cut off this program."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Sir. Representative J.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, I wish the Gentleman would address his remarks
to the Amendment, which he apparently supports. We could
get on with the business of the House. We support it,
too."

Speaker Daniels: "You point is well taken. Further discussion?

Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. Further discussion?"

Johnson: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, to close."

Braun: "Appreciate your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #6.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6, adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ploor Amendment #7, Dwight Friedrich..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich, Amendment #7."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2206, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Dangerous Drug Commission. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Reilly ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly, Amendment #3."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 puts in 248,000 dollars in block grant funds for residential services in the Dangerous Drugs Commission. This was money, frankly, that we thought we had restored in the Committee Amendment. It was, inadvertently, left out. I understand, now, that there is agreement on this Amendment, but Representative Matijevich wishes to put into the record some observations on this point. I would hope that the Chair would recognize Representative Matijevich for those observations."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members ο£ the House, we...we've had some meetings, of the Democratic staff and the Republican staff. We still have some problems in...but, I'm going to go along and withdraw my later Amendment. But, first, incorporate some remarks into the Amendment 2 to House Bill 2206 adds 1,300,000 record. dollars in alcohol, drug abuse and mental health funds to the Dangerous Drug Commission's FY'83 Amendments 3 and 4 would make technical changes to the amounts adopted in the House Appropriations Committee. The Democrats support additional funding for community programs to combat drug abuse. And we have no problem with the intent of these Amendments, and I want to make that very clear. However, after our staff has had some time to research the issue of block grant allocations for particular block grant, we think the calculations used to arrive at the final allocation to the Dangerous Drugs Commission may be in error. The federal requirements for federal Fiscal Year *83 allow the state to allocate five percent of its total block grant allocation, at its discretion, with the other 95 percent being allocated according to a formula. This process would allow ... only

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

allow for an additional 375,000 dollars to be added to Dangerous Drugs Commission budget for FY 83. The Sponsor of the Amendments 2, 3, and 4 has interpreted the federal rules regarding this block grant to say that the state can include any unspent monies for FY'82 in the base for Fiscal Year '83, thus included in the base for the five amount for discretionary allocations. This would allow for additional 1,300,000 dollars to be added Commission. The best information that both Democratic Republican staffs have been able to obtain from the feds is that the requirements could be inter...interpreted both ways. None of the officials would give a written opinion as to the correction of either interpretation. So, if the higher amount were...was reallocated from the unspent FY'82 amount and, subsequently, found improper, the state would perhaps be forced to repay about a million dollars. Be feel it important to point out the uncertainty that surrounds this issue, and the possibility that Members who support this Amendment may not actually be adding funds to the drug abuse program. I wanted to insert that in...into the record. Both of us...Both Republicans and Democrats believe strongly in the intent of this to add more funds. for that purpose, in the Commission. But, I did want to incorporate into the record the uncertainty of the Based on that and the fact that we are going allocation. to further try to meet and, hopefully, resolve this issue to make certain that the funds are there and available. I'm going to support this and withdraw my Amendment #5. you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Reilly, moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Reilly ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly, Amendment #4."

Reilly: "I withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Matijevich ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #5."

Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2209, read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Health. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments #1 and 42"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5 failed in Committee. Ploor
Amendment #6, Hallock - Birkinbine..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hallock, Amendment #6."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment #6 seeks to offer 10,000 dollars to the

Department of Public Health for information they currently

publish, booklets on child care. It's very important

information. This Bill would keep that information going

out. I ask for it's support. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed "no". The "ayes" have it, #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, McClain..."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, Amendment #7."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this...Amendment #9 to 2209 would place back into the budget 870,000 dollars for family practice centers downstate Illinois. Those centers are basically in Belleville, Decatur, Quincy, and six other communities downstate Illinois. The problem with the Illinois Department of Public Health's budget, I don't think meaningly did this, is by deleting this sum of money from their annual budget; what happens is these family practice centers in downstate Illinois will either go out of business or will have to cut services drastically. The purpose that SIU ever put into this sort of family practice center was...concept was to get into communities that did not have adequate medical care in downstate Illinois. was the focus of the Illinois Department of Public Health. purpose when we initially funded these It was also a programs. This proposal, which would reinstate 870,000 dollars which reflects last year's appropriation, would place Belleville, Danville, Decatur, Duran, Park, Peoria and Quincy in a position so that they can stay in...in business. I believe this Amendment should be a bipartisan Amendment. It is a good Amendment, and should get the support of both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose Amendment #7.

I do believe that we did restore the money for the scholarships. Unrelated to that...Unrelated to that is this 890,000 dollar addition. I don't guestion the value of the program. The fact is, the state is only providing, in the first place, 15 percent of the total. None of these agencies, to the best of my knowledge — and we have checked

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

carefully — are going to close because of this. It seems to me that this is one area we can cut. We, in effect, have compromised in the overall area of this program. We're going to continue with the scholarships. We're going to cut out the funding for the family practice programs, but that doesn't mean they'll go out of business. They receive considerable other funds. I would ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #7 on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DeKalb,

Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative McClain, the family practice centers, would you describe...or give me a description of a family practice center?"

McClain: "Yes, Mr. Ebbesen. A family practice center is a...is a facility that is aligned with a medical school. And that family practice center is set up in nine communities, mostly in downstate Illinois like I listed previously. Those family practice centers are set up so that they receive people into the center for medical care, not operations or that kind of...for medical...usual medical treatment. Those people have...are targeted in areas where they do not have a good complement of medical clinics or medical physicians, and that's the purpose that SIU placed it."

Ebbesen: "Mr...Right. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment, I would just say this. We're talking about 870,000 dollars.

And I noticed that Representative McClain was drawing upon what was true several years ago. But I think with the...the number of graduates that would...in the various professions — whether it's legal or dentistry or medicine or podiatry or optometry or whatever — the basic thrust of

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

the family practice center was to encourage downstate to get physicians out there in all of the ...all of the various professions. But, in my opinion, based just on the numbers that are graduating, not only just in the State of Illinois but throughout the entire country, there seems to be a surplus. And I think that the whole concept of ... of spending now or appropriating 870,000, whatever that number is, for that purpose; I just think that you are finding these people who will go into these smaller areas and will service these people professionally in all categories. And I think that this Amendment, although it's well-intentioned, but I just think now that the whole picture has changed and this 870,000 dollars. The Amendment ought...ought to be defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, to close."

McClain: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen House. this Amendment should receive bipartisan su...support. I'd like to point out, directed Ebbesen's comments, that the Department of Public Health's 1981 state health plan, still lists 17 entire counties, the 102 that...and parts of eight other counties, that are experiencing severe shortage in physicians. That was purpose that we set up these family practice centers. the Now, to Mr. Reilly's comment in terms of no closures. ₩e We contacted administrators of did a study. all the centers for the South...or for STH. Wе Belleville, Decatur and Quincy and, while there were no specifics, Mr. Robertson, who is the Administrator, stated that closure of those three facilities is a distinct possibility. For Chicago College of Osteopathic Medicine, we talked to Dr. Natkow, N-A-T-K-O-W. The program will not close, but reductions in services to the patients will be

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

For Cook County Hospital, instituted. we called Dr. *Dowling*. There will be staff lay-offs. Now, that means teaching personnel and also residents. And there will service cuts. University of Illinois аŧ Danville, we talked to Dr. 'Tanner'. The Danville program provides medical services to migrant workers. Hoopes... Hoopeston area in Vermillion County. services will have to be eliminated if these funds are not supplemented in this program. This is a very important Amendment. It is not made as a partisan Amendment. It is made for a good Amendment for our state health plan. Ιt was our intention, before we ever set up these family centers. And I urge an 'aye' vote, and I'd ask for a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment All those in favor signify by voting *aye*, opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Would like to dump this Roll Call take it again. You've got a whole row missing in one section of our House. Dump the Roll Call. Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #7. Vote your own switch only. All those in favor signify by voting *aye*, opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this 85 'aye' question there are and 68 'no'. Gentleman's Notion prevails. Amendment #7's adopted. Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Bowman..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #8."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #8 adds 220,000 dollars for the renal dialysis program. Renal dialysis, as you may know, is

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

a...a procedure whereby people suffering from kidney disease ha...are hooked up to machines periodically to have their blood cleansed. It is necessary to sustain life. have a...an Act in Chapter 111 1/2, Section 22.31 and following that mandates the Department of Public Health establish such a program. We've had this in existence for several years. And, according to a memorandum which I have here, written by Byron 'Francis', Chief of Disease Control for the Department of Public Health, and I quote, it says, Based on the same distribution of cost per patient and the same percentage increase, the number of patients for Fiscal '83, as estimated for Fiscal '82, the grant program would cost 1...1,720,000 dollars, which is precisely the amount provided for in this Amendment. That's a 220,000 increase. The Department is changing the program this year. and reason for the difference is that they're planning to...to cut the payment of 20 percent of dialysis cost for facility dialysis completely. And they re planning to cut the payments to about 100 people who are currently on dialysis which, in my opinion, threatens their survival. is why I'm offering this Amendment, and I ask your support for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose Gentleman's Amendment. It's hard to rise Amendments and...and stand in opposition. But the fact is. in this program, it is at least receiving the same amount of funding, a million five, as it received last vear. Tt. is at least not being cut. Now, I understand that all kinds of arguments could be made that it ought to And, of course, if we all had our druthers, a lot of kind of programs would go up. The fact is, this is at least

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

being held even. There is no justification, in my opinion, for adding the 220,000 dollars that we're talking about here. We should vote against this Amendment, and we should get on with the work of the House. I would urge 'no' votes on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain." McClain: "Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this, again, is a piece of ... an Amendment that I would ask all of you on both sides of the aisle to take a look at. What happens is, there would be 100 eligible patients that will not be on this dialysis machine. what happens is these people...if you remember, we had this debate a couple of years ago, these people, then, pay for this dialysis treatment themselves. Then, at that point, they get ... they cannot afford it any longer. have to go to the Department of Public Aid and become on public aid. So, what we're doing, if we defeat this Amendment and we do not restore the money for these 100 eligible patients, is we are requiring them, later, to go on to the Department of Public Aid rolls, lose their dignity and then be provided this renal dialysis treatment. I think that will cost the state many more dollars. It's inhuman. I'm sure the Director didn't mean But I think it's a bipartisan Amendment, and that we ought to put aside any kind of support. It's just a mistake on the part of the Department, the Bureau I'm sure no person here can stand and let these people go on public aid, it costs the state much more, let them lose their dignity. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support, strong support, of this

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Amendment. Having had some first-hand experience with...with this...with the problem that's involved with those people who have to depend on this...this life-saving operation that's involved here; As we...some of you may or may not know, the...the Reagan Administration has cut back funds on the federal level, and have decided to close some of the kidney dialysis centers, and have those depend...their lives depend on these treatments, to take a machine home with them and to cut down on the cost operating the center. There's a great number of these people who have to depend on these treatments, that cannot have them given at home because it's quite an involved and dangerous procedure. Just imagine hooking yourself up to a machine that takes the blood out of your body and cleanses it and puts it back. And there's a lot of older people who, certainly, don't have that kind of help at home. had a son who was on a dialysis machine for a couple of years. I happen to know something about it. that. in area. there's a dialysis center that relies шy very strongly on this funding. And I. urgently, you to...to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would join the Gentleman from Morgan in opposing the adoption Amendment. The Sponsor of this Amendment had offered a similar one in Committee, which was defeated. And I point out that the Gentleman who sponsors the Amendment didn't even vote for the Bill out of he was that interested in this particular agency and program, it would seem to me that he would have the courage of his convictions to put a *yes* vote in the committee would urge the Members of the House to reject system. 1 this. I...I'm not questioning the programs, Mr. Speaker,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Members of the House. We have all kinds of programs here which we could make great arguments for. The question is, again, getting back to the tight...the number of existing dollars that we have and how we intend to fund it. Now, we've heard the Gentleman here who has offered this Amendment offer Amendment after Amendment to add to add. And I'm asking, "Where are you coming with the cuts?"."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you know, the whole appropriations process, I think, is a matter of trying to get us, in some way or another, to announce what we feel are priorities. We, I don't think, appropriations process, there's any way that you can physically say, 'Well, okay, we've got 200,000 dollars from this, and we're going to take it out of to...out of this." It's very difficult, as we go along, to do that. example, I may feel that this is a very important item, and that it ought to be restored into the budget. I that the 200,000 dollars ought to come from some issue that's in the Senate. It's very difficult to do that as we go along. Anybody has got to admit that. The Governor has admitted, for example, that he's made some mistakes, Ωħ the...the funding for the Metropolitan Enforcement Group, on the matter of the Institute for the Visually Impaired. He's made those...He's announced that he's made those errors. I think this is an error. And...And we ought to say that we believe strongly in the...the program for renal We all know people who are...are getting the dialysis. treatments in the program. It's a matter of threatening life if they don't receive this res...support. I think that Republicans and Democrats, you know, it's not that big of an amount. Out of a 14 plus billion dollars

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

are we going to say, for example, that we can't find out of one contract. We can find, out of one contract, that amount of money. Let the Governor, if we have to, and the whole veto process. Let him show me that he can't find one contract that he can't throw out of the budget and veto and support this 200,000 dollars. I think that all of us ought to be for this. And, therefore, I would urge the Members to support the Amendment #8 for this valuable program. And let us...None of us ought to say that by denial of these funds, that we're going to threaten anybody's life. It is a very vital program."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've had very few people rise and speak against this, and I think you should listen very carefully to their arguments. Because, their arguments are really will of the Representative from Jacksonville suggested that it would nice, if we had our druthers, to add all sorts of to the budget. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not an Amendment that's a part of a wish list, as it were. This is an Amendment which, literally, is life and death for people who depend upon renal dialysis programs. Moreover, we have been, all of us in this state really, have been the victim of changes that have been made at the federal level, which are to put more people on to a program like this, because they won't be able to get the money necessary from Public Aid to support the ... their ... the dialysis. We have problems with 'MANG Spend-Down' Requirement in the state. 1119 last week to try and deal with that. But, should that fail in the Senate, we are going to be in very serious trouble, because people will not be able to get public aid support for this program. And they will only be

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

get it from Department of Public Health. That's why the money is needed here and it's needed now. I urge your support."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #8.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'nos' have it. Amendment #8 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2210, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2210, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #3, 4 and 5, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 3, 4 and 5?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Jaffe - Matijevich..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe, Amendment #6."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Members and Speakers of the House, Amendment is not an...an increase, but merely a transfer in the DOR's budget. And, basically, what this transfer does is it transfers to the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute money to fund an educator, which would be a teacher or social worker, and an education administrator. positions became vacant in Fiscal Year 1982, and are not reflected in the 1983 budget; although they are absolutely essential. Because, without these three teaching positions, the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute does not really have a full force in order to do the things that they have to do. As I've indicated to you, it's a...it's money that's been transferred from other parts of the DOR's

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

budget, other parts of the budget where...that really doesn't need the money. It's a small amount, 68,000 dollars who are...for three teachers. And I can think of no reason to vote against this Amendment, and I would urge an 'ave' vote on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly." Reilly: "Yes, with a reason to vote against the Amendment. fact is that we put the IVHI back in the budget quietly at an 87,000 dollar increase over last year. This is We ought to be glad that we were able to save the lily. it, and we ought to be grateful for the 87,000 dollar increase to add on top of that three new positions, another 69,000 dollars is just more than...than we should be asked to bear. I would ask 'no' votes on this Amendment. restored the money for IVHI. It's a good program. It os going to stay open. They don't need the additional money on top of the increase we already gave them. I would urge 'no' votes on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Just to refute the Gentleman's argument, I... I would just tell you that there has been ingre...an increase in those funds, even without this particular transfer. And, with the Amendment and...with this particular Amendment, there is a substantial increase in those funds. As I've still indicated to you, this is for the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. They need three teachers in order to be fully...at full force. Without these three teachers. they really can't do the job that they're supposed to do. You're talking about a typing teacher, you're talking about a mobility teacher, you're talking about a social worker. These are essential things for the blind, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on it. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 81 'aye', 78 'no'. Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2213, read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2213, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #3 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed?

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, 5, 6 and 7 failed in Committee.

Floor Amendment #8, Kosinski."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski, Amendment #8."

Kosinski: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the appropriations process in our Committee, money was taken from 15 agencies and divisions of the very sensitive Department of Corrections to provide a youth center at Kankakee. Any youth center is certainly desirable in the state, and I have no objection to that at all. What I have here is an Amendment to restore the monies that were taken from those 15 depart... 15 agencies so that Corrections can function in the manner as approved in the original budget, and I ask for your approval."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #8. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #9."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, before making my presentation I would like

to ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #9, Representative Bowman?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Bowman: "To the Amendment. This particular Amendment adds a very small amount of money. It adds only \$182,000 to fund house bed spaces for corrections parolees and \$118,000 to fund 13 community correctional center hed spaces for pre-releasees. These bed spaces were, in the past, funded under the state's Title 20 Program, but not to be funded in Fiscal *83 as per the budget. Now, these beds are primarily run by the Salvation Army. Some of the finest work and post-correctional work is done by the Salvation Army. Very rarely do we have the Salvation Army coming to us and saying that their work is being impaired by actions of the state. I think it behooves take a look at this program for community correctional center bed spaces. We're dealing here with pre-releasees. people who are being prepared, if you will, to return to the community. They need a lot of service. They need counseling. They need, in many cases, medical assistance and so forth, and that's the sort of thing the Salvation Army provides them in these ... in this program. These beds, it may sound like a modest number of beds, but each bed can handle several DOC pre-releasees in any one year. we're talking about here really is providing enough beds to handle a couple of hundred, if you will, a couple of hundred parolees and pre-releasees and I think that the Salvation Army does a fine, fine job, and we ought to give it a vote of confidence by adopting Amendment #9. Ţ ask

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

for a Roll Call on this."

Speaker Daniels: "Bepresentative J. J. Wolf. Bepresentative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I join Representative Bowman in asking for a Roll Call on this Amendment and the next four Amendments because I believe that people ought to be on the record What Mr. Bowman is asking us to do is to spend more issue. money. Now, I want to recount for you the current situation we face in the budget and how that affects Amendment. I'd like to quote for you a couple of quotes that I think are particularly pertinent to this and to the budgetary situation. Quote, ... I would play out that in those years, referring to previous years, there perhaps was some reason for optimism, optimism which have at this time in light of this information. Т would point out that the state is currently having trouble paying its bills. Purthermore, I would say, looking ahead, for next year is certainly precarious. the budget think that for these reasons we have no right to optimistic about the revenue projections that are in the budget book... Those quotes are all taken Gentleman that offers this Amendment and who wishes to spend more money, who wishes to spend more money on this particular Amendment on a good program, but one we cannot afford. In earlier Amendments he's wanted to spend money on other good programs, but good programs we cannot afford. The Gentleman has voted for patronage employees transportation. He has voted for concrete at the expense of people programs when he votes to take money out of the General Revenue Fund and to spend it on highways. We cannot afford those things. We are barely able to keep budget together, to keep this state going, to keep

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

essential human services going. The Gentleman, if he adds this money to corrections, he's going to have to take the money if he's going to be honest about it in the process out of Public Aid. But does he want to do that? No, he's never offered an Amendment to reduce Public Aid. Out of education? No, he's not going to offer an Amendment out of education. Or out of some other human service program. The money is simply not there. The Gentleman knows that and a schizophrenic approach to the budget will not balance the budget. I would urge a 'no' vote on this issue because a 'yes' vote is intellectually dishonest."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Gentleman offers Amendments. Нe has. I Amendments in a row. He says it's only a small amount of money. He says 118,700 for the contractual services, another 183,930 dollars in GRF for community supervision; and, as I add up these five Amendments, now we're nearly three million dollars again. This Gentleman has offered Amendment, after Amendment, after Amendment spend... He's probably offered to spend more money than any individual Member of this House of Representatives and comes before us with additional ones, at this particular time."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me."

Wolf: "And then, does not ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Excuse me,
Representative Wolf. One second. Representative Bowman."
Bowman: "Yeah, I wish that this Gentleman, as well as the

previous Gentleman, would confine his remarks to the Amendment instead of making a personal attack. Okay? Why don't you direct him to do that?"

Speaker Daniels: "You are directed to confine your remarks to the

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Amendment instead of making a personal attack. Okay?"

Wolf: "I shall certainly attempt to do so, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Wolf: "The Amendment is the...to confine the remarks to the Amendment is the additional spending of dollars, and I think I was fitting within that framework, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Wolf: "So, as I look at these, Mr. Speaker, I'm just saying that the Gentleman has, again, offered an Amendment to spend additional dollars. I would just point out again, in the Appropriations Committee, of course, he didn't put his mouth where... money where his mouth was and didn't vote for the Bill. It just seems to me ludicrous to come up here and offer Amendment after Amendment to spend, come up with no solution as how to cut or how to provide the funds and then not vote for the Bill. I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Mr. Speaker just... I don't think it's... We're all getting tired. I don't think that it serves anybody any purpose to try to inflame other Members. So, we all do it sometimes, and we shouldn't do it, but I think the Speaker ought to keep Mr. Holf and Mr. Vinson within the guidelines of restricting their comments just to the Amendment and not to diatribes and political speeches and get Mr. Bowman all upset, and then we have to deal with him for the next two weeks. So, keep your remarks on the Amendment and stay off of Hoods."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Marion, Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"
Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will yield."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Priedrich: "Representative Bowman, I think this is a good Amendment, and I'm inclined to support it. My guestion is, of course, with this and the others, are you going to propose a cut somewhere; and, if you are, I'd like to support it if I could determine where you're going to make the cuts to balance the budget."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "First, I would ask the Speaker, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I have a guestion of... I have a question of you,

Mr. Speaker, if you'd get off the telephone long enough to

answer it. Mr. Speaker, the question I have is directed to

you, before I respond to this Gentleman."

Speaker Daniels: "Ask away."

Bowman: "Because he asked me where I would make cuts. Now, that
is not within the scope of this particular Amendment. I
will be happy to respond to him if it is your pleasure."

Speaker Daniels: "It's my pleasure."

Bowman: "Alright. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is because this may take us far afield, because there are many alternatives..."

Speaker Daniels: "Try to be as brief as you can, Sir."

Bowman: "I will be brief, but there are many alternatives. The Governor, for example, stood right there at the Clerk's desk and gave us a budget message in which he was notably silent on such things as decoupling our state income tax structure from the federal income tax structure; whereby, if we fail to do that, we will be giving tax breaks to people who have already received extremely generous tax breaks. We should decouple our state income tax system from the federal tax system. That would save us many tens of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. Also, the same

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Governor stood there at the Clerk's desk and was noticeably silent on such things as the automatic phase-in of sales tax exemption on business machinery, and on farm machinery and on gasohol equipment. He stood there and gave us a budget message which he presented to us a very austere budget; and, yet, he was totally silent on the fact that that budget is giving tax breaks to people already received tax breaks. And so, I would vote, Mr. Friedrich, I would vote to keep the tax levels the way they are, without cutting back further, without dumping more tax breaks on top of people who have already received tax breaks. That's what I would do, Mr. Friedrich. you."

Friedrich: "Thank you. Your solution is tax more and spend more, then. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative Bowman, I would like you... I notice that you've got several Amendments and they address themselves to increases in contractual services, like for community correctional centers, community supervision, community supervision and community supervision. Now, would you relate that and compare that to what Representative Mautino addresses himself to, in terms of institutional budgets. He wants to reduce it. Is there... Could you relate the two for me, the two situations?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "First of all, the... of the five Amendments, which I have offered here, only the first three are relevent at this point. I will withdraw two of the subsequent Amendments. The Amendment we are debating right now

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

regards the bed spaces for community correctional centers. The subsequent Amendment, the next one, will talk about a per diem rate increase, and a third one is employment services, specifically. Now, almost all of these are pre-release or post-release. Pre-release or post-release..."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Representative, he's got a little laryngitis, and I understand that and I'm in sympathy with him. But, I don't know whether you can turn it up or what. I can't really hear."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, what I'm saying is that these... the three Amendments that I'm going to be offering in succession deal with pre-release and post-release and not specifically with institutionalization. The pre-release, however, is an alternative to institutionalization, a very cost effective one I might add, because the people in these... this program are... are not security risks, if you will, and do not need to be guarded the way we do at our prisons. So, the Amendment #9 and Amendment #8 have a component which deals with pre-release, which is an alternative to institutionalization."

Ebbesen: "May I interrupt just one moment? Is the Representative Mautino's Amendment that we're going to act upon, is it in phase or out of phase with Amendment #9, money-wise?

That's all I want to know. Yes or no?"

Bowman: "Representative Mautino's Amendment does not take these monies out. So, it's in sync. It's synchronized."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, sometimes, you know, you can say that we're spending more monies because an Amendment may add additional funds,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

but the fact of the matter is that, with regards to Department of Corrections, we really don't have a policy that's doing any good, as far as doing something about and solving crime in Illinois. That's really what we're going about and is at the heart of this issue. First of all, it is... it is a fact that the community bed space more than half of what it is costing us, as a state facility, to provide for bed space. That's actually a. 'a good deal' for taxpayers. You know, I ... I write a weekly column; and, when the Bureau... when the budget came out, I said in that weekly column it looked to me like the felons and the fish are the only ones that made out, referring to the almost 100 million dollars that we're going to spend in bonding funds for added new prisons and Now, the fact of the matter is two fish hatcheries. that we don't have an answer. Our whole answer to matter of corrections is build new prisons, build new prisons. In fact, it seems to me that that's the answer in Illinois to our poor economy. In other words, provide jobs with new prisons. I think that's a darn shame when State of Illinois can do nothing in answer to our crime problem and not look at the fact that there are community bed spaces that are doing a better job than we are in the State of Illinois. The fact of the matter is, and some were able, and I couldn't attend, were able to go to the facilities in Chicago that are operated by the Salvation Those of you who attended, I think, will find, or did find that they were, not only a good facility; that getting our money's worth and they are doing a better job in those types of bed spaces than we are as a state Now, I think it's just a matter of time. facility. recollect, quite vividly, that, when Thompson was running Governor Thompson, as a candidate, one of his prime

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

issues was the fact of the bulging prison populations. that we can't answer that purely by adding new prisons, building new prisons: that we've got to look at the of rehabilitation, that we've got to look at the matter of community facilities that may be available for lesser and we aren't doing it. We are failing miserably, and at least what Woody Bowman is doing is responsible. think that, rather than condemn him, as a couple of you have on the floor, and all that you can say by condemning him is you're adding funds. You ought to look at the total You ought to look at the fact that ... picture. that senior citizens and people all over the state are fearful of their lives. because of the fact that we're getting We're going backwards with the nowhere. of the matter of justice, the matter of solving corrections. crime, and the fact that what we're doing, when we people in prisons, is all we're doing is that we are... are sending them out and they are then hardened criminals. йe are putting some people in prison who don't enter there real people that really belong in prison, believe it or not; and, when they get out, they are worse off than I think that is a crime in itself, and I they went in. don't think that anybody ought to stand on this floor and condemn any individual, because that person out ο£ conviction, even when he can hardly talk ... Woody "I've got laryngitis, and I shouldn't be me and said, talking. He's talking out of conviction, what he believes in, and I don't think I've ever stood on the floor of this House and condemned any one person - and I can get emotional - because they believe in their issue. I've... I've strongly disagreed with some of you on that side of the aisle, but I never once condemned you for standing up and believing and saying what you believe in. I'm going

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

to support him, because I also believe in the issue."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman, to close."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. would simply like to point out, to those people who are saying that we're spending more money, that, in fact, what we're doing is keeping the number of spaces constant. We're keeping the number of bed spaces constant, because the Governor's budget called for cutting back on the number of bed spaces. That particular decision was no more rational, no more sensible than his decision to close the Institute for the Visually Handicapped. We... Our prison populations are bursting right now. The end of the growth is not yet in sight. We need these programs for pre-releasees and for parolees; otherwise, we're just going to be dumping people back on the street before their term is up, because we won't have enough room in the prisons to hold everybody. So, we'll have to cut their term short, dump them back on the street, and them just pray that don't run afoul of the law again. Here we have an institution like the Salvation Army, who performs valuable service, keeping people, keeping former convicts from going wrong again. We need these beds. It's not new money. It's the same number of beds that we had in their... the budget last year. I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Bouman, moves for the adoption of Amendment #9. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I°d just like to point out some facts, facts that have not been

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

pointed out in debate; and, that is, since Fiscal Year 1977 to Fiscal Year 1983, the appropriations for community service division will have increased from 6.3 million to 16,8 million, a 167.2% increase and that, between Fiscal Year '77 and '83, the expenditures to the Salvation Army will have increased from 108,000 to 972,000. That's an increase of 132%, and I would ask for a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 77 'aye', 79 'no'. This Amendment #9... Representative Winchester. Record Representative Winchester as 'no'. Do you wish a Poll of the Absentees, Sir? Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "I sure do; and, after that, I would like a verification of the 'nos'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees and a Verification of the Negative Roll Call."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Barnes. Brummer. Cullerton. Darrow. Ewell. Plinn. Garmisa. Henry. Kucharski. Kustra. Leverenz. Martire. Mautino. O'Brien. Ozella. Schraeder. Stearney. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. No further."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Schraeder. Record Mr. Schraeder as 'aye'.

 Proceed with a Verification of the Negative Roll."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alstat. Barkhausen. Barr. Bartulis. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Collins. Daniels. Deuchler. Deuster. Cont.i. Davis. Jack Dunn-Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Fawell. Findley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griffin. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huskey. Johnson. Karpiel. Jim Kelley. Klemm. Kociolko. Koehler. LaHood. Leinenweber. Margalus. Mays. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCormick. McMaster. Ted Meyer. R. J. Meyer. Miller. Neff. Nelson. Oblinger. Olson.

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Peters. Piel. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Harry Smith. Irv Smith. Stanley. E. G. Steele. Swanstrom. Tate. Telcser. Topinka. Tuerk. Vinson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. Zwick and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the negative roll. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was it my imagination or were all of those Republicans? Representative Barkhausen."

Speaker Daniels: "Barkhausen. Gentleman's here."

Bowman: "Representative Bower."

Speaker Daniels: "Bower. Glen Bower. He's here."

Bowman: "Representative Findley."

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

Bowman: "Craig Findley."

Speaker Daniels: "Findley. Representative Findley. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentlemen recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Hudson."

Speaker Daniels: "Ray Hudson is here as always."

Bowman: "Johnson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson, Tim Johnson. Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Daniels: "Harry Leinenweber. Harry Leinenweber here?

Representative Findley has returned. Return him to the negative roll. Representative Leinenweber. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Bowman: "Margalus."

Speaker Daniels: "Margalus is here."

Bowman: "Ted Meyer."

Speaker Daniels: "Ted Meyer. Representative Ted Meyer.

Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Peters. Oh, I'm sorry. Wait a minute."

Speaker Daniels: "Do you have anyone else, Sir?"

Bowman: "Peters."

Speaker Daniels: "Peters. Representative Peters. Pete Peters.

Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what you said about Representative Meyer, however. What was the arrangement on Representative Meyer. Is he here or not?"

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

Bowman: "Representative Meyer. I asked him, but I didn't hear whether he was announced..."

Speaker Daniels: "Ted Meyer. I removed Ted Meyer from the Roll Call."

Bowman: "You did. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir."

Bowman: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

Bowman: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Daniels: "Return Representative Peters to the negative roll. What was your next question, Sir?"

Bowman: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Daniels: "Reilly. Representative Reilly. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? He's over here."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Bowman: "Representative Kustra."

Speaker Daniels: "Kustra. Representative Kustra. Gentleman in

the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bowman: "Representative Ropp."

Speaker Daniels: "Ropp?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

Bowman: "Harry Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Harry Smith. Representative Harry Smith.

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Roger Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Stanley. He's here."

Bowman: "Roger McAuliffe."

Speaker Daniels: "McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe.

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Daniels: "Bianco. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Bowman: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

Bowman: "Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Daniels: "He's here."

Bowman: "Also, I note that Representative Conti isn't here. How

are we handling that? Is he at the nurses station or

what?"

Speaker Daniels: "I believe he's back in his office. I can

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

check, Sir."

Bowman: "Okay. No, I remember from last week, but I just wanted to check and see if he was in the Capitol."

Speaker Daniels: "I think Representative Hanahan is aware that

Representative Conti is here."

Bowman: "Okay. Then I have no further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 78 'ayes' and 74 'nos', and the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson. requests a Verification of the Affirmative Roll. and Representative Johnson has returned. So. return Representative Johnson to the negative roll. Representative Peters has been returned already. So, 78 'aye', 75 'no'. Proceed with a Verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Bowman, Representative Conti is here."

O'Brien: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Clerk Beattv. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Currie. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Farley. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Levin. Loftus. Macdonald. Madigan. Matijevich. McGrew. McClain. McPike-Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Connell. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Zito."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ozella."

Ozella: "Mr. Speaker, you want vote me 'yes'?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is Representative Ozella recorded?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Daniels: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Can I be verified?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Beatty requests leave to be verified. Beatty and Getty. Leave is granted. Okay. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, I also verified Representative Leon."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay, Sir. Proceed."

Vinson: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Daniels: "Steczo. Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Daniels: "Richmond. Representative Richmond. Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "McGrew. Sam McGrew. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Daniels: "Flinn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Vinson: "We'll let him not vote. Leverenz."

Speaker Daniels: "Leverenz."

Vinson: "Did he vote? I apologize. Representative Dunn. John
Dunn."

Speaker Daniels: "John Dunn? John Dunn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry. Excuse me. Excuse me. John Dunn is over here, Sir, on the Republican side."

Vinson: "Would you admonish him that he should be in his seat
during a verification?"

Speaker Daniels: "Well, I think he's got his eyes on Robbins' groceries. Further questions? Alright, Steczo is here.

Beturn Representative Steczo to the Affirmative Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Van Duyne is here. Bradley. Gerry Bradley.

Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?

Gerry Bradley. Van Duyne is here, Sir. No. We're on

Gerry Bradley."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Daniels: "Domico. Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Daniels: "Lechowicz. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Daniels: "Pechous. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Christensen."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Christensen. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Yourell."

Speaker Daniels: "Yourell. Yourell. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Daniels: "Stuffle. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Wait a second now. Alright. What's the count,

Mr. Clerk? Return McGrew to the affirmative roll. There

are 72 'aye', 75 'no'. Amendment #9 fails. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #10."

Bowman: "Leave to withdraw 10."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, #11."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This adds the sum of 1.6 million dollars to the Department of Corrections budget for purchase of employment services. This is to put money in the budget that had been there traditionally. In Fiscal Year '81, there was 1.8 million dollars; Fiscal '82, 800,000 dollars; and zero in Fiscal '83. Apparently, the more that we put people behind bars the less interested we are in finding jobs for them, when they are finally released, and we are indeed putting more and more people behind bars. And so, with the unemployment rate the way it is these days, it's especially important that we have employment services available when

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

people return to society. Now, this Amendment is supported by a statewide coalition and, in fact, will provide employment services around the state. It provides for funding, at least by way of example, for the Safer Foundation of Chicago, and the reason I mention them is because we had the founder of the organization testifying. I just want to read just a couple of paragraphs to give you some statistics. According to figures received from the Department, it is estimated that 7,800 parolees will released in Fiscal '83. An additional 2400 work releasees from public and private centers will also be released. The total comes to over 10,000 offenders, a staggering number needing placement services. For a moment, let's pretend that no one coming from a work release center needs employment services after release. So, we only look at parolees. Those are 7800. With some federal Title dollars, for which all the present employment agencies contribute 25% - and this is... the way we used to do course - we could obtain services for about 3,400 placements for 2700 parolees. Now, in Chicago alone, there are presently 5,000 parolees under supervision. These are staggering figures, Ladies and Gentlemen. We need to provide employment services for people who are released to If they have a stable job, they are less likely society. to get in trouble with the law again. I think, if concerned about law and order, we will be concerned about finding decent jobs for those people who are released from prisons, and we need this service now more than ever. I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DeWitt,

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is some five to ten times as much

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

the cost of the preceeding Amendment. When we queried the Gentleman on the preceeding Amendment, as 1 would on this Amendment; and, when he admitted that he was about the budget figures, he concerned defended the Amendment to spend more money by saying he was for higher taxes. If you vote for this Amendment, I would suggest implicitly endorse the Gentleman's suggestion; that he's for higher taxes, than you are. I would urge Members of the House to stop and think. Are we for higher taxes, or are we against higher taxes, be they corporations or individuals? I think, when you think through it, you're for lower taxes, and you believe that government can live within its means and should be required do so. We can do so, if we... if we reject these that Amendments for higher spending the Gentleman repeatedly and continually offers. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment, if only for the reason that what's he's proposing in this Amendment is better services for ex-cons than he is for the unemployed, who committed a crime. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that Representative Bowman, in his opening remarks here, said that traditionally, traditionally that these dollars were in there. Well, I'd just like to remind Representative Bowman, this is not a traditional year. You know, you take a look at the profile. Everybody's got to suffer their fair share of what's going on, as far as things in general. You know, we've had forty years of traditional years of spend, spend, spend, and all of a sudden the crank has been turned; and, we're... we're trying to go the other way. There's a transition area... arena going on here; and, as

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

far as that 1.6 plus million dollars, I just think it's not a traditional year. And, if we're going to take money like this and use it, we're not going to use it in this area. I think that, when you put your priorities in perspective, we can be talking about education and other things, and I just think that this, of all the Amendments that deserves a 'no' vote, this is one of them."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, to close."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just suggest, those of you who might be taken in by the gib-gabbler from Dewitt, that... that we're not talking about higher We're talking about not lowering taxes further on people who have already received substantial reductions in taxes. I would also say to the Gentleman from DeKalb that there are people from DeKalb who are convicted of felonies. and who go to the penitentiary, and who are returned I'm sure there are probably even a few miscreants in DeWitt. Perhaps the ... every community represented here people who have been sentenced ŧο the penitentiary system and who will be returning to those communities. Τf Мe do not find employment for people, they will be far more likely to commit crimes, once again, in those same communities. This is a very important part of reducing recidivism and stopping the cycle, the vicious cycle of crime. This is a law and order Amendment. He need this Amendment, not because it's traditional. only mentioned that because... to suggest that we're not asking for something new; we are simply trying to cope with burgeoning prison populations, at a time when unemployment is extremely high; and, if we fail to do so, we do at our own risk, because the crimes that will he committed will be committed in our own communities. That we can ill-afford. I urge adoption of this Amendment."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Bowman, moves the adoption of Amendment #11. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it.

Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Roll Call. Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman requests a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 54 'aye', 81 'no'. Amendment #11 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, Amendment #12."

Bowman: "Withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, Bowman."

Bowman: "Withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman. Withdrawn. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, Schraeder."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder. Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Mautino."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino, Amendment #15."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 15 is technically incorrect.

I'd like to withdraw it and go to 16."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, Mautino."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino, Amendment #16."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To show that I don't play any favorites, the same Amendment that I presented on the previous Bills, addressing the guestion of contractual service, appears in Amendment #16 to 2213. Basically, what the Amendment does, is reduce from the professional

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

artistic budget allocations line items. The total reductions are 158,520 dollars in the areas of the general academy, information services, office. the training facilities, juvenille field services, Pierre Marquette Youth Center, Hannah City Youth Center, Joliet Youth Center and St. Charles Youth Center. I've once again addressed the question of contractual service line items, and I think I know what the feeling is of the Membership on reducing contractual service, since they did not see fit to do so in the previous Bill with the Department of Revenue. I find it very difficult to understand the rationale, when Members stand up and say that Amendments add dollars to Bills; yet, there are no provisions for taking money from independent budgets and putting it where it is needed the most. given everyone the opportunity to do so on the first three I will be most happy to take the wishes of the General Assembly on this Amendment as well. I think it's It doesn't hurt anyone. Contractual services in the Department of Correction, I believe, last fiscal were ten million dollars. I'm addressing this particular provision, a very minor amount in the area of 158,500 dollars."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #16. Any discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Hould the Gentleman yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative... Representative Mautino? Is this the line item that, for instance, hospital medical care is paid for by the Department for inmates?"

Mautino: "It is, but these reductions do not reflect those dollar amounts in the budget."

Vinson: "Now, what I'm saying is, ..."

Mautino: "This is only..."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

- Vinson: "... is this the line item that the Department would purchase hospital medical care for for an inmate?"
- Mautino: "No. This is line item 1245, as were all the previous Amendments. Line item 1245 only addresses professional and artistic contractual services. Only line item 1245."
- Vinson: "And you're representing to me that that is not the line item that the Department would use, for instance, to pay for doctors or medical care for inmates that they had to be sent to a hospital or a clinic."
- Mautino: "That's correct. Your assessment is correct. I am not recommending that to you. That is not my intention. That is not what the Amendment does."
- Vinson: "Given that intention of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would not oppose the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative Mautino, moves for the adoption of Amendment #16. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #16 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are attached to a Bill of the following title: Senate Bill 791, action taken by the Senate May 25, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit; House Bill #522 together with Senate Amendment #1, passed by Senate, as amended, May 25, 1982. Kenneth Wright,

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Message from the Senate by Mr. Secretary.' Secretary, 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #97. adopted by the Senate May 25, 1982. Kenneth Bright. Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills with the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills #1212, 1267, 1285, 1292, 1321, 1324, 1344, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1356, 1357, 1360, 1361, 1364, 1367, 1368, 1374, 1379, 1383, 1386, 1391, 1399, 1410, 1412, 1421, 1423, 1424, 1487, 1496, 1526, 1428, 1514, 1571, 1503, 1534, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1564, 1566, 1359 and 1678, passed by the Senate September(sic - May) 25, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. ""

Speaker Daniels: "Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 936, Ryan Terzich; 937, Greiman; 938, Greiman; 939, Pechous; 940,
 Terzich; 941, Terzich; 942, Carey Stanley; 943, Irv
 Smith; 944, Kustra... that's Krska; 945, Hanahan; 946,
 Bullock."
- Speaker Daniels: "For the record, before Representative Conti,

 House Bill 2213 will be moved to Third Reading. 2213,

 Third Reading. Representative Conti, on the Agreed

 Resolutions."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 936 sponsored by Speaker Ryan and Terzich, we commend Lieutenant James DeFily for his work in firefighting and preventing fires and promoting public

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

safety. We recognize his contribution to the Chicago Fire Unions and the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. Resolution 937, we hereby wish Fiona Calder good luck in retirement after 40 years, knowing that the young people of her district 62 will miss her deeply. Bethe Campbell, House Resolution 938, by Greiman, that Bethe Campbell, also Des Plaines District 62, Central School, takes pleasure in extending their best wishes to Bethe and Norm Campbell their retirement. House Resolution 939, whereas...marks the anniversary reunion of former students and colleagues of Southern Illinois University. House.. House Resolution 940. Terzich - Capparelli - Lechowicz - Krska - Madigan. Mr. and Mrs. Leo Bokicki of Chicago, Illinois recently celebrated their silver wedding anniversary. House Resolution 941, Tezich - Capparelli - Lechowicz - Madigan -Krska, it has come to the attention of the House that Mr. and Mrs. Walter Orlow of Chicago recently celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 942, Village οf Hoffman Estates, which was incorporated September 23, 1959 for the last 22 consecutive sponsored a day-long array of 4th of July activities. Irv Smith, House Resolution 943, that Joseph Bonefeste will retire at the end of the 1982 school year from a career of dedicated service to the Springfield community high school an educator. House Resolution 944, Pather Kurty will celebrate his 40th anniversary in the priesthood on Sunday, May 16th. House Resolution 949 (sic, House 945), Hanahan, that George R. Justen and Son Funeral Home is celebrating its 100th year of service to the McHenry. Illinois community. House Resolution 946, the Reverend Claude J. Murphy of Chicago will be installed May 27th, member of the Board of Directors of the National Bar Association, special assistant to the office of its

115th Legislative Day

May 25. 1982

president, attorney, Arnetta Bubbard. Mr. and..Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I didn't catch your attention.

Was that the Resolution with reference to Claude J.

Murphy?"

Conti: "That's right."

Epton: "Well, I certainly would object to that. I..I can't believe that that's on the Agreed Resolutions and I apologize to Representative Conti for not calling it to his attention before. Representative..."

Conti: "Mr. Epton, can I interrupt?"

Epton: "Yes, Sir."

Conti: "As I was reading the Resolutions, it was handed to me, and all I read was the first paragraph. What's your objection?"

Epton: "My objection is that Claude J. Murphy is not a gentleman that any of us should be proud of. And to have this House praise him in any manner, shape or form reflects discredit upon us. I have no objection to an ex-convict trying to earn an honest living. It would be a novelty if Mr. Murphy tried to do that. I certainly...He is presently the 7th Ward Republican Committeeman. He's a disgrace to our party, and I certainly object vehemently to any praise of that gentleman."

Conti: "I certainly apologize to the House floor. I usually get these Resolutions in time, Agreed Resolutions. This was brought to me about 15, 20 seconds before I started reading the Agreed Resolutions. I apologize to you and to the Members of the House, which, of course, we're not in a position to know what the man's record is. We only can take what the..."

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Epton: "Would you just withdraw it?"

Conti: "... What .. I'll take it out of the record."

Epton: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "946 will be withdrawn as an Agreed Resolution.

Representative Bullock?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was not my intention to speak in the Legislature today, but I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."

Bullock: "I recently submitted to the Clerk a perfunctory Resolution and asked that it be placed on the Agreed Resolution list, went to the Majority Leader and explained to him the Resolution, which was drafted by the Legislative Reference Bureau. And it is sort of an anomaly because I, as a Democrat, sought to commend a Republican who is former Secretary of the Cook County Republican Central Committee, who is a Black man that is being placed on National Bar Association Board of Directors, who is being invested by the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. is a Republican. And I certainly would not have seen fit to cite an individual for accomplishments, Republican or a Democrat, if I felt that there was any hint spector or any ο£ immorality, illegality On the individual's part. Ι don't know from what basis the previous speaker gathers his information relative to this individual, but I'd like for the record to indicate that I, certainly, am not aware of the accusations that this person has lodged against this local Republican official, that I personally, and that many of the Members of the Republican side of the aisle have had opportunities to deal with, not the least of which is the Chairman Republican party who sits in this Body. And I take personal affront that Representative Epton would rise

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

castigate an individual in the manner that he has. I think he owes the Black community, I think he owes the Republican party, and I think he owes the Members of this House further explanation and proof and evidence that the charges he's made on this floor are indeed fact. I would not want to be caught defenseless to charges and allegations that he's lodged on this floor. I think it's reprehensible, and I am surprised at a man that I respect immensely, Representative Epton, would use this tribunal, this tribunal to make spurious, racist charges that are without foundation. And I challenge him to produce evidence and I challenge him to present to the State of Illinois substantiated information to validate the accusations he's made against this outstanding Republican official.."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative..Representative Bullock.

Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the first instance I'm surprised that my colleague across the aisle would take 1 had no idea he was the Sponsor, nor do I believe for a moment that he knowingly was trying to praise that individual. I suspect he, like so many others, have been conned by the gentleman. As far as being able to prove my remarks, I certainly can do so and am perfectly ready and willing. I have already indicated ŧα the Attorney General of the State of Illinois that to have him as a member of his campaign Committee is sheer idiocy. The gentleman is a Republican Ward Committeeman who has never voted in a Republican...has never voted in an election. a matter of fact, I was responsible for his appointment. The gentleman...And I think that the Gentleman across the aisle can share the embarrassment with me. This question that we're praising has pictures showing him in

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

with President Ford, has endorsements from Presidents of various universities. most of which were probably handwritten by the gentleman himself. I won't even...I won't even go into the fact that he has used my name and charged various bills to my account and has expended sums in my name. I think that my colleague across the aisle should be satisfied with the fact that I have received several calls, have been asked to pay bills that Mr. Murphy using my name and my stationery. If you suggest that I should keep a closer watch on my stationery, right. But for the Sponsor of this Bill (sic. Resolution) to suggest that I, in any way, impugned his integrity is just sheer nonsense. He knows better. I didn't even know who the Sponsor was. I was sitting here trying hard not to listen to what was going on because it's rather boring. And the name, Claude J. Murphy, caught my attention and I repeat, I would have.. I would hope that it would be removed from the Agreed list if the Representative across the aisle persists...and to suggest that it's racist, as far is one of the most ridiculous statements made. concerned. I don't know where you live, but I know that I'm one of the few Gentlemen who live in a Black community, whose children go to Black schools, who play with Black children, and I rather resent your remark because you know better. I have personally endorsed you, financed you in many cases. And I don't think I like your remarks at all. So, if an is due, I'll be happy to receive it from you."

"946 Speaker Daniels: is withdrawn from the Representative Conti moves for the adoption of the Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

suspend the posting rule on... for some Bills for Rules Committee, O'Connell, 1575; Davis, 1302; McMaster, 1593; and Telcser 1656. I've talked to the Minority Leader, and he said he would not object."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman asks for unanimous leave. Does he have leave? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I don't know if I'm going to object or not. I'd like to know what's in these Bills."

Speaker Daniels: "Why don't you check with the Minority Leader?"

Friedrich: "I'll be glad to get you a synopsis or read them out of the Digest. The truth of it is, I don't know either. I was asked to have them heard tonight; and, if they are, the person will show up. The person has...they have not been testified on, and the person will show up and tell you why he thinks they're an emergency. I'm not committed to voting them out."

Darrow: "Then... Is your Leadership committed to voting them out?"

Friedrich: "No, Sir."

Darrow: "I have no objection."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman asks for unanimous leave. Hearing objection, unanimous leave is granted for the suspension of the appropriate rules for a hearing in the Rules Committee tonight. Representative Friedrich announces the Rules Committee will meet thirty minutes after Session. Representative Conti moves to adjourn the House 'til 10:00 tomorrow. Representative... The Clerk. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 842, Ryan - Madigan et al.
Whereas, the House of Representatives learned with great
sadness of the recent death of John Cardinal Cody,
Archbishop of Chicago, and; whereas, at the age of 74, only
eight months from retirement, the head of the largest Roman

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

Catholic archdiocese in the United States died in the early morning of Sunday, April 25, 1982, and: whereas, in 1965, Pope Paul VI appointed Bishop Cody to head the Chicago Archdiocese, the Pope's first appointment to a major American See, and: whereas, two years later, in May of Archbishop Cody was selected a Cardinal by Pope Paul VI and received his red hat in Rome one month later. whereas, the Cardinal's record of achievement includes: his establishment of a solid insurance program for employees and a retirement program for priests: his reliance. in more than 90% of the cases. on the recommendation of the Clergy Personnel Board in making appointments, even going so far as to appoint priests who had criticized him severely in public; his successful implementation of the Vatican II liturgical reforms: development of the nation's largest deacon program; and, backing of inner-city schools his strong financial parishes, and; whereas, this holy man was born in Saint Louis on Christmas Eve in 1907 to Thomas Joseph and Cody. immigrants from rural Begley Ireland. dedicated his life to the priesthood at the tender οf 12 when he entered the Saint Louis Preparatory Seminary. After he graduated in 1926, he was assigned to the North American College in Bome, a grooming place for future bishops where, at 19, as a college's youngest student. was called 'Bambino' by his fellow students, and: whereas, after his ordination in 1931, the then Father Cody's rise through the churches hierarchy truly began. Until 1938, he served as a member of the North American College faculty and as an aide to the Vatican Secretariat of State later became Pope Pius XIII. In 1938, he was assigned as secretary to Archbishop - later Cardinal - John Glennon in Saint Louis. By 1947, Father Cody had been consecrated a

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

bishop of the newly-created Kansas City - Saint Joseph. Missouri diocese where his talent for fund-raising soon became evident. In 1961, not long before Father Cody was named coadjutor to Archbishop James (sic - Joseph) Rummel in New Orleans, Archbishop Rummel ordered the desegregation of parochial schools, a decision which Bishop Cody carried out after the Archbishop's death. In 1964, now Archbishop Cody joined the other American Bishops in an appeal for stronger vatican Council statements on racial justice: 1965, Pope Paul VI appointed Archbishop Cody to the Chicago Archdiocese, and; whereas, on December 5, 1981, Cardinal Cody celebrated his Golden Jubilee which represented 50 years in the service of God as a priest. He celebrated his last Mass in Holy Name Cathedral on Christmas Eve. whereas, as the leader of 2.4 million Catholics. Cardinal Cody will be remembered for his warm personality, his great vision of interfaith unity, his intense love for the people of Chicago and his love of God and the Catholic Church: therefore. be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois that on this 30th day of mourning we express our heartfelt sorrow and our deep sense of personal loss at the the Archbishop of Chicago, John Cardinal Cody; that we extend to the Chicago Archdiocese our most sincere and deepest sympathy on the loss of this tireless servant of God and God's people, this man whose dedication to needs of others will be sorely missed throughout Chicago and the State of Illinois; that we join the Chicago Archdiocese in mourning this tragic loss; and be it further resolved that a formal indication of our sympathy, a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to the Chicago Archdiocese, with our most condolences; and be it further resolved that we adjourn as

115th Legislative Day

May 25, 1982

a token of our deep respect."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters and Madigan moves for the adoption of Death Resolution 842, until 10:00 tomorrow morning. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The House stand adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning."