116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Byan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Sister Tarcisius McCarthy. Sister McCarthy is a Sister Servant of the Holy Heart of Mary from St. Mary's Hospital in Kankakee. She's also a very dear, close personal friend of mine and is classified and called and paid as my campaign sponsor and spiritual campaign manager. And, so I want all of you to listen to what she has to say today, because she has special words here for each and every one of you that are here. Sister Tarcisius."

Sister Tarcisius: "Dear God, Creator of the Universe, Lover of wisdom, Comforter of all those in this Assembly engaged in the daily struggle to do Your will as they perceive it. Bless us as we gather here today in this chamber to reflect on the achievements of the past and to draft meaningful legislation for the future. This. like similar deliberative bodies, is one which passes through many time periods and, like so many others, it's Members would do well to reflect on the implications of these words from the Book of Ecclesiastics. 'A time to kill and a time to heal, a time to tear down and a time to build, a time to weep and a time to laugh, a time to mourn and a time to dance, a time to hate and a time to love, a time of war and a time of peace. Lord God, help those elected to this Body, the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, strive to make the coming year a time of healing, building, laughing, dancing, loving and of peace. Amen."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, very much, Sister. That was very nice.

Sister Tarcisius is celebrating her 60th year as a nun with
the Catholic Church, and so this is kind of a special
occasion for her here today. She's going to join us again
tomorrow. I think I'll have Representative Caparrelli give

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- us the Pledge this morning."
- Caparrelli 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. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Dwight Friedrich, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Bills, determined emergency Bills, pursuant to House Rule 27C-3 by the Committee on Rules, action taken on May 25, 1982 and were replaced in the Committee on Assignment: "Exempt" House Bill 2606 and Senate Bills 1259, 1260, 1288, 1298, 1305, 1369, 1375, 1389, 1429, 1452, 1470, 1471, 1480, 1491, 1519, 1532, 1579, 1590, 1591, 1592, 1594, 1599, 1621, 1652, 1656, 1668, 1672 and 1685."
- Speaker Ryan: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 167 Members answering the Boll, a quorum of the House is present.

  Representative Getty, who's absent today?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may the record indicate that Representative

  Dan O'Brien is excused for official business and

  Representative Garmisa due to illness?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Leverenz is back today? Representative Telcser,
  do you have any excused absences? None. The record will
  so indicate. Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1212, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Corn Marketing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1285, J. J. Wolf Winchester, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1344, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1353, Wikoff, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Bill 1354, Bradley, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1355, Kane - Woodyard - Zito, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors and the State Colleges and Universities. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1356, Woodyard - Stuffle, a Bill for an Bill. Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis. First Reading of the Bill. 1361, Wikoff, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the retirement purposes of higher education institutions and agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Wikoff, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses οf University Civil Service Merit Board. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1367, Terzich, a Bill for an Act to exempt from taxation receipts from the sale of gas or electricity or transmission of messages to school districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1368. Karpiel, a Bill for an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1374, Leverenz -Dwight Friedrich, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1379, Terzich, a Bill for an Act relating to the payment of medical expenses for persons incarcerated in county jails. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1383, Findley - Birkinbine, a Bill for an Act to for assistance of certain employees-owned enterprises. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1391, J. J. Wolf -Vinson, a Bill for an Act to amend certain appropriation Acts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1399, J. J. Wolf - Vinson, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1410, J. J. Wolf - Reilly, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Health Finance Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1412, J. J. Wolf - Davis, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judges! Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1421, J. J. Wolf - Bower, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1423, J. J. Holf -Davis, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Teacher Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1424, J. J. Wolf - Davis, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain retirement benefits for teachers. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1428, J. Wolf - Wikoff, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Purchase Care Review Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1436, Mulcahey - Frederick, a Bill for an to delete population limits in municipalities and counties that levy tax on gross rental receipts to hotel rooms. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1487, Bower, a Bill an Act to provide for the preservation of Illinois farmland. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1496, Reilly, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Stuffle - McClain, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code and an Act creating the Illinois Department of Veteran Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1514, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Supreme Court. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

1526, McBroom, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1534, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1537, Bell - Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1538, Bell - Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1539, Bell - Keane, Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1540, Bell - Keane, a Bill for an Act relating to revenue. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1564, Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning video taping of the testimony of a child. First Reading of ... First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1566, Duyne, a Bill for an Act to amend the Aurora Civic Center Act and the Waukegan and Joliet Metropolitan Exhibition Auditorium Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1571, Olson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1657, Ebbesen, a Bill for аn relationship to various licensing Acts and duties of the Department of Registration and Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1658, Boodyard, a Bill for an Act to release higher...highway easements and to restore access rights to certain described lands. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1678, Carroll, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of various state agencies. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kulas, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kulas: "Yes, Mr... Mr. Speaker, if you listened carefully to the prayer this morning, you heard that there's time for a lot of different things. Don't you think it's about time you

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

told us what the schedule for the rest of this week will be?"

Speaker Ryan: "No, I don't. Do you have any other questions, Representative? It's the intention of the Chair to work all day, Representative Kulas, and the sooner we get through it, the better off we'll be. So, on page two, under the Order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 2196, Representative Bolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2196, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to Amendments 1, 2 or 3?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Nelson..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Nelson, on Amendment #4 to House Bill 2196."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #4 to House Bill 2196 would House. partially restore the funding for the Illinois Nature Preserves Commission. Their budget was slashed this year, and I was very sorry to see that. Amendment #4 would delete 40.000 dollars and insert, in lieu thereof, 75,000 dollars. is still a figure below this year's fiscal year budget for the Nature Preserves Commission. It was created in 1963 to oversee a system of nature preserves, areas of natural scientific interest worthy of special protection in our Last year we passed Senate Bill 1124 which specified the powers and duties of the Commission;

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

although, they were not significantly changed. Ιt is composed of nine members with a scientific background appointed by the Governor, and what the Commission does is compile maintain and inventories on natural areas throughout the state, promote the protection of natural preserves, and it adopts rules jointly with the Department of Conservation. The Nature Preserves Commission always been funded by a particular line item in the Department of Conservation's budget. The Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act makes the Commission the principal coordinator and overseer of the Nature Preserve System makes the Department the principal state agency to acquire and hold nature preserves. I would like to emphasize the fact that Commission members serve without pay. The Commission has a certain degree of independence which allows it to attract nature preserve dedications and work in cooperation with land owners. My specific interest Nature Preserves Commission results from work that was done in my district with a volunteer group called 'Save the Prairie Society'; a group made up entirely of volunteers worked very hard to preserve a particular spot of virgin land that had not been touched by developers, and the volunteers were helped by the Nature Preserves Commission. Many of them have written to me in support of restoration item in the budget. Such a drastic reduction to 40,000 dollars will allow the Commission only to pay for travel expenses and, perhaps, for one staff person. think that that is an unfair amount to slash from their budget. During the last ten years, the Commission has a contract with the Natural Land Institute in Rockford which provided the technical staff to assist the Commission in performing its duties. What this proposed reduction would do would be to eliminate that staff, and I would

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

specifically request your support for Amendment #4 to House Bill 2196. I'd be glad to answer any questions about the work of the Commission or about the kinds of things that can be done, if this money is restored. Thank you, very much."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support the Lady from Cook in her Amendment #4. Even with this Amendment, the appropriation is still 11,200 less than the PY '82 appropriation level. I think that this makes it a reasonable Amendment, and I would urge the Members to support her on the adoption of Amendment #4."
- Speaker Ryan: "You finished, Representative? Is there further discussion? Representative Darrow."
- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the Governor's budget, this item was funded at 35,000 dollars. This will bring it up to 75,000 dollars. and granted this is not that amoun... that large amount of money. However, last evening many of us voted against such things as this to keep in line with the Governor's budget. I know that many times I was in the minority of the Minority Party voting against many pork barrels. This budget already has two pork barrel items attached in Committee for Representative Hoxsey. This will third one on this budget. I think it's a worthwhile project; however, I would hope that the Members on side of the aisle, who are trying to live within the Governor's budget, would vote against this Amendment. a tough decision to make. It's nothing personal against the Sponsor of the Amendment, but I think we should hold the line on these pork barrel items. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would concur with the remarks of the Gentleman from Rock Island. First of all, this Amendment to increase the Commission's budget from 40,000 to 75,000 dollars is not necessary, because the Department, in the development of their FY \*83 budget, has determined that it could absorb the amount of provided by a fund cut in that particular budget. personally spoken to Director \*Kenny\* about this very morning, and he has assured me that the Department can take care of the functions internally. The Department would do this by realigning priorities of existing staff within the Bureau of Natural Resources. An increase in the FY '83 appropriation to the Nature Preserve Commission would. therefore, be duplicative of the Department's effort on their behalf. During Fiscal \*82. the Commission will not expend their appropriation that they have. To date, they have authorized the Department to enter into a contract for 60,000 dollars with an outside firm to provide staff assistance to the Commission, and it is uncertain whether all or ... not that will An additional 5,000 has been set aside for the expended. Commission's travel, and the balance of 21,200 dollars presently uncommitted and will probably not be expended. Therefore, I say that it is not necessary. The Department can, with their existing personnel, take care of the function. We did have some concern about that Committee. Our staff researcher had questioned that as I am assured and believe the Director is able to do that and so, therefore, would ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in support of this Amendment. One

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

thing, and I'm not certain whether the Sponsor of Amendment brought out the fact that Illinois has only a handful of prairies left in this state. The prairie in our district, Representative Nelson and my district, represents one of the few prairies that are still existing in state. The people that... that promoted this increase in the budget appropriation, they say the Prairie Society worked... have worked long and hard to maintain this small segment of Illinois history. For 35,000 dollars I feel is an investment in the future of our state, in the future of our ecological state, to support this mere 35,000 dollar increase in a multi-billion dollar budget... mill --million dollar budget. I would rise in support of the Amendment."

- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt,
  Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to introduce the fifth grade class of the Tri-City Grade School, Buffalo, Illinois, Doralee 'Huffman', their teacher, represented by Irv Smith, Josephine Oblinger and Doug Kane, currently."
- Speaker Byan: "They left, Sam. Oh, they're up here. Welcome to the Illinois House. A timely introduction. Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Ewing: "I'd like to move the previous question."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, that's not necessary. Representative Nelson, to close."
- Nelson: "Thank you, very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I think that we have discussed this issue. I would like to see Chairman Wolf agree with me that this is a very modest increase in the budget for the Illinois Nature Preserves Commission, especially since restoration of these funds will allow the Wolf Road Prairie to be a name that is known

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

for posterity from generation unto generation, and I would ask for the support of other Members of the House as well.

I'd appreciate a Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2196?'. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Pardon me. Did you mention my name in debate?"

Speaker Ryan: "Yes. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. You want a Roll Call? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to House Bill 2196 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Ar. Clerk. On this guestion there are 99 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment's adopted. Record Representative Ewell as 'aye', Mr. Clerk and get a key for his switch, would you please? Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, J. J. Wolf, amends House
Bill..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, on Amendment #5."

Wolf: "Withdraw #5 and 6, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #5. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, J. J. Wolf, amends House
Bill..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, on Amendment #6."

Wolf: "Leave to withdraw #6."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #6. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Bowman - Levin, amends House Bill 2196 as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "The go... Which one's first, Bowman or Levin?

Representative Levin... Levin, you're first."

Clerk Leone: "No, Amendment #7, Bowman dash Levin."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Bowman wants Levin to lead off. Is that right? Lead off, Representative. Representative

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Ebbesen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, I'd question the germaneness of Amendment #7."

Speaker Ryan: "Give me the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative
Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bowman: "I believe... I believe this is an appropriation Bill; and, as such, any Amendment regarding appropriations for the same fiscal year is in order. We have, in the past, adopted budgets for the Department of Public Aid on such things as the Illinois Arts Council and Racing Board Bills. I believe this is entirely within the scope of the germaneness rule."

Speaker Ryan: "We'll let the Parliamentarian rule that, but your thoughts are well taken. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, one other thing, you know, this Amendment — it appears to me to be the same amount in what was defeated last night on another appropriation Bill; and, if nothing else, it's... would appear to be dilatory."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on that issue, I think the Chair to have some caution because, for example, last week a Bill relating to the gas tax went down, and I would hope that the Chair would rule that this is not dilatory. The only reason that it's being offered now is there were some requests for a Roll Call by some Members who are very sincere and conscientious about this issue, and we weren't given that Roll Call on a prior Amendment. So, therefore, because of that, it cannot be dilatory, and I would caution Chair that, for the remainder of the Session, we wouldn't want a precedent set where we wouldn't want some issues that we may have, in the past, voted on but we can always change our mind, and they would not be deemed to be dilatory, I'm sure. And I would urge the Chair to rule that we are proper in offering this Amendment."

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Speaker Ryan: "The Chair always proceeds with caution,

  Representative, but I appreciate your words. Representative

  Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Bowman: "Well, just to point out, with respect to the guestion as

  to whether this is dilatory or not. We did reguest a Roll

  Call last night and didn't get it."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, that's hasn't got anything to do with today,

  Representative. State your point."
- Bowman: "I think this issue deserves a Roll Call vote. #e requested..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, we'll have a ruling from the Parliamentarian prior to that. Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Wolf, J. J.: "I was going to speak in opposition to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any... any other... Is there any other discussion concerning the... Representative Ebbesen's question? Do you seek recognition again, Representative?
- Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, just to state that this Amendment was considered last night. It had a fair hearing on another Bill. The fact that this is the Department of Conservation, the subject matter is entirely different; and, to me, considering this Amendment, at this point in time as busy as we are in this House... It had a fair hearing last night, and it failed and it's dilatory. And I think that's what the Chair ought to rule."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Ebbesen, your point is not well taken, and the Amendment is in order. And we'll proceed with Amendment #7 to House Bill 2196. Now, who's going to talk? You're still up. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your getting my name right. It's taken about a year and a half to do it.

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Amendment #7 deals with the Renal Dialysis Program and attempts to restore 220,000 dollars to that bring it to the same level as the current fiscal year. Last week we had before us House Bill 1119. the MANG spend-down Bill, and one of the results of the MANG spin down has been that senior citizens and handicapped have not been able to get dialysis on an out-patient basis. because they have not been able to meet the six-month spin This has forced them to go to the Department of Public Health. Director Kempiners testified to that effect before the Appropriations Committee a couple weeks ago, and this has increased the number of persons seeking use of this Program. The Department of Public Health, rather than serving the needs of this increased population, has sought cutback on the appropriations of what they have been Currently, and this is according to providing. dated May 4th. there are 75 individuals who have applied for this service, in large part because they have not eligible for the spin down. They have applied for this service, and they've been turned down because there is at the present time. I suggest this is a life the money, and death situation. If they cannot get the renal dialysis, they will die. The Department's proposal for dealing with the increased need for renal dialysis, as a result of the spin down, is to send it right back to the Department of Public Aid. I have a plan for the remainder Fiscal 1982, and one of the proposals is to send new applicants back to the Department of Public Aidsuggest that the buck has to stop someplace. The MANG spin down is clearly not cost effective, and one dire consequences of the MANG spin down has been people. who need a dialysis, have not been able to get it. have gone to Public Aid, and Public Aid is now saying,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

"You've got to go back to MANG". This doesn't make sense. This is a cost-effective program. I think that it's a priority. It's an important program, and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, I request, at the appropriate time, that there be a Roll Call vote so we all have the opportunity to be recorded, in terms of our views on this key issue."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there further discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mr. House. Yesterday evening I recited the Gentleman who would be from Evanston's testimony before the Budget Comm... before the Executive Committee on the budget. I find it interesting that today he now has to go find a Cosponsor to offer his Amendments and probably appropriately so. His intellectual schizophrenia on the budget issue has become pretty well known in this chamber. His proposal before today would add 220,000 dollars to a budget that he says we to cut more money from. That additional 220,000 dollars, which is in addition to last year's budget which the current budget preserved intact; there is no cutback in budgetary figure. I'd make... I want Members of the House to understand that. That additional 220,000 dollars to come from someplace. Do you suspect that either Sponsor is going to offer an Amendment to cut someplace else the budget? I would ask Members to think about that. Obviously, they're not. I don't believe they've offered an Amendment to cut. I certainly Representative Bowman has not. The important Members of the House ought think about in connection with this. The Gentleman offered this Amendment in Committee, and he was defeated. The Gentleman offered this Amendment yesterday in connection with the Public Health budget where

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

it would be appropriately funded, and hе was defeated. Now, today the Gentleman offers the Amendment in connection with the Conservation budget. I wonder why it is that we're coming back to discuss Public Health budget issues in connection with the Conservation budget issue. I suspect he's going to throw this Amendment back at us day, after day, after day on the false premise that we're cutting the which we are not. We ought reject this, because it is, as Mr. Ebbesen said, dilatory. It is premised false budgetary information. We are not making a cutback in the proposed budget. All of the money is there today. and we ought reject it because the Gentleman, when he loses the issue on a budget that is appropriate to, ought to recognize that he's lost the issue so that we can get with the business of the House, rather than clogging up the cost of operating the House by offering the Amendment to every other Bill that comes along. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill, because the Gentleman's lost it twice already and he doesn't need to do it again."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago,
Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, isn't it strange that the loudest voices are the ones that run away with all the pork in their hands? Last week you was dropping elephant tears about grabbing a five million dollar facility in the Bloomington area. Today. he's talking about people that can't help themselves. These people on renal dialysis can't help themselves. They have to the... to the hospitals for this treatment. We spend a million dollars on the magnificent mile ad, but we can't spend 200,000 dollars on people that depend on renal dialysis. We spend 50,000 dollars for luxury offices in Chicago, but we can't spend 200,000 dollars for the people

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

that are dying from renal dialysis. We spend 1,200,000,000 dollars with medical purveyors from the Chicagoland area, and we've got swindlers from the Gold Coast Michigan Avenue where some of your doctors are swindling us out of 500,000 dollars, but we can't help people that are on renal dialysis. You've got the Governor and the Secretary of State flying around with a helicopter that's supposed to be for mercy use, and we can't spend 200,000 dollars on renal dialysis patients. I think your priorities are mixed up, Representative Vinson, and I think you ought to cut those crocodile tears out."

Speaker Ryan: "Have you completed, Representative?"

want to know whether you're ... "

Giorgi: "No, I can go on for a few more minutes, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Ryan: "Whatever... Whatever your pleasure is. I just

Giorgi: "I just wanted to tell you Republicans that you can't...

you don't amend a Bill once to get it through your skulls.

You amend it twice, three times, four times and a dozen
times, and you still don't understand."

Speaker Ryan: "Whatever's right, Representative. I might inform the group that there are some 45 Amendments left to do on Second Reading Bills. So, if you want to give your campaign speeches, it's okay with me. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's true we have a large number of Amendments here. This Amendment was addressed once in It was addressed again last night. Committee. don't know how many times we have to Gentleman lost. 'I consider an Amendment over, and over, and over again. issue aside, I think we're going to set a precedent here: that you keep working, and you can keep adding Amendments as long as we're in Session. I think there has to be an end to it sometime. We've addressed the question twice

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

already. I think a 'no' vote would be proper at this particular time. If not, it would be an encouragement just to keep introducing and re-introducing again. Now, it ends up on the Department of Conservation's budget. If we defeat this, can we then expect it to come up on the Fire Marshall's budget or someplace else? How many times do you have to vote on an issue before it's disposed of? I would just urge everyone to vote 'no' on this particular issue and get on with the business."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Levin, do you care to close?"

Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Department plans on cutting program. Thev're going to eliminate payments to facilities, which means the hospitals. They are going to pa y home dialysis, but that, according to the Department's own analysis, represents fifty people. Without this 220,000 dollars, there will be substantial cutbacks. There will be a substantial number of people who will not be able to get this service. I urge an 'aye' vote on this critical Amendment, and I ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 to House Bill 2196 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 80 voting 'aye', 82 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Levin."

Levin: "I would ask for a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks for a Poll of the Absentees. Read the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Bradley.

Cullerton. John Dunn. Garmisa. Hallstrom. Katz. Krska.

Kulas. Martire. O'Brien. Pechous. Pullen. Schraeder.

C. M. Stiehl. No further."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Alright. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on to explain my vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, proceed, Representative. It's not timely

Kulas: "Well, I just wanted to say ... "

Speaker Ryan: "If you want to take the time of the House, go ahead."

Kulas: "I just wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we wouldn't be considering this Amendment today if we would have had a Roll Call vote last evening.

Now, those of you who are voting red on this Amendment, you are pulling the plug on 100 citizens of the State of Illinois. Now, for these people, there is no Postponed Consideration or a Conference Committee. These people die.

Vote me 'yes', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Bullock. Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Ewell from 'aye'... from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Schraeder. Change the Gentleman... Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Giglio. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Pechous 'aye'. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, please record me..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Please record me as voting 'no'."

Speaker Ryan: "Record the Lady as 'no'. Are there any other changes? Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, if the Bill has the requisite... if the Amendment has the requisite number of votes, I would seek a

verification of the affirmative."

Speaker Ryan: "Alright, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Vinson, has requested a Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call, and we start out with 87 voting 'aye' and 80 voting 'no'. Poll the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. The House will be in order. The Members will be in their seats. Mr. Doorkeeper, clear the floor. Take them all off, if they're... If they're unauthorized, get them off the floor. We're going to try and get out of here today at a decent time."

- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brunner. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Currie. Deuchler. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Giglio." Getty.
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Mr. Clerk. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Just for a moment, Mr. Speaker. How is the ticket sales going tonight?"
- Speaker Byan: "I didn't understand you."
- Giorgi: "How's the ticket sales going tonight?"
- Speaker Ryan: "For the Democrat dinner tonight. You'll have to check with Representative Madigan on that, Representative.

  Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Keane. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Loftus. Madigan. Margalus. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Connell. Ozella. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. E. G. Steele. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Turner. Van

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Duyne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell and Zito."

Speaker Ryan: "Do you have any questions, Representative, of the Affirmative Boll? Proceed, Representative."

Vinson: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Ryan: "Jaffe is in the center aisle."

Vinson: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Schneider. Representative

Schneider in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Farley. Representative Farley in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'ave'."

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Balanoff's in her chair."

Vinson: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Ryan: "Who was that, Representative? Representative

Braun. She's in the back of the chamber. Got a red dress
on."

Vinson: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Capparelli is in his cham... in his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Carey."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Darrow is in his seat."

Vinson: "No, I said Carey, but I see he's in his seat now."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Carey is in his seat also."

Vinson: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman in the chamber? How is the Lady recorded? Oh, here she is over here. She tried to get..."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Vinson: "Where?"

Speaker Ryan: "She's on the Republican side, Representative, where her heart is."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, would you admonish Members to be in their seats, as they re supposed to be in the course of a verification?"

Speaker Ryan: "You're admonished, Representative."

Vinson: "Representative Donovan."

Speaker Ryan: "Donovan. Representative Donovan. Representative Donovan in the chamber? Walking in the back door. The front door. He's in the chamber."

Vinson: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Flinn. Is Representative Flinn in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Giglio is in his...is in his chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, what's the current status on Representative
Hanahan? Is he verifiable or is he..."

Speaker Ryan: "He's in his seat. You can verify him if you'd like."

Vinson: "Oh, okay. Representative Kane."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Kane. Representative Kane in the chamber? Representative Kane. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Wait a minute. He's right here. Just stepped in the back door. He's right here at the well."

Vinson: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz. Here is he down front.

Return Representative Schneider to the Roll Call. He has

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

returned to the chamber."

Vinson: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McGrew. He's in the back of the chamber."

Vinson: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Ryan: "He's down here in the front."

Vinson: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Murphy is in the back of the chamber."

Vinson: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Stuffle. Representative Stuffle.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Here he is, right here.

Just came in the door."

Vinson: "Representative Stewart."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Stewart. Representative Stewart in the Chamber? Representative Stewart. How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove her from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Zito."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative... He's right here in the aisle on the Democrat side."

Vinson: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer.

The Gentleman in the chamber? In the back of the chamber."

Vinson: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Domico. Representative Domico in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Ryan: "On this guestion there are 83 voting 'aye', 80 voting 'no', and the Amendment is adopted. Further

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2214, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2214, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fire Marshall. Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any Motions filed with respect to
  Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendments #2, 3 and 4 have failed. Floor
  Amendment #5, Terzich, amends House Bill..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich, on Amendment #5."
- Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #5 brings the amount of 10%, which is due to the
  Chicago Fire Department, for their training program in
  accordance with legislation that we passed two years ago,
  and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Terzich, amends House Bill 2214
  as amended."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich, on Amendment #6."
- Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #6 affects all of the local units of government throughout the state, and what it does, it appropriates an additional 415,000 dollars for grants to local governments for training fire protection personnel. This item reimbursed local units of government up to 50% of the cost associated with training. Currently, they are

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

allowing only 13% reimbursement to the local units of government. This will bring it up to approximately 19%, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 to House Bill 2214 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2217, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2217, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Military and Naval Department. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Hallock, amends House Bill 2217..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hallock, on Amendment #2.

Representative Hallock in the chamber? Do you want to call... Do you want your Amendment? Proceed,

Representative, on Amendment #2."

Hallock: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #2 seeks to put in 8,000 dollars for a place in Bockford. Commonwealth Edison is re-burying some cables.

Part of the cables will go the Bockford Armory, which is owned by the Department of Military and Naval. This would take care of their share of that in re-burial, and I'd ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative from

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment, at only a small amount, however, I rise to oppose it, because I really don't think it serves any purpose at all. The work has nothing to do with the Armory Building, which the Military and Naval Department has authority to maintain. The project, which will bury power lines, has been requested for cosmetic purposes only. Departmental personnel indicate this project will benefit either the Armory or the State of Illinois, and the Department of Administrative Services has not granted an easement for this project. Based on those reasons, I believe that the Assembly ought to reject the Amendment and vote against it. As I said, it's only a small amount, but I really think it serves no purpose for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Levin."

Levin: "... yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates that he will, Representative."

Levin: "Have you talked to the Department about this Amendment; and, if so, what is their position?"

Hallock: "Yes, I talked to the Department, initially, about a month and a half ago, and their position was, at that time, they did not support this 8,000 dollar Amendment. But they have assured me that, if, in fact, we can get it through here, they will go ahead with the plans with Commonwealth Edison. If I could just remind you what this is, there are power lines which conflict in this one area of Rockford. They are going to be buried below the ground. These lines directly connect the Rockford Armory with Commonwealth Edison's utility services. So, it should be part of the state's duty to bury those lines and pay their fair share, and that's what this Amendment does."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Levin: "Representative, further questions. It's my understanding that this would be of a purely cosmetic effect. Can you tell me any benefits to the Department that would derive, in terms of its operations from burying these power lines, other than having some neighbors in a fairly posh adjoining subdivision think the area looks a little bit better?"

Hallock: "Well, cosmetic to one person may be a necessity to somebody else. If you know this area of Rockford, these power lines are currently in the street, in the middle... on the side of the street, blocking the curbs. There's no place to park. So, what one person may say is cosmetic, to somebody else, it would be purely a necessity. I would say that this is not cosmetic; that it must be done, and it impedes the traffic flow. And I would say it's the state's responsibility to enhance that part of the area and pass this Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Speaker, I don't want our district, 67 and 68, to become
a district like a couple of the others. You know, where
these guys are always picking on one another, but I got to
say this. There's my colleague from Rockford who wouldn't
vote for the renal dialysis Bill, but he..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative, would you state your point?"

Giorgi: "Yeah, he wants to spend 8,000 dollars..."

Speaker Ryan: "On the Amendment."

Giorgi: "On the Amendment..."

Speaker Ryan: "On the Amendment."

Giorgi: "...on the 8,000 dollars. This is some of our choicest land in the Rockford land area. It's on our beautiful Rock River, and he wants us to pick up a tab for 8,000 dollars to take some unsightly wires, for the asthetics or whatever, but I'm sure about having priorities mixed up. That's a good case."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Hallock, to close."

Hallock: "Thank you, very much. Well, I should remind my colleague from Rockford, this is actually in a democratic part of town, but I'm concerned about the whole City of Rockford. And I would ask for his support on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "You're out of order, Representative Giorgi, and I mean you're really out of order. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to 2217 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2222, Representative Wolf. Representative, do you want to go with this Bill now? Representative Bolf, 2222? 2222. You want to move that Bill?"

Wolf: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Hanahan - Laurino..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hanahan, on Amendment #1."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this simply increases the allowance for the payment of the secretarial help that work in the Stratton Office Building and all secretarial help working for the General Assembly in the House of Representatives. The simple facts of life are that, after... This Amendment is just an increase

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

allowance to the total budget for the operation. It, in no way, sets salaries for the secretaries and other staff working directly for the House, but it does allow the Speaker and the Minority Leader to set up a Committee or to decide how much money a secretary should be made. The unfairness that's going on right now is the fact that secretaries make a hell of a lot more, as much as three times more than other secretaries working for the House of Representatives, but that, in itself, is not so scandalous. real scandal is that some secretaries, The identical work, are mispaid, quite unfairly. Worse than that is the secretaries working for the Senators, doing the identical work in a minority capacity or a majority capacity, are even paid that much more. There's a general unfairness here, and it should be straightened out. All this Amendment does is allow the Speaker and the Minority Leader to sit down and to rearrange the priorities of setting down equitable salaries for our staff. urge a favorable vote."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it appears to me that there's only one way to vote on this Amendment, and that's 'no'. This increase is 900,000 dollars on the House appropriations' Operations money to provide funds to allow Members of the House each to have their own secretary. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the voters were guite explicit in their... last November when they voted for a cut-back Amendment. It just seems ludricrous, at this particular point, that we should go the opposite direction. As a matter of fact, you walk around sometime. I suppose there is... there's not enough work sometime during the summer months to keep secretaries

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

busy when they work for two or three Representatives. I don't know what they would have to do if they only worked for one singly. I think there's only one proper way to vote on this 900,000 dollars, nearly a million dollars to provide personal secretaries for every Member of the General Assembly and that is to vote 'no', and I... and I will ask for a Roll Call vote on this."

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

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of In answer to the last Gentleman's statements, I House. think some of us have been working on this thing ever since we found out that last year, when some of the secretaries shortchanged, some of the new girls coming off the street hired by the Representatives were getting the same amount of pay that some of our girls were getting that were here five, ten and fifteen years. There's just no ... no equalization here; and, when you talk about what we've done for collective bargaining for teachers and people that work for State Government, I think it's not only a disgrace, but a dishonor to those of us who have girls that not only do what we ask them to do here with our secretarial business and our work business, but some of the other little things that they do to keep us looking real good in doing what we're supposed to do. Also, may I add that these girls deserve it; and, by having a conference between both sides of the aisle as to determine one kind of scale that some of our girls should get comparable to the Department of Personnel or any other department in State Government, is And, I would urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."

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

House. As Representative Wolf indicated, the Speaker

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

introduced this budget as a reduction from last year. He included fewer secretaries and fewer staff, because we will have a smaller House. This Amendment makes one secretary for each Representative. Now, I myself have had no problem with sharing a secretary with another Representative. I believe that this Bill... that this Amendment is out of step with the times. I would appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I don't know whether I have a question of the... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether I have a of the Sponsor of the Amendment or just a question. generally, but it seems to me that we're doing something here that we have never done before and, perhaps, it has a reflection on this Amendment and the House appropriation... House appropriation Bill. But I have observed, that one Representative now is going to have two offices in the State Office Building with phones placed in both offices, and I'm wondering if there's money in the budget for the appropriation for funds for an extra office for one particular Representative. I don\*t ... Can you tell me about that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative McClain." McClain: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of this Amendment to House Bill 2222. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know that secretarial salaries at the ... across the street in the Stratton Building are not paid what they ought to be This gives the latitude to the Speaker and Minority Leader to finally start paying these ladies what they truly deserve, and it still gives the flexibility to both the Leadership to set up their salaries. We're not involved in setting up the actually salaries, and so I would urge an 'aye' vote."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Hanahan, to close. No, wait a minute. Representative Ronan, on Amendment #1."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to speak in favor of this Amendment. I listened to Representative Wolf's analysis, and that's why I think be's absolutely correct on his analysis but wrong on his position on this Amendment. voters did make a mistake last November, and they thought that this government could be more effective if we have fewer Legislators. Well, they were wrong, and I totally disagree with that. However, since they've made the decision, in order for a Legislator to be effective, he's got to have staff to get the job done, and we ve got to stop kidding ourselves. So, I urge every Member of the General Assembly to vote for this Amendment so we can have competent staff, adequately and fairly compensated so that they can do the job we're supposed to do with them. I urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Yes, once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's just the inequity between the Senate secretaries and the House secretaries alone that bring us into the 20th century if we equalize our salaries. Secondly, after next January, those of you ... I'm not going to be here. The Speaker isn't going to be here. There's many of you who are not going to be here, but those of you who will be here are going to be acting as single-Member Representatives. It's going to be quite difficult..."

Speaker Byan: "Speak for yourself."

Hanahan: "... for those of you to share secretaries in single-Member districts. Remember that, number one.

Number two, the salaries have not been increased for years for some of the secretaries who have been working for us

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

for eight. nine and ten years duration. Secretaries last year received a 2%... a \$2.50 a week increase in salary for the last twelve months. When I investigated, originally, possibility of getting equity in the salaries, I realized and recognized, after years of service here, Speaker and the Minority Leader did not have money in the budget, the present budget, in order to equalize salaries. That is the reason why this Amendment is offered next year\*s budget appropriation. In no way does this reflect a mandate that the Speaker, the Minority Leader got to increase salaries unfairly. I'm hoping that, by giving them total latitude, that they'll recognize that some secretaries, who have been working here nine years, do not deserve a thousand dollars a month when secretaries, who were hired off of the street, come in almost for the same salary; and, at the same time, have other secretaries making as high as 30,000 dollars a year working for this House of Representatives, working for a single Member, not more than one Member at a time. I just think that in just fairness to our secretaries, those who have given of themselves, that the people who voted for the cutback didn\*t say we should cut down and treat our secretaries unfairly. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 2222 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 81 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Keane, amends House Bill 2222..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Keane, on Amendment #2."

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

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

General Assembly. What Amendment #2 does is it returns the amount budgeted for legislative staff and research... legislative research and operation staff to this year's amount. A cut had been made in this. The reason I offering this Amendment is that, during the debates at the cut-back Amendments, we found, in doing research, we that other states that had reduced the size of their General Assemblies became more dependent upon amount of work that has to be done by a General Assembly is not dependent upon the numbers of elected officials in that Assembly, but rather it's a factor of the size of the budget and the total population of the state. The fact that we will have fewer Members, one-third fewer Members in this Body next year does not mean that we will have one-third less work. We will have the same amount of work. and we will have a greater dependency on staff. If... It's my opinion that we will probably increase our staff next year simply to make up and to provide bodies and minds to do the work that presently is done by Members General Assembly. If, in fact, this proves false, what we can do is we can handle the situation by not ... by just not hiring or not renewing vacancies, not filling vacancies: or, at that time if the Leadership so desires, they can cutback. One of the things that I'm most fearful of is we have developed, on both sides of the aisle, good and competent staff. If we terminate the staff because because of the appropriation process and then you have to go out next May, June and hire staff, we it\*11 take years to train them to bring them up to the level and to the expertise that we presently enjoy. And it's for that reason that I offer this Amendment, which does... keeps the staff level, for next year, at this year's level. I would ask for your support."

116th Legislative Day

'ave' vote."

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative McClain." McClain: "Thank you. very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of House Amendment #2 to House Bill 2222. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this budget was prepared, I'm sure there SOME thought given to it, but what happened with the line item for our research staff is it went back almost two years to what we were paying research staff two years ago. That is a cut of a couple hundred thousand dollars. A 1 1 this Amendment does is replace those funds to the current year funding, which is an additional 200,000 dollars for that line item. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think both sides of the aisle are very proud of our staff, our research and Our appropriation staffs, along with all the other individual staffs. So, I think it's very incumbent on us, if we want to keep our competent staff, keep their morale high and keep the House being known for having good staff; that we ought to support this Amendment, and I urge an

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf."
Wolf, J. J.: "I request leave to take this out of the record, Mr.
Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman wishes to take the Bill out of the record. Out of the record. On the Calendar, on page eight, under the Order of Amendatory Vetos appears Senate Bill 791, Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich on the floor? Want to go with this, Representative? Are there any Motions filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion filed to accept, Representative Terzich."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur with the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 791. What he basically did, he said the Bill

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

provides for the Senate term Lottery, making necessary technical changes. However, the Bill attempts to ease the report and requirements with respect to public disclosure of campaign contributions. Currently, the law requires separate disclosure of all campaign contributions in excess of 150 dollars. The Bill increased it to 250 dollars, and he amendatorily vetoed this Section, bringing it back to the 150 dollars, and I would move for, you know, concurrence with the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Collins. Any discussion? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion that this Amendment of the Governor be adopted. You may recall we sent a Conference Committee Report to the Governor which dealt with several areas of the Election Code. One of them deals with the Lottery necessary to establish the Senate terms. Another Section dealt with the threshold required for the reporting of campaign contributions. The Committee Report had raised the threshold to 250 dollars. The Governor's Amendment lowers the threshold back to current level of 150 dollars, and I think, on balance, the Governor's Amendment should be accepted so that the other portions of the Bill can be enacted into law."

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

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Byan: "Indicates that he will."

Tuerk: "That is the only change made in the... As I recall, there was a Conference Committee Report. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Tuerk: "And that was the only change made by the Governor?"

Terzich: "Right. That's correct."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Tuerk: "And could you just, very briefly, review the other provisions of the Bill so that everybody knows what they're voting on final action?"

Terzich: "Yes, the file is being gotten. Actually, it says the... the Senate Bill 791 is a comprehensive revision of the Election Code. It provides for the distinction between Legislative District and Representative Districts in the election process for Senator and Representative. It establishes more detailed provisions with respect to the initiation and processing of petitions for public question and petitions for Constitutional Amendment. In addition, it deleted references to cummulative voting procedures, which are now obsolete, and the Bill also provided for the Senate term Lottery by making necessary technical changes in the statute."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Koehler."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Koehler: "Representative, when you were talking about the increase... the other requirements for the petition passing, does this not increase the burden on groups who might be willing to pass a petition to put a question on the statewide ballot?"

Terzich: "Only in the part that they have to sort the petition when they file. That was all."

Koehler: "And file them with each separate election jurisdiction?"

Terzich: "No. It's still filed with the State Board of Election."

Koehler: "Well, it's filed with the State Board of Elections, but it also requires that they file them with each of the

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

separate 111 election jurisdictions in the state, a copy."

Terzich: "Yes, a copy is correct."

Koehler: "Well, I certainly agree with the Governor on his reduction veto from the 250 to 150, but I still am very concerned about the increased requirements embodied in this Bill upon groups who might wish to petition and put a question on the ballot. So, thank you though, Representative."

Terzich: "You're welcome."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Byan: "Indicates that he will."

Ropp: "Does this provision now have anything to do with appointing people to parties that have no people running, at this point, prior to the fall election?"

Terzich: "It... Supposedly, it reconstitutes the representative Committees that are currently are Legislative Committees, which are not changed."

Ropp: "In other words, someone can still be appointed to run this fall in the fall election?"

Terzich: "Yes, they probably can right now."

Ropp: "Okay. What is the last time that they have to be specified prior to the November election?"

Terzich: "It's the understanding here is, what, fifteen days...

fifteen days before the election or fifteen days before the
final certification. One or the other, I'm not sure."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move for a favorable vote on concurring with the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 791."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

to Senate Bill 791?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar, on page two, under the Order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 2066, Representative Katz. Would you like to hear the Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2066, a Bill for an Act to appropriate a sum of certain named estate. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "This is a reappropriation of funds to the estate of a taxpayer who died. He had a slight refund of a few dollars that was due him under the Illinois Income Tax Law. Due to the fact that he was not living, he did not secure a check for that amount. This would appropriate the amount of money which is a very modest amount of money, about 150 dollars, which would be a reappropriation of a refund that was due this Gentleman. It would go to his widow. I would move for the adoption and passage of House Bill 2066."

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

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

Speaker Byan: "I'm sure he will."

Preston: "Representative, who is this individual that's getting this refund?"

Katz: "He is a ... a constituent. It's a late constituent. It's the estate of James O. Spencer. It was a request to me from the attorney for the estate of James O. Spencer. I'd be glad to show you the refund checks, which were paid to him, which were not cashed. I have a photostat of that money, and this simply appropriates the money to the

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Comptroller so that he can honor the checks that were paid to this gentleman and give credit to this gentleman's estate for two checks; one for 75.42 and the other for 75.48."

Preston: "Representative, why... I'm not clear."

Katz: "His name was James..."

Preston: "There was a refund made to him by the State of Illinois, and he did not cash the checks."

Katz: "Yes, he died in the interval."

Preston: "And why couldn't his estate now... why couldn't those checks be deposited in an estate account?"

The checks were stale, and the State Comptroller could not reissue them because the period... the year had passed, and it will require additional funds for the appropriation of the money in a different fiscal year. So, all this does is reappropriate the money in a different fiscal year to the State Comptroller so that he can honor the checks that were given to this taxpayer, during his lifetime."

Preston: "I see. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite the fact that this is not budgeted in the Governor's budget, I would urge all the Republicans to support this measure in a spirit of bipartisan support, which I hope will prevail during the rest of the Third Reading of the Bills."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is... Did you want to close, Representative Katz? The question is, "Shall House Bill 2066 pass?". All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 152 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

declared passed. House Bill 2115, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2115, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave to move this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 2115 to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections?

Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 2115 has now been... now on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Yourell. Are there..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Ryan: "Amendment #3, Representative Wolf."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the Sponsor's Wolf: cooperation in bringing this back. This Amendment 600,000 dollars Capital Development Fund for the Sand Ridge Fish Hatchery to insure that it's construction can continue on, on schedule. The approved change orders have virtually eliminated the required construction contingency and change orders for the Hatchery waste treatment system, mandated by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency alone, have cost of 367,800 dollars. These funds are needed to fund pending change orders and provide the desired the contingency for the construction work under the contract. in keeping the project on schedule. I would to point out that these are capital funds. They are not general revenue funds. The bonds are being retired by the increase in fishing license fees, which this General Assembly has imposed on the sport fishermen of Illinois. and the Department... or the Bureau of the Budget has given their approval. I have a letter to that effect, and I would

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- appreciate a favorable vote on the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Thank Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make an you, announcement that the 90 students from Gompers Junior High School, which lies about four blocks west of my house, and led by all the teachers from their group: 'Shainecker, Mrs. 'Newheart', Mrs. 'Divine', Mr. 'Erb', Ms. 'Polaris', Ms. \*Medlock\* and Ms. 'Spain' are in the Republican side up there. Ninety people from Gompers Junior High School in Joliet."
- Speaker Ryan: "Welcome. Welcome to the Illinois House. Further discussion on Amendment #3? Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Yes, can... Mr. Speaker, can the Clerk advise me as to how many Amendments are on this Bill now?"
- Speaker Ryan: "I didn't hear you, Representative."
- Yourell: "Could the Clerk advise me as to how many Amendments are on the Bill, presently?"
- Speaker Ryan: "How many Amendments, Mr. Clerk? 3, 4 and 5.

  We're on 3. There's two more after this one."
- Yourell: "Representative Wolf, I have a question. It's my understanding... Is this House Amendment #3, right?"
- Wolf: "That is correct."
- Yourell: "Alright, there's 4 and 5 on here. Now, what are we going to do with those Amendments? Those are the Public Aid Amendments."
- Wolf: "I would hope that they would be withdrawn."
- Yourell: "Well, one is yours, and one is ours. Have you announced this Amendment? Let's go to that, and then we'll get to four. I think we ought to withdraw those 4 and 5, before we adopt this one."
- Speaker Ryan: "I don't know how you do that, Representative."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Yourell: "Well, you're the Speaker. You tell me."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, I know. Well, it can't be done.

Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "I wasn't aware that there was one other one filed in my name. I intend to withdraw that one, and I would hope that the other one would be likewise, summarily withdrawn."

Speaker Ryan: "On Amendment #3."

Bolf: "... the adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, was this Amendment distributed?"

Speaker Ryan: "Yes."

Darrow: "Then, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates that he will."

Darrow: "Representative Jacobs, why is this going on the Treasurer's budget? Why didn't you offer it for the Department of Conservation?"

Wolf: "Well, first of all, this is an FY '82, which we need in order to insure that the project will continue on scale. Originally, there was some dollars introduced under another vehicle for FY '83. There is some concern, after speaking with the Fiscal Officer, that the money might not be there in time for them to finish the project; and, as I said, this is being retired with the fishing license fee increases which we imposed on the sport fishermen, and they'd like to see it finished and opened up."

Darrow: "Was there any mechanical reason why this couldn't be offered for a code department budget? Why are we using a constitutional officer's budget?"

Wolf: "This is Capital Development Fund money, and it was the one vehicle that was available that would be for FY \*82, rather than FY \*83. I did speak to the Sponsor about it. He agreed, and that's why we're using this as a vehicle."

Darrow: "Thank you."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I stand in opposition to this Amendment. This one's going to be so much fun to vote against that I'd like a Roll Call vote on it."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Further discussion?

Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to House Bill 2115 be adopted?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Hr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf, on Amendment #4."

Wolf: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #4."

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

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Levin, on \$5. Withdraw \$5. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Leave to consider House Bill 2115 on Third Reading."

Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave to hear House Bill 2115 on the Order of Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Proceed on 2115 on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill again, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2115, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Byan: "Representative Yourell."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, House Bill 2115, supplemental Bill to the State Treasurer, and this new legislation is required before the end of this fiscal year; because, it deals with making the principal and interest payment from the various bond and interest retirement funds on the state's general obligation bonds. It's necessary to do this before July 1st, and I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2115."
- Speaker Byan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2115 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 158 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House stand in recess until the hour of 1:00 o'clock."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves the House stand in recess 'til the hour of 1:00 p.m. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House now stands in recess 'til the hour of 1:00 p.m. The House will be in order. The Members will be in their seats. Page three of the Calendar, House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2190, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Byan: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. House Bill 2190 appropriates 1,844,794 dollars to the State's Attorneys'

  Appellate Service Commission for their ordinary and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

contingent expenses for Fiscal Year \*83. There were no Amendments offered in Committee on this particular Bill. It is an increase of 259,500 dollars over the previous year, or a 16.4% increase. This agency, which is headed by our former colleague, Kenny Boyle, of course, is doing an excellent job, and I would solicit the affirmative votes of the Members of this House."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2190 pass?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 139 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2191, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2191, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Arts Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this appropriates 2,409,000 dollars for the Arts Council for Fiscal Year '83 for their ordinary and contingent expenses. I would have my hyphenated Cosponsor and the Chairman of the Subcommittee, the Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative Winchester, be there to answer any questions and to close."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to support this Bill; however, I think that the Governor erred, when he took such a big cut in the Arts Council. We heard in debate yesterday on Amendments to the Illinois Arts Council appropriation that Illinois ranks 36th in per capita funding for the arts. I think that's a shame in itself. We heard that we spend only 25 cents per

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

capita, while the national average is 50 cents for the arts per capita. For us to have a 34% cut in such a vital area. and then use the excuse of the fiscal times, I think is in error; and, as I said yesterday, we are often compared with other states and, with other states around us, we compare miserably, even with Ohio and Michigan, other industrial states that are having severe fiscal crises in their We heard yesterday that many stood on particular areas. floor of the House and said, rightfully, that the matter of funding the arts is a good investment. business, and many of us think that. And I going to support this, but I'm grieved that, at this time, the Governor chose to cut this hudget by 36%. And I, reluctantly, am going to vote 'aye'."

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

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, maybe not to this Bill. I'm probably not recognized for this purpose, but I would suggest perhaps that you move to the Order of the Equal Rights Amendment and we might get a rapid improvement in the attendance on the House floor. That's just a suggestion."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Wolf, I understood you to say that this was 2,400,000, but didn't Floor Amendment #5 add a million-two to that? So, it's now three million-six something or other, which is either at or exceeding last year's appropriation?"

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Winchester."

Wolf: "Yes."

Winchester: "Well, as the Subcommittee Chairman, maybe I should

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

answer that question for Representative Wolf. The Bill was... Representative Leinenweber, the Bill was originally introduced. The Governor's requested funding level was 2,409,000, and Representative Braun put an Amendment on yesterday, 1,275,000. We now have a total of 3,684,000 which is a 34.6% increase over the Governor's recommended level."

- Leinenweber: "Well, it's even more than that, isn't it? The way

  I figure, that's a 50% increase. If the Governor's

  requested amount was two million-four, and we added a

  million, two hundred and seventy five, the way I figure,
  that's more than a 50% increase."
- Winchester: "Well, my staff figured it, and that's what they came
  up with. But you may be right. Either way, it's still
  excessive."
- I think that's exactly the point, Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Nembers of the House. Here we are, I think this is the ... one of the first appropriation Bills, and we are exceeding the Governor's budget by 50, more than 50%. I happened to have been in the Executive Committee a couple of weeks ago when a Resolution was presented asking the Governor to come in with a new budget, because of the dire straights of the State of Illinois finances, which, at that particular time, the Democratic side of the aisle felt was about 145 million dollars too optimistic. So, if we're going to start out by increasing every one of Governor's OCE appropriations by 50%, where is all this going to end? I... I'm going to urge a 'no' vote on Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Braun?"

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With regard to this appropriation, I only caught the last part of the previous speaker's remarks. However,

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

as we discussed in the debate yesterday, the fact of the matter is, that the activities of the Arts Council really do produce revenues for the State of Illinois. You've only to turn on the radio and hear someone talking about, 'Come to Michigan and spend your money. Come to Nisconsin and spend your money. Come to - wherever - and spend to know that other states have already figured out that artistic and cultural activities bring dollars to their state. We have a tremendous investment in tourism here in Illinois. We have tremendous resources in artistic community, as well as our tourism endeavors, that ought to be protected. The funding on this Bill for the Arts Council is at a minimal level. We were successful yesterday in getting it put at the level of the Governor's budget last year, and I encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill, not only because of its contribution to the arts, but also because of its contributions to producing revenues for this state at a time when we so... so desire... so need those revenues in our state Treasury."

Speaker Who's going Ryan: "Further discussion? to close? Representative Wolf? Representative Winchester, to close." Winchester: "Well, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to remind the Membership as to exactly what the status of the Bill is now, and what it was when the Governor introduced Bill into the General Assembly. The appropriations, when the Governor introduced the Bill, was Representative Braun's Amendment increased it by 1,275,000. now stands at 3,684,000. This represents a 34.6% increase, or 50% increase, whichever percent of increase want to take. Everybody votes the way they want to vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2191 pass?'.

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed, by

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 121 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2193, Representative Holf. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2193, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Environmental Facilities Finance Authority.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Mr. Speaker, I would defer to Representative Winchester."

Speaker Ryan: "All right. Just a minute. I... I'd like to point to the Members of the chamber that we have a former Member with us, back, it looks like, at her old Representative Giddy Dyer, former Member of the there. House. Nice to have you with us, Giddy. Giddy. hasn't a thing changed but the players. The script is still the same. That's right. Good enough back in days, for those folks; they're good enough these days, for us folks. Now, who do you want to speak? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Illinois Environmental Facilities Financing Authority. The... The Bill appropriates 126,200 dollars, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I intend to support this Bill, too. However, I did want to note to the Body that the Authority had issued, up until March of this year, a total of 729.4 million dollars

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

in revenue bonds to finance the acquisition of pollution abatement facilities, and now, because of our severe economic conditions, we are finding it very difficult to issue new revenue bonds for... for these purposes. There have been additional requests for financing of 493.4 million dollars, which we are going to find it very difficult to find the resources for. Many of these requests are from public utilities, so I wanted to alert the Body that we are, because of our difficult economic times, finding it very hard to provide these revenue bonds, and I... I think that is a shame, but I am going to support the Bill, as presented to us."

- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Winchester, to close."
- Winchester: "Well, in closing, Mr. Speaker, this is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Illinois Environmental Facilities Financing Authority. It is 126,200 dollars, and I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2193 pass?'.

  All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed, by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 144 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2194, Representative Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations to the Department of Transportation.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2194 as amended reappropriates one million... or, 1,510,408,000, to the Illinois Department of Transportation for ordinary and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

contingent expenses for various highway and water... water resource capital projects. All of the items in House Bill 2194 have been subject to prior approval by the General Assembly, and passage is necessary to ensure payment to contractors for projects which are already obligated. House Bill 2194, as it now stands, is 163,479 under the introduced level by the Governor. I ask for a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2194 and the subsequent Bill 2195 relate to reappropriations and appropriations of the Department of Transportation. These are the first Bills that we considering on Third Reading that relate to a major agency of State Government. I stand here, now, to oppose both House Bill 2194 and 2195. The Department's appropriation Bills have been introduced higher than what was requested in the Governor's budget, and I... I feel, first of all, that there are reasons why this Body must oppose the agencies under State Government. First of all is the issue of how deep is the gap in the budget, as introduced by the Governor, because of the ... the fact that the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission has come before us and said that we will be short by about 158 million dollars, according to their revenue estimates. Also, this may be revised. There is indication to believe that the budget, introduced, could be short as much as slightly over 200 But, to the matter of the introduction of million dollars. the Department of Transportation, the appropriation Bills have 318 million dollars more than the original request of 2.3 billion dollars, as contained in the budget book. you and I have heard the 'Chairman of the Appropriations Committee come up before us, and tell us how

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

additional funds we are adding by Amendment, yet no one has said that we have added 318 million dollars by introduction - by introduction, more than the Governor's budget. For the most part, the increase has involved reappropriation... reappropriation monies from the Road Fund, and the Series A and Transportation Bonds. Ву understating their appropriation needs in the Budget Address, the Governor able to present a much smaller budget request to the press and the public, than is intended for introduction. effect of this, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that this is a strategy to depict the General Assembly as quote 'big spenders', when actually, the budget is being introduced at 318 million dollars more because that's what the Governor wants; and, he ought to say it. Now, someone presented me with a copy from the Builders Magazine of 1976. It ... It says, 'Jim Thompson's views on the Illinois highway program.', and ... and I ought to share with you a few of the quotes that I gleaned from that article. "We must start putting designated funds to work. First, we must stop diverting Road Funds to In spite of this very pious statement, and in spite of statutes enacted in 1979, Chapter 127, Paragraph 144-3, the Governor continues to divert funds in his Department of Appropriation, 38 million dollars from Road Fund. In... In contradiction to his own quotation. another quote from that particular article, and evidently, that was from his position statement of six years ago. Quote, We should develop an Illinois Roadway Development under the auspices of the Governor's Office. When the plan is complete, funding of the state should ... should proceed according to a definite set of priorities. Yet, recently, we passed legislation calling for the Department to submit every two years..."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "For what purpose... Just a minute, Representative.

  For what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative

  Vinson?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, we have a rule in the House that when a question is at issue, and the question is before the House, conversation will be limited to the question before the House, and I don't believe Representative Matijevich is doing that, and, in not doing so, he's violating the rules."
- Speaker Ryan: "Your point's well taken. Will you keep your remarks to House Bill 2194, Representative?"
- Matijevich: "Well, I'll speak to the next Bill. I really think, Representative Vinson, I... I don't know what tickles you as much as it does, but I really think that the whole subject is a matter of ... of appropriations under the Department of Transportation. I really believe addressing that issue. If ... If there was anything that I may have been straying. I may have been straying on to the next Bill, rather than the last one; but, I'm going to forego any further remarks on this Bill, because it is a reappropriation Bill, and withhold those remarks to the second, but on the second Bill, you, nor anybody, is going to shut me up, because they do relate to the issue. They relate to the matter of ... of Department of Transportation. They relate to the... to the administration, and I'm going to say them, and I've got a right to say them. So, on this I would urge the Membership to vote a 'no'. the responsible vote on this agency's budget."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Reilly... or from Morgan, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thanks. Thank you. He've never contemplated renaming the county, but it's, perhaps, not a bad suggestion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're going to hear this

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

story over and over again, I'm sure, on several of these Bills. The fact is that the Governor came before and submitted a budget to this Body and to the Senate that barely meets the basic needs of this state. agrees on that. It's a tight year. A lot of things had to in order to get to the level he submitted, but he did submit a budget to this state that deals with the needs that we have. Now, you're going to hear a lot of about revenue estimates. The fact is, there is no human being on earth who knows that subject matter at all. can stand before you today and say within five, six, seven percent of what we're going to have, come next June 30, and that's what we're talking about, and that means a range in forecasts of two. three, four hundred million dollars, up or down. So, anybody who says that Governor, somehow, has to re-submit his budget because the revenue forecast has changed, just doesn't understand subject matter, and is just hiding behind a smoke screen. The fact is, he submitted a budget to us that, at least. tries to deal with the basic needs that we have. The Democrats in the Senate, now, are trying to cut out basic needs that we should meet in this budget. The Democrats in the Senate are now trying to cut state employees' wages. They're now trying to take money out of all kinds of areas. The Democrats here, on the floor of the House, going to vote against funding Transportation. That is just Sure, that we can argue over the revenue estimates, but we must pass a budget that meets the basic needs. The Governor submitted one. It's at a reasonable There is no reason to change his revenue estimates. He is not changing his revenue estimates, and for the Legislature, because of the other Party, to say that we're not going to meet the basic needs of people in this state,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

and we're not going to pass any of these appropriations, because of some sound and fury signifying nothing about revenue estimates, is just plain wrong headed. responsible thing on all of these Bills is to move them along through the process, get them over to the Senate, receive from the Senate the Bills that they are passing to us, and deal with the basic problems that we have, as we go through this Session. Everybody knows, by the way, on the million dollars supposedly over, this reappropriation Bill. Everybody who\*s involved in the appropriation process knows that that's automatically adjusted several times during the process to reflect the unexpended balances... the unexpected balances of the contracts that are outstanding. It'll change again when it gets to the Senate. It'll change again when we get to Conference Committee. That is just another red herring. The fact is, we have before us, the basic operating expenses of State Government, and the responsible thing, we will do on this side of the aisle, is to pass those Bills and get on with the process of running State Government."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the passage of this Bill. Most of you know that I, along with several Democrats, offered House Resolution 828 to this Assembly, which called upon Governor Thompson to revise his budget document, in light of the revision of revenue estimates by the Illinois Fiscal and Economic Commission. That Resolution was assigned to the House Executive Committee, where, along strict Party lines, it was defeated. The Republican majority in the Rules Committee has refused to consider Democratic proposals, which would provide for decoupling of the Illinois Income

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Tax from the Federal Income Tax..."

Speaker Ryan: "Hould you confine your remarks to House Bill 2194, Representative?"

Madigan: "I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. Which would provide approximately 40 million new dollars to the General Revenue Fund to balance the Governor's budget. In light of these actions by the Republican majority, and in light of the refusal of Governor Thompson to revise his budget document, we are faced today with a budget document which, very clearly, is not in balance, and; therefore, stands in violation of the Illinois Constitution. For those reasons, I plan to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it's not uncommon to hear the Minority Leader engage in political quackery, just as we've heard. On the one hand, the Gentleman talks about a political Resolution, which was rightfully killed in Executive Committee, the thrust of which dealt with the Governor's budget having revenue estimates in excess of what the yields actually would be, and the fact that we're spending more money than we have available. Well. Speaker, and Members of the House, all we have to do is remember the events yesterday and earlier this morning. was the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who have offered Amendment after Amendment, spending money. And, they have done so in the Appropriations Committee, likewise; and now comes the Minority Leader talking to us about fiscal responsibility, and the fact that he is going to lead his followers and ask them not to vote for House Bill 2194, and perhaps, some subsequent ones which are later to be called. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members the House, the Illinois citizens aren't as foolish as the Minority Leader thinks they are. You can't have it

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

both ways. You can't, in one instance, talk about not presenting a balanced budget, and that the Governor's revenue estimates and spending estimates are unrealistic; and, in the very same breath, instruct your followers to offer Amendments to spend more money and not explain to the Members of Assembly just how we're going the ultimately, find ourselves with a balanced budget. Speaker and Members of the House, if we wind up with excessive spending in Illinois, it'll be the Minority Party whom the voters would rightfully blame. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've gone through Second Reading. House Bill 2194 ought to be passed, just like the rest, even though, even though many Bills are burdened with the excess of spending of the Minority Party."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "To the Sponsor, how many of the projects here are...

in the reaprop, are frozen projects? Those that fell under

the Governor's freeze plan? Can you give us a dollar

amount? Specifically, the one..."

Winchester: "All right. In House Bill 2194, there are no frozen projects, I'm told."

Leverenz: "Are there any that have not gone to bid?"

Minchester: "Not that we're aware of, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would you consider taking it back to Second, and amending it to the Governor's original request?"

Winchester: "No. I want to move it, if you guys will guit the political haranguing. This is a good Bill."

Leverenz: "What happens... What... Well, I'm just asking questions. What happens if this Bill fails?"

Winchester: "Well, if this Bill fails, the contractors obviously are not going to get paid, for the... the many projects

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

that we've appropriated over the last several years. Many of them include big appropriations; 50, 60, 70 million dollars, that they're being appropriated so much money every year, so the bottom line answer to that question is, quite a few contractors won't get paid for the work that they've already performed."

Leverenz: "It was introduced originally at 1,192,000,000, is that correct?"

Winchester: "I'd say that's pretty close."

Leverenz: "Currently, it's 1,510,000,000?"

Winchester: "That's... that's correct."

Leverenz: "308,000,000 over the Governor's budget."

Winchester: "Subject to adjustment by the Comptroller's Office."

Leverenz: "But, that 308 is what somebody put in it, by Amendments, or as it was introduced?"

Winchester: "It's my understanding they weren't going to obligate
the funds in time, so that's why the... the Amendment had
to be introduced."

Leverenz: "And, that a Member on your side said that this should be settled by Conference Committee, rather than out here in the open, so that we all have input to it?"

Winchester: "I didn't hear that."

Leverenz: "A person on your side of the aisle said that."

Winchester: "I didn't hear it."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Please do."

Leverenz: "Thank you. Clearly, this shoots, with skyrockets, over and above what the Governor went out and told the world he was going to do, in terms of appropriations, for reappropriation projects, and the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle stands in support of a budget-buster. To that end, so that we can force this back to some sense of reasonableness, I ask that you vote 'no'. I intend to vote

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

\*no\* . "

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

Peters: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion prevails. Representative Winchester, to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, because Legislators on both sides of the aisle have been talk... talking about House Bills 2194 and 2195, I think a lot of Memberships may be confused ... a lot of the Members may be confused as to the actual Bill that we're hearing now, and... and what it does do. We're only hearing House Bill 2194, and 2194 is a reappropriation Bill, and for those new particularly Legislators, Democrat and Republican downstaters, what reappropriation means is that it is appropriations that have been approved by previous General Assemblies for various projects, big projects, that are now under construction, and at ... as ... as certain segments of that construction is completed, money is allocated to Comptroller's Office, and the Treasurer's Office to reimburse for... for those costs. Now, what we're doing if we don't pass this Bill, we're saying to those contractors, many of them in ... in your district, districts throughout the State of Illinois, that they're not going to get paid their money for work that they've already done; and that's what we mean by reappropriation. And, if you've got a problem with 2195, let's address that issue when that Bill comes up, but on 2194, let's talk about reappropriating money that is needed to pay for ... for work that's already been performed, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2194 pass?".

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Vinson, one minute to explain your vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would point out that yesterday, in debate on House Bill 2194, specifically, in a Motion to table Amendment #3 on the Bill, Representative Van Duyne was one individual who said that he would vote for the Bill if the Motion carried, and the Motion did carry, and I would invite Representative Van Duyne now, to follow through on his commitment to vote for the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, one minute."

Van Duyne: "I'm a man of my word."

Speaker Ryan: "I've always known it. Representative Wolf, to explain your vote."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I just would like to point out that in the past Sessions, the Gentleman from Lake, the distinguished Minority Spokesman Appropriations Committee, has always said, 'You all know these Bills are going to pass sooner or later. So, let's quit playing around and let's pass the Bills. We have to fund State Government. You know it's important. Be. won Amendments. We lost some Amendments. We're ready to some move on the Bills now. Let me tell you what alternative is, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. this Bill goes down, it is basically in the shape in which House has put these Bills. Like I say, we lost some Amendments, we won some Amendments, but basically, the will of the House has prevailed. The alternative is to send this... Bill will go down, the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations is going to shape these Bills the way

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

wants them, which is done in every Session. We've always argued about 'King Howie' in the Senate, and what... he has overlooked the House, and the House's will. That's what's going to happen. That's the alternative. I think we've got enough votes on the Board right now, Mr. Speaker. I've had my say."

- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2195, Representative Wolf. What... Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2195, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker: House Bill 2195 as amended, appropriates 1,150,576,000 dollars to the Illinois Department of Transportation for its FY'83 ordinary and contingent expenses for highway capital projects. represents 149.1 million of the 11.5% decrease under its FY'82 new appropriations. Amendment... There were at least one Amendment... As it now stands, House Bill 2195 is 48.1 million over the introduced level. This is primarily as a result of additions made by Floor Amendments, including a million dollar added back to the Road Fund Amendment by Representative Rigney. I would ask for a favorable vote." Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain." McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there are two issues that the Membership should look at with this appropriation. first one is ... Representative Clarence Neff, last year,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

had House Bill 753, now a Public Act, which required the Illinois Department of Transportation to submit a five year The Illinois Department of Transportation has not followed the statutes that we have passed. That five year master plan for highways and waterways, aeronautics, mass transportation, and railroad was supposed to be submitted us by January 1, 1982. IDOT has failed to do that. Secondly, I think it's very important for the Membership to know, that on Bills that are key to us... in other words, to funding the Road Fund, they took no stand. They were neutral on House Bill 2002. I think, for those two main reasons, we ought to hold off our votes until they become aggressive for the Road Fund, and for other needed transportation issues."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear the last sentence in Representative McClain's statement. I would remind him that his Amendment #14 was adopted to House Bill 2195 yesterday, and he made the commitment that, if I would vote for the Amendment, which I did, that he would vote for the Bill on Third Reading. Now, I think he ought to be a man of his word, just as Representative Van Duyne was on the last Bill, and I would invite him to vote 'yes' on 2195."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Vinson, I would love to have you in a court of law. I said 'I think so'.

I'm still thinking so. I gave no word."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I would just... I jotted down the precise words that

Representative McClain said yesterday, and I think if he

goes back and reviews the transcript, he'll find that this

quote is exactly right. He said, 'Yes, if you'll vote for

my Amendment'."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "All right. Let's keep the remarks to the Bill.

Representative Madigan, on the Bill."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I plan to vote against the passage of this Bill for the reasons that I enunciated on the previous Certain Members from the other side of the aisle Bill. have attempted to rebut what I have said in the record today, what I said before the Executive Committee, and what have said publicly since the beginning of this Session, but I have not heard anything of any substance, and no has come forward and said, We have this revision or the Governor's Office has that revision. Nothing's been offered. The clear, undisputed fact is that, this budget document is not in balance, that it violates the Illinois Constitution, and that anyone who supports this document in will be in violation of the Illinois Constitution, and for those reasons, I plan to vote \*no\*."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion prevails. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since I've been in the Legislature that the Chair has not allowed the Minority Spokesman of a Committee, when his light is on, to speak on an appropriations Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich..."

Matijevich: "If you want to do that, that's all right, but I just wanted to point..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Matijevich, let me tell you that I did call on your Minority Leader, whose light I thought was probably more important than yours, at the time; and, I

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

will continue to call on the Minority Leader when he seeks recognition. It's not my fault when the previous question has moved. Representative Peters, would you withdraw your request, so the Minority Spokesman can be heard? Proceed, Representative Matijevich. In violation of the rules."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I... I asked that very respectfully, because it is the first time I've seen that done."

Speaker Ryan: "On the Bill, Representative, 2195."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the... of the House, I think that many of us are aware that, last year, when the Department of Transportation appropriation Bill came before us, the Governor, at that time, had announced that that was the leanest road program that have had. This road program is even 145 million dollars leaner than last year's. Now, Representative McClain has. his remarks on this Bill, mentioned that the laws have not been followed. The laws have not been followed relative to both a five year master plan on all phases of transportation, just not on highway, but all phases: water districts, aeronautics, mass transportation, every bit of it. But, also the road... the law has not been followed, and we passed that Bill last year. You people voted for it, like I did. The laws have not been followed, also, on a five year road program. That was supposed to be admitted... submitted in April. In fact, the Members of the... of the Appropriations Committee can tell you that this year's road program was submitted to us on the day that the Bill was presented to the Appropriations That's how late this year's road program presented to us. Now, by ... by closing off debate, we haven't even heard about the matter of this year's summer road program. In other words, repairing of the asphalt program, and Members of the Committee were very concerned,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

because they're going to put a ... a less percentage of asphalt base on taking care of certain highways. to ... All of you ought to be concerned about that, because we're really not repairing the highways the way we should. and I'm not going to mention some of the quotes of six years ago, but, what's going to happen is, we are going to expend the funds this year, that we're really throwing down a rat hole, because we're not taking care of those highways the way we should; and all we're doing is putting on what I think is sort of a cosmetic political program for this summer. I just wonder... It... It may be the only people that it will satisfy is the Teamsters' Union. I don't know, and I don't know what that entails, but I really that ... that this budget, this appropriation Bill is one that all of us should vote either 'no' or 'present' on, for some of the... some of the things that have been said, and there are some other reasons, I think, that a \*present\* or 'no' vote is a responsible vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf.

Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates that he will."

Darrow: "At the present time, we have an office in Washington, D.

C., and it's my understanding that this is maintained through Road Fund revenue. Is that correct?"

Winchester: "Yes, that's correct, Representative."

Darrow: "And, approximately how much money from the Road Fund is going to staff an office for the Governor in Washington, D. C.?"

Winchester: "One second, please. 226,000 dollars."

Darrow: "And, how long have we been using Road Fund money to subi... subsidize the Washington office?"

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Winchester: "We don't know, Sir."

Darrow: "But, this is about 59% of the entire budget for that office?"

Winchester: "Yes."

Darrow: "All right. Now, turning to the contracts, I have a couple questions about those. There's a contract with Weather Corporation of America for 17,175 dollars, for weather reports. Is there some problem with the United States Weather Bureau, that we can't use their reports?

Or, why are we having that contract?"

Winchester: "I can't answer that question, Representative. I'm sorry."

Darrow: "Then, calling your attention to... let's see here...

700... just a small amount to American Management
Association of Chicago, 720 dollars to provide a four day
course in principles of professional salesmanship. Why
does the Department of Transportation have to have a course
in professional salesmanship?"

Winchester: "I can't answer that question, Representative."

Darrow: "Have you reviewed these contracts?"

Binchester: "Would you repeat that, Sir?"

Darrow: "Have you reviewed these contracts, that the DOT has entered into?"

Winchester: "I, personally, have... have not reviewed them myself, but it was thoroughly discussed in Committee."

Darrow: "From what you know of them, are you comfortable with these contracts, that have been entered into?"

Winchester: "Yes, I am. The reason I could not answer your questions, cause I could not remember, off the top of my head, Representative Darrow. I was trying to ask my staff for the specific answers, and of course, when you've got four or five people standing around you, sometimes it's difficult, but my... my personal answer to... to your

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- question is, 'Yes, I am. I'm satisfied with those contracts.'"
- Darrow: "And, if you had to go back to your constituents, you'd be able to justify these, then."
- Winchester: "Yes, I think I could, Representative, and I think you could, too."
- Darrow: "Well, to the ... to the Bill and to these contracts, I can't justify these with my constituents. We have a number of contracts, here. We've got 32,840 dollars to coordinate and promote vehicle occupant restraint systems: we've got another one, here, for 25,000 dollars to a Washington law firm, and their contract reads, 'For legal services, legal assistance, to assure that the Department has adequate legal representation at federal legislative hearings and proceedings'. Well, of course, a law firm's going to say you need more lawyers. They... they generate each other. And, you can go over one of these contracts after another. not to mention the one that was so publicized, and Straum', 272,000 dollars, that the Governor had for ten days of heated discussions over the transportation program and the RTA. We can go on, and on, and on. I can't go back to my constituents and explain why the DOT's entered these contracts. I don't think most of the Members here can, and I... I think that we should vote 'present', until we get the message to DOT that they should do away with the contract system and use in-house staff. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Further... Representative Winchester, would you care to respond?"
- Winchester: "Well, I would like to, Mr. Speaker. We spent almost two hours in Committee with Secretary Kramer, asking questions of some very influential, knowledgeable, Democratic Legislators, and Representative Kramer answered each one of those questions, one by one, apparently

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

satisfactorily, because no Amendments were offered to make any corrections, and I would... I respect Representative Darrow and his comments, because he is not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but, Representative Darrow, I would like to say that... that apparently, your side of the aisle was satisfied with those contract issues that you brought up; or, if they were not, Amendments would have been issued... offered."

Darrow: "Well, since I'm still on, I didn't know you... whether
you were closing. I really didn't ask you a guestion. I
was... I was just addressing the Amendment, but since
you..."

Minchester: "Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you asked me a question."

Darrow: "No. Since you continued, just let me say, the
Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard on this
side of the aisle, and your side of the aisle, but that
doesn't mean that your Members on your side, nor my Members
on my side, should just go along and not review this
legislation, and examine it for their own constituency and
their own districts. What might be good for Southern
Illinois may not be good for Cook County, and likewise,
other areas of the state."

Winchester: "That's... Representative Darrow, that's what I like about you. You're a man who thinks for himself, and not... and is not controlled by the machine. I appreciate that."

Darrow: "Well, I still vote 'no'."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Ryan: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "First of all, this 1.1 billion dollar budget, and I

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

personally appreciate the fact that the Gentleman withdrew his request for a... to close debate. This, is the budget that is probably one of the most important in State Government, as far as dollar amounts are concerned, and I'd like to ask a question. On page one, under contractual services of two million seven, is that the area where they paid 'Winston and Straum' 272,000 dollars for the transportation plan?"

- Winchester: "Yes, I'm being told that that's correct,

  Representative."
- Lechowicz: "And, is that also the same line item where you paid 75,000 for the RTA cash flow analysis?"
- Winchester: "I'm being told that that's correct."
- Lechowicz: "And, the 'Plumbers Cement' Association, 26,000 for a continuing comparative study. Is that also the same line item?"
- Winchester: "On that, I'm being told that it could be. We're not sure."
- Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are just a few items that, at the discretionary aspect of the head of the Department, or John Kramer, this type of money was spent for what he may have thought was a laudable purpose, but, unfortunately for the taxpayers in Illinois, there was no definite item that was improvement, as far as within the state, or within this budget, and I think it's important that we realize the fact that, yes we do require an adequate transportation budget, and I think that it's only fair that you would explain to this House what the summer program is, in reference to filling the respective cracks and crevices and potholes in this state, and where it's contained in this budget."
- Winchester: "I'm sorry, Representative. I was talking to my staff. I didn't hear the question. Would you repeat it,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

please?"

- Lechowicz: "My... My question to you, Sir, is that where in this budget in the line item, is the repair program for the State of Illinois, in reference to cracks, crevices, and potholes?"
- Winchester: "Well... If... Are you wanting the specific line item number, or are you wanting the total amount of dollars? I can tell you the total amount of dollars. We'll have to take a minute to find the specific amount."
- Lechowicz: "No, no, no. I'm going on the budget, now, and we'll go to the respective totals in a minute; but, I'm asking as far as in the budget, and I'd like to know exactly what programs and what priorities they are."
- Winchester: "Bell, I don't think we can tell you that,
  Representative Lechowicz, as to exactly what projects and
  what the priority is on it. We don't have that
  information."
- Lechowicz: "Well, I think we can start off, maybe, with Southern
  Illinois, Western Illinois, Central Illinois, work our way
  up to Chicago, if you would."
- Winchester: "I can assure you that in Southern Illinois, it's

  very, very few projects, and believe me, having to stand up

  here and take all this haranguing is... is very difficult

  when... when I don't have anything to gain out... to gain

  out of it, for Southern Illinois, but because I... I am a

  conscientious Legislator and believe in transportation, I'm

  willing to do it anyway. Now, what was your question,

  again?"
- Lechowicz: "What about the 21,000 for Southwestern Illinois area?

  You know about that one?"

Winchester: "No, Sir."

Lechowicz: "Well, it's 21,000 to 'Lidden, Meals, Weisler, and Katone', and they were supposed to develop a comprehensive

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

transportation policy for Southwestern Illinois. My question was as far as the road program, though."

Winchester: "Okay."

Lechowicz: "I'd like to know what roads are scheduled, and to what extent."

Winchester: "Well, I think that I'm going to be able to answer your question on page seven of the Bill, if you'd like to refer to page seven."

Lechowicz: "All right."

Winchester: "Line twenty-one through thirty-five, Section five."

Lechowicz: "351 million, yeah."

Winchester: "Then, we'll have to go to the... the... the road book, which I don't have a copy of, Representative. I'm sorry. To find the specific projects that DOT is recommending in that 351 million."

Lechowicz: "I don't believe that answers my question, though. you read that, specifically Section five, it says, 'The following named sum or so much as may be necessary to appropriate from the Road Fund to the Department of Transportation for engineering and contract costs construction, including reconstruction, extension improvement of state highways, arterial highways, roads, areas, access areas, roadside shelters, rest areas, fringe park... parking facilities, and sanitary facilities, and such other purposes as provided by Illinois Highway Code, and for bikeways as provided by PA 78-850 ...

Winchester: "Representative Lechowicz ... "

Lechowicz: "That does not answer my question."

Winchester: "Are you specifically asking me for a breakdown of all the road projects, their locations, and the total amount of dollars expected to be expended?"

Lechowicz: "I'm... I'm asking you for the summer road program."
Binchester: "Summer road program."

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

Lechowicz: "Out of Bouse Bill 2195. This Bill supposedly takes effect July 1. I'd like to know the amount of money that's appropriated in this Bill for the completion of the summer road program, where it's supposed to start, where and when it's supposed to be completed, what areas are affected."

Winchester: "Well, because you are a very influential and... and prestigious Legislator on that side of the aisle, I have asked the staff people to go and get a DOT book, and it shouldn't take more than ten seconds. If you'll just hold on, we'll try to get you that specific answer."

Lechowicz: "Fine."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Collins in the Chair."

Lechowicz: "Can I ask him some other questions in other areas?"

Winchester: "Yes, go ahead."

Speaker Collins: "Proceed, please."

Lechowicz: "We're waiting to get the over... overall plan. Is there any money appropriated in here for any additional airplanes, for the Department of Transportation. No?"

Winchester: "That's my understanding. That's what I've just been told by staff."

Lechowicz: "Could you give me a breakdown on page twenty-one: the amount of money that's sent to the Secretary of State,

State Board of Education, Department of Public Health, Law Enforcement..."

Winchester: "Obviously, Representative, you must be reading that from something. Why would you want me to reread it back to the Membership?"

Lechowicz: "Well, first of all, it's the Bill, and if you're the Sponsor of the Bill, you should be aware of the fact what this money is being spent for, and that's exactly what my questions are. What is this money being spent for?"

Winchester: "I know what it's being spent for, and I think you do, too."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Lechowicz: "Well, I'll tell you..."
- Winchester: "What was your specific question? We'll try to comply with it."
- Speaker Collins: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, request recognition?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the Gentleman from

  Cook has just about used up his alloted time on this
  issue."
- Speaker Collins: "I think he's about finished. Proceed,
  Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Hell, Mr. Speaker, you presume absolutely incorrect.

  I'm not about finished. My questions have not even been addressed, and I was kind enough to..."
- Winchester: "All right. Your last guestion, Representative

  Lechowicz, was involving traffic safety, I believe. Is
  that correct?"

Lechowicz: "Incorrect."

Winchester: "All right."

- Lechowicz: "Page twenty-one, Secretary of State. I'd like to know what they use that money for."
- Winchester: "Okay. Yeah, it's on page twenty-one. Now, you want to know... you want to know personal services? You want telecommunications? What do you want to know?"
- Lechowicz: "I just requested to know what purpose is used in the Secretary of State's Office, in House Bill 2195."

Winchester: "For..."

- Lechowicz: "105,000 dollars. How come that money is not appropriated in the Secretary of State's budget, in lieu of 2195?"
- Winchester: "All right. It's my understanding that 100...
  there's 148,700 dollars for the Secretary of State's line
  item, and it's for the DUI enforcement program, accident
  reduction, and error accounting system."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What was that? Pardon me? I didn't hear you. I'm sorry."
- Winchester: "Okay. There's 148,700 dollars, and it's for the DUI enforcement program for accident reduction and error accounting system."
- Lechowicz: "Why wouldn't that money be appropriated directly in the Secretary of State's budget?"
- Winchester: "It's... It's my understanding, it's a federal safety program. The money is transferred from the Traffic Safety Division of the Department of Transportation, to the Secretary of State."

Lechovicz: "So, it's strictly a pass-through."

Winchester: "It's... Yes, it's a grant."

Lechowicz: "Okay. What about the Board of Education... State Board of Education?"

Winchester: "Okay. That ... The explanation is the ... "

Lechowicz: "And Public Health?"

Winchester: "... Is the same thing. It's 118,200 dollars for audio-visual restraint program, school bus driver training, and it's the same explanation. It's federal funds that goes through the Traffic Safety Division to the Secretary of State's Office, and grants."

Lechowicz: "And it's also, as far as the Department of Law Enforcement, it's all federal pass-through money, as well?"

Winchester: "That's correct."

Lechowicz: "The operation of automo guip... automobile equipment?

That's also pass-through money?"

Winchester: "That's ... That's correct. That's correct."

Lechowicz: "That's a new purpose, I guess. Do you happen to have the road breakdown for me, yet?"

Winchester: "I understand it's for the summer... You're talking about the summer payment program?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Winchester: "All right. It's 27,000,000 dollars, and it's listed, Representative Lechowicz, it's listed in this book, right here, which I'll be more than happy to let you have."

Lechowicz: "Where is it, in the Bill?"

Winchester: "It's within the 440,000,000 dollar road program line item."

Lechowicz: "Okay."

Winchester: "Which was on page seven, I believe."

Lechowicz: "And you say... what page was that in the booklet?"

Winchester: "In the Bill, it's on page seven. In the book, it's on several different pages."

Lechowicz: "Well, on the Bill... in the Bill, it's 351,000,000 for... for your programs, but it isn't justified."

Winchester: "Well, there also... there's also Series A Bonds,

Representative Lechowicz, on page eight. I think it's

74,000,000 dollars, on line eighteen."

Lechowicz: "Right."

Winchester: "But, you have to add..."

Lechowicz: "Does that mean we're paying our summer road program out of the Series A Bonds, now?"

Winchester: "No, I don't believe so, Sir. No."

Lechowicz: "Yes or no?"

Winchester: "The answer is no."

Lechowicz: "What are we using these Series A bonds for, then?"

Winchester: "For major highway construction projects,

Representative. And... And bridge work, which you, I

think, were the Sponsor of some Amendments not too many
years ago, for Series A bonding for bridges."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Collins: "Proceed, please."

Lechowicz: "I, personally, believe it would be a mistake of this

General Assembly to pass House Bill 2195, at this time. I

believe that this is a major item of state expenditure. I

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

don't believe that the Membership of this General Assembly has had their responses or their inquiries that they may had in their respective districts, answered have adequately. If you ever want a response or ... to your questions, now is the time to raise the question, before the Bill passes out of this chamber. I'm specifically referring to your respective own individual districts, and, you really want to have some input, please vote 'no' or 'present' on 2195, until your inquires have been answered. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, to close."

"Thank you, Nr. Speaker. I... I don't understand Winchester: what the rationing is from mу hoop friends, distinguished Gentleman from Chicago and his Minority Apparently, they want to hold this Bill in hostage for some political game, but to all the freshman Legislators and downstate Republicans and Democrats, be careful, as this ... as to this piece of strategy. If ... If the distinguished Gentleman from Chicago is so concerned about the individual Members' road projects, then he should have told them early, that the name of the game is that you get with the Department of Transportation early, before the budget is submitted to the General Assembly, and you work out those important priority work pro... road projects that you in your district, with Department of Transportation officials. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of

## 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

This is the funding that funds the Transportation. Department of Transportation. This pays for the of all the employees within the Department. It pays for the ... the operations of the snow plows, and the graders. mowers, and all those things that's necessary. couple of years ago, we got in some game playing. of the aisle, and we came very close to having to ... to go for a couple of weeks without paying our highway maintainers. and paying our bills, because we were trying to use Transportation's Bill as a hostage Bill. Let's... You know, let's not do that. Let's ... Let's be responsible Legislators, and ... and pass out a Bill that, in the words of the Gentleman of Lake, is a bare bones - and I'm glad he admitted that. It's a bare bones budget. It's less than year, but it does have 440,000,000 dollars for a road and bridge program. It does have 7.6 million for downstate transit programs. It does have 51.4 million for transit capital, with 80 ... with 84% of that 51.4 million going into the RTA region, and it has 7,000,000 dollars for inner... inter city rail, which many Legislators yesterday voted for some Amendments, because they have Amtrak and inter city rail in their districts, and this is important reason why they should fund this Bill. it's possible that we might be able to play some games with it, and do some things, or hold it in hostage, and get some additional projects for somebody else, but those times are We're responsible Legislators now. The press is watching us, so let's... let's vote this Bill out, forget it, and go on to the next Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2195 pass?'.

All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

all voted who wish? The Gentleman... Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

explaining my vote, two previous Legislators, Mautino: "In Representative Darrow and Representative Lechowicz. addressed the question of why are there so many dollars in contractual services for items not exactly related to building roads. I'd like to point it out, as well. approximately 22,000,000 dollars in services, not in road construction. For that reason alone, I'm voting 'no', on 2195."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just urge a more green lights up there, and let me... let me plead with this General Assembly not to fall into that trap. Don't... don't let the Senate Appropriations Chairman shape this budget and every other budget, as they have done in Let's make the House an equal partner. past. He \* ve adopted a couple of Amendments yesterday. They supported by Members on that side of the aisle who rose and spoke for... for the inter city rail subsidies, 5.2 million dollars, 38,000,000 dollars was added to the road program, against the anti-diversion. We discussed these Amendments. It was the will of the House to put those on. Gentlemen Ladies of the House, it just seems ludicrous to get up and spend time, countless hours of debate. Committee and on the floor, to put Amendments on a Bill, and then, not vote for the Bill in it final stance. Ιf this Bill goes down, you know what's going to happen in the Senate, and let me, again, rephrase the words of the distinguished Gentleman from Lake. You know we're going to have to pass these appropriations at one time or another. Why not do it now, and get it over with, and save ourselves

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

a lot of time and aggravation? A \*yes\* vote is the right vote at this time. I urge you not to fall into that trap, and don't be persuaded down the primrose path."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Buff."
Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. In explaining my 'no' vote, I would just simply
like to remind the Members that it was just a few months
ago that the Governor had announced that he was going to
suspend all state construction jobs, and I would... and
that was a time when he was working with '82 dollars in
the... in the Fiscal Appropriations. Admittedly, by the
Sponsor of this Bill, that he's going to be working with
less, and I sus... I suspect that the Governor has done
something rash, and a 'no' vote would affirm that."

Speaker Collins: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 96 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no', 16 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2197. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act making

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J.
Wolf. Pardon me, Sir. For what reason does the Minority
Leader rise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to you."

Speaker Collins: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "I have in front of me, a letter dated May 26, from Senator D'Arco, addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, requesting that Representative Brummer be assigned as the House Sponsor of Senate Bill 1496; and my question to you, Mr. Speaker; has the request of Senator D'Arco, a Joint Cosponsor of this Bill in the Senate, been complied with?"

Speaker Collins: "Well, that's the... That's not the matter that is before us at the present time, but we will look into it, and get an answer for you."

Madigan: "I missed your response."

Speaker Collins: "I said, that matter is not before us now, so while the question is probably out of order at this time, we will look into it and get an answer for you promptly."

Madigan: "Does 'promptly' mean today?"

Speaker Collins: "If possible, yes. Momentarily, if possible." Madigan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf.

I beg your pardon. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, my very dear friend, former

Senator Bill... Bob Mitchler has brought some new Memorial

Day speeches. I know quite a few of the Members are making

Memorial Day speeches, but I'm sort of appalled, they're

mostly Republicans. I hope some of the Democrats are

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- getting involved in some patriotic things, but anyway, I've got some new speeches."
- Speaker Collins: "Well, what are... What appalled... What are you appalled at?"
- DiPrima: "Apples."
- Speaker Collins: "You're appalled, and chagrined, and what else?

  At what?"
- DiPrima: "But, anyway, I've got some new speeches that Bob
  Mitchler brought over, for any of the Members that would
  like to... they're going to address some Memorial Day
  programs."
- Speaker Collins: "Thank you, Representative DiPrima.

  Representative Wolf, please proceed."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to defer to Mr.

  Bower, my hyphenated Cosponsor on this."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Effingham."
- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingence expense of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. It appropriates 219,287,300 dollars. The '83 request is 14.6% less than the '82 appropriations. There were no Amendments on either... in either Committee, or on the floor of the House. I would ask for a favorable vote, and answer any questions."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
  Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill. I've found that
  this agency is one like many other agencies in the state,
  and I think we're going to see this as time goes along,
  that is impacted by the loss of federal funds. The
  Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for
  administering twenty-seven federal grant programs. Of the

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

twenty-seven programs, the funding for five major programs could be reduced from sixteen to twenty percent, because of the loss of federal funds. For example, the Clean Air Act, Water Pollution Control Act. the Resource Conservation Recovery Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act - grants that to the heart of air pollution, water pollution, and noise pollution, will be severely impacted by the loss of federal I've... I've found that when we look at certain funds. polls. one thing is very surprising. I've noticed in some votes in the... in the House the last couple vears. manv people seem to be turning away and becoming, quote 'anti-environment', and polls all around the country suggesting that one thing that the people are still very, very concerned about is the matter of water pollution, pollution, and noise pollution; and I think that we, as a Body, should be very concerned about that. So, I think, if we su... support this appropriation Bill, we are saying, in effect, that we agree that the Federal Government can... could ... should continue to reduce severely, the funds that come to the state, so that we can effectively enforce these types of Acts. I think that is a dangerous stance, and, therefore; I am going to vote "present" on this Bill, and I would urge the Members also, to do so."

Speaker Collins: "Mr. Madigan, your light was flashing, and it's out now. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to respond, if I could, to some of the comments that Representative Matijevich just stated on this piece of legislation. This Bill is a perfect Bill for all of us to hook exactly on what Governor Thompson does with President Reagan. President Reagan is cutting our Illinois Environmental Protection Agency up to 20%, and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Governor Thompson is not aggressively going towards their... except... and to cure the 20% reduction. Illinois will be severely hurt because of those 20% reductions in Director \*Carlson\* does a good our department's budget. job, he's a man of his word, and he does a very good job in trying to secure the Illinois Environmental Protection He is not being supported by the Governor of this state by going to the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and requiring from the Federal Government, a replacement of those funds. The second is; if you remember last year, Representative Ted Meyer and I had a Bill which would cure the automobile mandatory emission control standards for the Chicago area and East St. That Bill was defeated. The Director of the Environmental Protection Agency has repeatedly gone to the Governor. 'We must do something, or we may have sanctions imposed against us because we do not have an inspection plan in the State of Illinois for those two program and metropolitan areas. The Governor has refused to act. For those two reasons, because the Governor has refused to protect Illinois, both from sanctions and from the loss federal dollars, I ask for a 'present' vote."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters.

Peters... McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All
those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', opposed,
'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Effingham,
Representative Bower, to close."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's interesting how the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle keeps coming up with novel excuses not to

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

vote to keep State Government operating. This Bill was one of the few that the Democratic Party didn't offer any Amendments for, so apparently they thought that the Governor's budget was adequate in this area. It is an important agency, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2197 pass?'.

All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Rep... J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "It's all right, Mr. Speaker. Not necessary."

Speaker Collins: "Oh, he withdraws? Have all voted who wish?

Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are

104 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no', 47 voting 'present', and

this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority 
Boucek, 'aye' - is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman

from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you

rise? No, it was for purpose of a rec... introduction, I

know that. Is the Minority Leader on the floor? I'm

prepared to respond to his guestion. All right. We'll...

We'll call... We'll call another Bill in the meantime.

House Bill 2198. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2198, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget."

Speaker Collins: "Out... Out of the record. House Bill 2199."
Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2199..."

Speaker Collins: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "A Bill for an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, this Bill appropriates 3,000,931 dollars in General Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year '83 ordinary and contingent expenses for the Office of the Governor. There were no Amendments offered in Committee by anyone, and this appropriation is a reduction of 3.4% over the previous year's budget. I think it's a.. tight, bare bones budget, and I would ask for the affirmative vote by the Members of this House."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize it is trodi... traditional that this House and the General Assembly always support Constitutional Officer's a appropriation Bill, and send it sailing out. we've always done it, no matter what they put in it, almost blindly; and, however, I'm going to vote "present" on this Bill, mainly and purely from the fact that I really believe that the whole matter of coming to this General with a budget that, I think, is about 200 million dollars out of whack, is a responsibility that ... that the Governor had that he didn't live up to, and I think it's very strange that we pass by the Bureau of the Bud... Budget's appropriation Bill, because the fact of the matter is, that that Gentleman is the architect of this budget that gaping holes in it, and he should have faced up to that fact on Third Reading in it ... in it's appropriate order; but, since we passed over that appropriation Bill, I really think that this Bill is one where we can, on this side of the aisle, register our opposition to the fact that we were given this budget, and all of us know why it was given to us in such a way. I think we ought to speak in very clear terms, that Bob Mandeville shortchanged education by a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

significant amount, and he really thought that, well, he's going to put the onus on ... on us Legislators. The budget not only has a 200 million dollar shortfall, but he said, "Well, I'm going to make the Governor look good, but let's make the Legislature look bad, and if they want to add more monies, let them impose a tax. The Governor has. reluctantly, in fact I've read some press clippings from some on the other side of the aisle: some, of influence, on the other side of the aisle. who have said that the Governor really has put some distance between himself and ... and new ... increases in taxes. In other words, he's proposed some tax increases, yet, he's done that purely for the press, knowing that he doesn't want to be aligned with any tax increase. I realize there are some arms waving, and you don't like to hear that, but that's a fact; therefore, I think ... "

- Speaker Collins: "Excuse me, Sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, rise?"
- Ebbesen: "I was wait... Mr.. Mr. Speaker, I wish he'd address the Bill, and quit giving a political speech."
- Speaker Collins: "Well, that's John's nature. Please direct yourself to the Bill."
- Matijevich: "You know, if you... all you have to do is disagree with it, Joe, but I think that there are many who will agree with it. Many on this side of the aisle know it's a matter of fact. I think there's many reporters who haven't been fooled by all the rhetoric. I surely wasn't fooled by it. So, I would urge the Members on this side of the aisle to give us a 'present' vote on this appropriation Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

  Conti: "Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to interrupt at this time, but I know he might be leaving shortly. A man that's been a Member of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

this Body, comes from a very well respected family. His father was a nationally recognized labor leader. Carl 'Solstrum', a former Member of this House. In the back, on the Democratic side, there."

Speaker Collins: "Welcome back, Carl. Always good to see you."

Conti: "He was a good Republican."

Speaker Collins: "Is there further discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2199 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. Would somebody vote Representative Leinenweber Representative Collins \*aye\*? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take On this question, there are 113 'ayes', 8 the record. \*nays\*, 46 voting \*present\*, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed\_ Representative Madigan. In response to your question about Senate Bill 1496, we are in receipt of a letter from Senator D'Arco addressed to the Assistant Clerk of asking that Representative Brummer be named Sponsor of that Bill... House Sponsor of that Bill. Number Representative D'Arco is not the principal Sponsor of the Bill. Representative DeAngelis is. His letter, even probably not proper, in light of House Rule 30(d). are also in receipt of a letter from Senator DeAngelis, the principal Sponsor of the Bill, asking that Representative Reilly be the chief Sponsor of that Bill, and his Bill is directed to the Speaker, in keeping with House Rule 30(d), the rule has been properly followed, and Representative Reilly, and, I... I'm told, Representative Giorgi are the Cosponsors for that Bill. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in response to the ruling of the Chair, I think that any of our Members can consult their Digests and see that Senate Bill 1496 is sponsored by DeAngelis hyphen

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

and Geo-Karis. In... In my understanding, given all of the years that I have served in the House, where there is hyphenated Sponsorship, it has meant that there is joint Cosponsorship; that each of the Sponsors has an equal right to the Sponsorship of the Bill. In this case, Mr. D'Arco has filed, with the House, a letter which clearly that he wishes Mr. Brunner to be a Cosponsor of indicates the Bill. You may object to the form of Mr. I \* m sure that the letter could be retyped to conform with the House Rules. The point I wish to make that the person who, according to the Digest, is listed as a Sponsor of the Bill in the Senate. wishes Mr. Brummer to be his Sponsor. My view is that Speaker Ryan does not want Mr. Brummer as a Sponsor because it Brummer's candidacy for reelection against Mr. Bower, a Republican Member of the House. So, what we have is another example of the Republican Majority using and abusing the Rules of the House and the prerogatives of Majority status..."

Speaker Collins: "I beg your pardon, Sir..."

Madigan: "... To advance the political cause of its Members."

Speaker Collins: "If you'll refer to House Rule 30(d), you will see that it is silent as to the Sponsorship of the Bill, and states that the Senate Sponsor may remove the House Sponsor, upon written communication with the Speaker. Representative Reilly."

Ryan: "Well, just ... just to inform ... "

Speaker Collins: "The Speaker, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Representative Madigan, it seems that every time things don't go your way, the rules are abused and misused. And I'm tired of hearing it, and I'm sick of hearing it. The rules are pretty specific about who will be the Sponsor of that Bill. I don't know

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

what you're so paranoid about Brummer for, and I didn't even know that there was a request over here to make him the Sponsor of the Bill, but if he needs that for his reelection, he's in bigger trouble than I thought he was. And so, I think that we'll continue to follow the rules as the Chair has outlined, and Representative Reilly will be the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from 'trouble', Representative Brummer."

Brunner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the other Mr. Speaker. There are hyphenated Sponsors in the Senate. One of those hyphenated Sponsors asked me to be one of the hyphenated Sponsors in the House. I had filed a slip to be a hyphenated Sponsor, in accordance with the request hyphenated chief Sponsor in the Senate. I certainly have no objection to Representative Reilly being a hyphenated Sponsor. In fact, I was told that Representative Reilly and I were going to be hyphenated Sponsors with regard legislation. I have since then been informed that the ... it was too politically sensitive to allow me to be a hyphenated Sponsor on that. 1 find that Apparently, the... the political impact is interesting. more important than the substance of the legislation. In keeping with the request of the hyphenated Sponsor in the House... I mean, in the Senate, Senator D'Arco, I would pursue my request that, in accordance with the ... his request that I be added as a hyphenated Sponsor, it would that ... that fairness and equity would indicate that, when there are two hyphenated Sponsors, each of them ought be able to, at least, designate one hyphenated Sponsor in the House. That is what has occurred here, and I find it interesting that the Calendar that was printed, showing Sponsorship of the Bill, which, as I understand it, allows

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the Bill to be then read into the record; the Calendar today indicates that I was... I am the Sponsor of that Bill, once that Calendar is printed and my name is on there. The Bill was read into the record, but it was read into the record with Representative Reilly. Again, I... I would certainly be glad to sponsor that Bill as a hyphenated Sponsor with Representative Reilly. I would ask that my name be added as a hyphenated Sponsor, in accordance with what the rules would apparently indicate, and what justice and fairness would dictate."

Speaker Collins: "The Sponsor of the Bill in question, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief, 'cause we've got more important things to do than to argue over the Sponsorship of this Bill. The fact is, that a lot of people have been running around, including the Minority Leader, over the last three weeks, talking about Representative Brunner being one of the Sponsors of this Bill. Until after all of these events that we're talking about occurred, no one. human being came to me and said, Neither the Minority Leader nor Representative Brummer came to me, who had been designated weeks ago as the guy who was going to carry this Bill in the House, and asked that he be a Sponsor.' I think this is an important Bill. I think it needs bipartisan support. I approached one of the Members of the Democrat Leadership, who is, indeed, on the Bill hyphenated chief Sponsor. There's nothing political about that. I had asked him a couple of weeks ago if he join with me in that cause. That's where we are. rules provide that the chief Sponsor designate can House Sponsors. Cannot designate them; and, in any event, just ordinary courtesy would suggest whoever the chief Sponsor in the House is, he is able to pick his own

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Cosponsors, not somebody from the Senate. Let's go on with the business of the House."

- Speaker Collins: "House Bill 2200. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2200, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, or the Gentleman from

- Will? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."
  Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
  the Assembly. This Bill appropriates 250 thou... 53,500
  dollars for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the
  Office of Lieutenant Governor for Fiscal Year '83. This is
  - approximately half of what last year's budget was, because the position is currently vacant, and will not be filled until next January. There were no Amendments offered, either in Committee or on the floor of this House, so I see no reason why we can't pass this. I would ask for an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, events over the last year have sort of made a mockery out of this whole appropriation, and this whole position of the Lieutenant Governor. This is the position in government, constitutional position in government that former Lieutenant Governor Dave O'Neal walked away with. At... At one time, he ran for office saying how much he had done, and then he walked away from the office saying that there was very little to do. I happen to disagree with the fact that this office could not be one that could be vitally important to State Government and if someone occupies that position, and has little to do, that's the nature of that person, or it is the fact that that that person is held down by the Governor. One of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

those two instances, evidently, must have occurred when former Lieutenant Dave Governor ... Dave O'Neal held that position. So, therefore, we have a... an appropriation this year that is a half-year appropriation, you might say, because the Office of Lieuten... Lieutenant Governor sits vacant. Some of the duties of the Lieu... Lieutenant Governor have been placed in the Governor's Office now. I'm going to, again, vote 'present' on this, because of the way that the position has been made a mockery of. that. in future years, that anybody who occupies the position of Lieutenant Governor, occupy it in the way that many of us have seen in the past, has been used in a very aggressive manner in issues that are helpful to, for example, senior citizens, to consumers, and in many, many ways, a Lieutenant Governor can be very, very busy going about the business of the ... protecting the interests of ordinary citizens of the State of Illinois. I hope returns to that, but right up until now, because of the way many have, I think, abused the Constitutional Office and made a joke out of it, I'm going to vote "present"."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the had the privilege of being introduced to State Government when I served as Administrative Assistant to Lieutenant Governor Neil Hartigan, some years ago. I think the Lieutenant Governor's Office is an extremely important office that can be extremely effective in leadership various areas of State Government in Illinois. I think, though I ... many other situations, I have been reluctant to go along with some of the appropriation Bills because they haven't been satisfactorily explained. In the case of the Office of Lieutenant Governor, I think that office can

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

restored to the great status that it should have been until now, and I think it's been a travesty and an unfair travesty, the treatment that that office had received at hands of the former Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, Mr. O'Neal, who made a mockery out of that office and of Constitutional Government in Illinois, by walking away from an office, saying you can learn everything there is to know in ten minutes. Perhaps, it took him only ten minutes to realize that he was unable to learn the effectiveness that be brought about through that Lieutenant can Governor's office, and I'd urge people to vote for this appropriation. I think when this office is again filled under the provisions of Illinois law, that it will be an office of leadership in Illinois Government."

- Speaker Collins: "Representative Davis, are... are you seeking recognition? The Gentleman from McClain, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We, on this side of the aisle, and especially myself, will be watching the Speaker's vote very closely on this particular Bill, whether it be red, green, or yellow."
- Speaker Collins: "Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative...

  The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, does seek recognition."
- Davis: "To close, if there's no further discussion to close,
  Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Collins: "I don't believe there is. Representative Piel, are you seeking recognition? The... The previous question, we don't need. Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Well, simply to ask for an 'aye' vote, and to assure the Members of the other side of the aisle that Lieutenant Governor Ryan is going to serve with a great deal of distinction, a great deal of dignity, and a great deal of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

fervor; and bring back the kind of things you would seek in that office; and, you're going to see a great deal of our great Speaker in that Office of Lieutenant Governor. Recommend an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2200 pass?'.

  All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

  Representative Nelson, 'aye'. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 47 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2201. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2201, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

  Davis: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Office of the Court of Claims. There were no Amendments offered in Committee. The appropria... The appropriation level is up by only 0.9%, less than 1% for this year's request, for a total amount of dollars of 4,010,600 dollars. I don't believe there were any questions of any significance in Committee. I don't believe there should be any here, and I would move for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

Darrow: "Why is there 100,000 going out of the Road Fund for the Court of Claims?"

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Will."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Davis: "Those are to pay the claims awarded by the court,

Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Why are they coming out of the Road Fund?"

Davis: "Because, they're Road Fund related."

Darrow: "In what way? Harlan Rigney and I want to know in what way they're related to the Road Fund. We're very worried about our Road Fund in downstate."

Davis: "Whatever claims that are presented to the Court of Claims that are related to road maintenance work, or to payment of bills, or to anything that in the Department of Transportation that goes to the Court of Claims, are paid through that particular endeavor."

Darrow: "Why don't you use General Revenue Funds from the Department of Transportation's budget?"

Davis: "Because, I didn't think of it."

Darrow: "Why don't you think about it next year? Thank you."

Davis: "Okay."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, is there any money... Will the Sponsor yield?

Representative Davis, is there any money in there for
'Medley Movers'?"

Davis: "No."

Speaker Collins: "We'll put it in, in Conference Committee. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Collins: "Indicates he'll yield."

Leverenz: "The total amount of the appropriation is four million?"

Davis: "That's correct, Sir."

Leverenz: "Por things that happened as a result of actions in the

Department of Transportation, what is the aggregate amount

in the Bill now attributable to the Department of

## 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Transportation, inasmuch as they received the highest amount of recognition in last year\*s Court of Claims budget?"
- Davis: "Well, we can't answer that guestion, Representative Leverenz, because no claims have been paid for next year, yet."
- Leverenz: "Aha. Caught me in the back. I apologize. This is your operations... OCE. This... Okay, I'm on a different Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will,

  Representative Davis, to close."
- Davis: "I would simply ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2201 pass?'.

  All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 136 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2202. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2202, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "Who's presenting this Bill? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's no change in this Bill from last year. However, there has been an Amendment added by Representative Matijevich, adopted in Committee, that breaks out a line item from the income fund of this Commission for land acquisition within the medical center area in the City of Chicago. I don't think there's any

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

controversy. I'd recommend an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Collins: "Is there any discussion? Does the Gentleman wish to close? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2202 pass?'. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 139 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2203. Out of the record. House Bill 2205. Out of the record. House Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf.

  Or, is it the Gentleman from Morgan? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2206 makes appropriations for the operations of the Dangerous Drugs Commission, in the amount of 16,893,100 dollars. I'd be glad to answer questions, otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The guestion is, 'Shall House Bill 2206 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. 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 160 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2207. Out of the... House Bill 2208. Read the Bill,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2208, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly. This is 2208. We took 2207 out of the record."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry for the delay. The Bill is the appropriations for the Human Rights Commission.

  It's in the amount of 382,700 dollars. It's for their operations. I'd be glad to answer questions, otherwise,

  I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2208 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman. I'm sorry, I didn't see your light."
- Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm pleased to see 127 green lights up on this Bill. It... It is kind of strange, that... that legislation of this sort would receive 125 votes, when we are still waiting on the floor of this vote... of this House for an opportunity to give the appropriate attention to a measure which affects every citizen in the United States, and our children, and our children's children. I'm referring, of course, to the Equal Rights Amendment. I..."
- Speaker Collins: "Excuse me, Ma'am. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, arise?"
- Wolf, J. J.: "On a point of order. We're on Third Readings,

  House Bill 2208. She just lost seven, eight, nine votes.

  If you want to keep it up, we'll lose the whole Bill."
- Speaker CollinS: "I would suggest that the Lady direct her remarks to the Bill."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Chapman: "Hell, I... I was directing my remarks to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I was indicating that I was voting "yes" on the Bill, even though there were Members of this Body... This is the kind of fun and games that some Legislators in this Body have been playing with the Equal Rights Amendment ever since 1972."
- Speaker Collins: "You're not... Please address your remarks to the Bill, Representative Chapman."
- Chapman: "I am addressing my remarks to the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "You're over your minute. By... Representative Leinenweber, wote me 'no', please. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no', 20 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the House, we'll go back to House Bill 2207, to pick up the one we just passed. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2207, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Bights. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the operation contingent expense Bill for the Department of Human Rights.

  It is, in total, \$3,444,000. It is for their operations.

  I'd be glad to answer questions; otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor (sic). Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Huff: "Representative Reilly, on line 21 of House Bill 2207, there's a line amount of 943thousand... That's not my question. I'm looking at the wrong Bill. But let me ask you this, Representative Reilly: the amount of monies that the Department of Human Rights Commission expects to receive from the Federal Government is indicated as \$435,000. In Fiscal Year '81, they received \$700,000. Can you tell me why that amount is reduced?"

Reilly: "Yes, Representative. As part of the general budget reductions enacted by the Congress, that amount...the total amount for the country was cut, and we proportionately got our cut."

Huff: "Okay, so that does not necessarily reflect the change in priorities of the Department itself, but rather a reduction engendered by action in the Federal Government."

Reilly: "That is correct. Yes."

Huff: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from...the
Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, to the Bill."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, here is another measure that presents an opportunity for Members of this House to show how they feel about equal rights for all of our citizens. Let's see if, in voting on this Bill, you snicker; you sneer; you make jokes; you giggle. This is a chance to show the women of the State of Illinois how you feel. Let's hear some more snickers, and some more giggles, and some more jokes about equal rights. I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Darrow: "Has there ever been an Affirmative Action Program filed

## 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- or any...any...What we have here in our notes is that the Department here was unable to break out a list of their employees based on race, sex and salary. Have they been able to do that yet?"
- Reilly: "Yes, it...and in fact, actually by the time of the Appropriations hearing that had happened. It is true that the Department initially made some errors in...Their numbers just didn't add up. I've admonished them and several other Members have, but that has been corrected."
- Darrow: "What is the sex break down of this Department, male versus female?"
- Reilly: "I don't have the Affirmative Action Plan here. But just a second. Maybe I can get that number. About 60/40 female."
- Darrow: "And in terms of the 60 percent female, how much of the appropriation goes to the females? How much to the males?

  Is it true that the male employees make substantially more than the females overall?"
- Reilly: "No. In fact, truthfully, with this Department, if you were going to do Affirmative Action for this Department, it would have to go in the opposite direction from Affirmative Action, both on..on racial composition and sexual composition, than in the typical Department."
- Darrow: "What involvement has the Department had with regard to sexual discrimination...with regard to the Equal Rights Amendment? A number of the opponents to that say we have sufficient laws to protect the women and we have sufficient departments to look after their rights. How many problems have been resolved through this Department as to the sexual discrimination?"
- Reilly: "I can't tell you over the years how many sexual discrimination complaints they have brought to completion.

  They did just complete a case involving Marshal Fields and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

have solved...worked on others over the years. I don't know that that is...is by any...I'm by no means trying to say that that means there are no problems left in that area, but they have been active in that field."

- Darrow: "But you have no idea how many complaints have been filed by women concerning discrimination?"
- Reilly: "I'm sorry. We just don't have that...that number here.

  There have been about 15 percent of the total number of
  cases that the Commission...that the Department, and
  ultimately the Commission, handles are..fall into that
  category. But, what that growth number is, I just don't
  know."
- Darrow: "If a woman were discriminated in employment today and she came before the Department of Human Rights for assistance, what's the time span before that complaint would be resolved? What's the average of settlement?"
- Reilly: "Jurisdictionally they have to resolve it within 300 days. The average is a good less than that, 130, 140 days.

  But the average doesn't mean very much because some cases get resolved with a phone call and other cases become major legal undertakings of investigation and ...and so on. But the average would be in the neighborhood of 120, 130 days."
- Darrow: "But isn't it true some of these discrimination cases have taken up to two or three years and even longer?"

Reilly: "Yes."

- Darrow: "What are you doing about those? How are you shortening the time period?"
- Reilly: "Hell, the Department...In the first place, that's a shorter average. The average has gone down since we created the...the Department. They have worked at that in a variety of ways. They've added more...more people, as they did in the...as we did in the first year when the Department was created. They've started a systematic

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

investigation process that..that will unit...that will deal with this. Basically you put more resources in and you try your best to..to speed them up. 'Joyce Tucker', who's the Director, is very aware of that problem, and has been working on it. It has gotten better. It's still by no means perfect."

- Darrow: "On occasion do they advise the people who come in to complain to go through the court system?"
- Reilly: "I don't know, but I would assume so. I mean, there..there are some cases that...I would suppose, were ..an employee of the Department might see that ultimately the matter's going to end up in the court anyway. And..and that advice may be given. I don't..I don't personally know of a case where that's happened."
- Darrow: "And what effect would the enactment of the Equal Rights

  Amendment have on this Department?"
- Reilly: "It would have no effect on the Department other than, I guess, the, you know, whatever moral force the..and whatever laws, court decisions, whatever, might be made in..in response to that. But directly, at least, the Department would still have its work to do and continue doing it."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean,
Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Now I know we are attempting to save on money. Can you explain to me briefly why we have a Commission and also a Department that apparently is attempting to do the same thing?"

Reilly: "Yes. They don't do the same things. What they do are related. In order to avoid having the prosecutor, the

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Judge and the jury all be one and the same, the Department was set up intentionally to prepare the case, to do the investigation and in a sense to be the prosecutor, if, indeed, a prosecution is warranted. The Commission is in the form of a Judge or a jury, however you want to look at it. In other words, if the matter doesn't get resolved simply at the staff level, and an action has to actually be filed, it's heard before the Human Rights Commission. But, they don't duplicate each other's efforts. There's...they...they do different things, but they're...it's a related function."

- Ropp: "Well, one other thing. It's been somewhat indicated this has something to do with the Equal Rights Amendment, and by
- Reilly: "...It has nothing at all to do with that."
- Ropp: "Okay. But some have said that. That the example that we are seeing on the first floor about fasting maybe to give a real bare bones kind of a budget, we ought to oppose this."
- Reilly: "I..I won't respond to the pun. But I would say that, in fact, we're confusing issues here. This is simply an ordinary operation of government. It's been around a long time. However you feel about the other question, this stands separately."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."
- Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The
  Lady from Cook, on this Bill and the previous one,
  attempted to interject the ERA issue. I would suggest to
  her that she speak to the Speaker and perhaps he would put
  a special call for the ERA, and then we could go on with
  the business of the House for the rest of the Session."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Minnebago, Representative Swanstrom."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves the previous guestion. The question is, "Shall the main guestion be put?". All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye", opposed 'nay'.

  The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, to close."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from Rock Island asked a number of guestions of the Gentleman from Morgan, and I would just like to remind the Members that the Director of the...is the..of the Department is Joyce Tucker, a Black female. And if he's suggesting the fact that...or the possibility that she might be discriminating against females' employment, I would have to think that that would be ludicrous. I would also ask that many of the Members of the House not follow the suggestion of the Lady from Cook to show how you feel about ERA, but rather, put the 'yes' votes on the Board and pass this appropriation."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2207 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 11..11 voting \*present\*. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2209. Out of the record. House Bill 2210, out of the record. House Bill 2212, out of the record. Bill 2213, out of the record. House Bill 2215, out of the record. House Bill 2216. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2216, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Vinson."

you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Vinson: "Thank House. House Bill 2216 is the ordinary and contingent Bill for the Liquor Control Commission. introduced, it provided for nine hundred and fifty-one eight hundred dollars for the Commission's thousand. functions. I believe, as everybody knows, the Commission's primary function is to regulate liquor in the State of Illinois. The Committee adopted Amendment #1 which added a position of chemist III back into the request, a total of twenty-six thousand, six hundred dollars. The rationale of the Committee in adding that Amendment back, which was not a partisan issue, was that the chemist III actually generates revenue for the state because, by having the chemist III, we can expeditiously make the kinds of tests on alcoholic content and so forth, which permits us to apprehend violators of the state liquor laws. I don't believe the Bill...there's any controversy in relationship the Bill, and I would move for its passage at this point."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2216 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

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 144 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the Gentleman...Representative Ebbesen, 'aye'. House Bill 2218. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2218, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2218 is an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prisoner Review Board. It would appropriate five hundred and ninety-eight thousand for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Board. There were no Amendments offered in Committee, and I would move for passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2218 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 167 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting this Bill. 'present'. And having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2219. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2219, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Racing Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2219 pass?". All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Only to notify the Members, I didn't hear anybody present the Bill. This is the Bill for the Bacing Board.

  I do support it, in spite of the fact that in Committee they said they're..they're going to ask for an additional forty-four racing dates, yet could not tell the Committee that it would mean one cent more in increased revenue.

  And I thought that was sort of ludicrous. But I do support the Bill."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Collins: "Well, the Bill was presented by Representative Vinson in his usual lucid fashion. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 131 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2220. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2220, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Officer of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "I really have to do it this time, Mr. Speaker? House
  Bill 2220 appropriates one million one hundred and thirty
  thousand five hundred dollars as introduced to the Office
  of Commissioner of Savings and Loans for its Fiscal Year
  '83 ordinary and contingent expenses. No Amendments were
  offered in Committee, and I would move for passage of the
  Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Hearing none, the question is...Oh, I beg your pardon. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn, John: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Collins: "Indicates he'll yield."
- Dunn, John: "Can the Sponsor tell me what the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loans is doing about the problems that we read about in the Chicago newspapers with Savings and Loans all across the state losing money right and left and watching their net worth decline and consolidating and facing the possibility of closure?"
- Vinson: "Representative, the Commissioner's Office as..as aggressively as permitted under the fiscal situation in

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

recent years examines Savings and Loans, state authorized...state chartered Savings and Loans to ensure that they are fiscally sound and meet the requirements of the law and the regulations of the Commissioner. There has been, it's my understanding, ongoing cooperation between the Commissioner and the Federal Regulatory Authorities, and I believe that is largely the extent of the answer to your question."

- Dunn, John: "Are all the Savings and Loans audited on schedule as required by the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loans?"
- Vinson: "The estimates are that about 85 percent of the associations have been examined in accordance with the law."
- Dunn, John: "How many Savings and Loans have ..have closed in the

  State of Illinois in the last Fiscal Year, the Fiscal Year

  that we're now in? I'll...I'll change the question. How

  many have been closed or merged or recommended for closing

  or merger in the Fiscal Year?"
- Vinson: "Well, in Piscal Year 1980, there were 228 state chartered associations. In Piscal Year, in 1981, there were 214 state chartered associations. Now that doesn't necessarily mean that there were a reduction of 14 that were closed. That..that includes mergers and so forth, acquisitions."
- Dunn, John: "How many mergers and acquisitions were there?"
- Vinson: "There were a total of 14 mergers, acquisitions and closures."
- Vinson: "I think..I think, Representative, the ..the real effort on..in..in this regard, in the State of Illinois, has

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

actually been made by the Treasurer of the State in connection with the ..the public loan programs that the Treasurer has engaged in. The problem, as you know, has been that there's been an enormous outflow of funds over a long period of time from the Savings and Loans due to the prevailing interest rate conditions and the housing...the housing markets and the problems with the Savings and Loans portfolios. It's basically a fundamental economic factor that the State Regulatory Agency is ... about all it can do is examine and when it discovers a problem, highlight that problem and enforce the law in relationship to a failure to adhere...adhere to the law. But in terms of any effort to improve or bail out the .. the industry, the extent of that at the state level, I, personally, believe, has been done by the Treasurer, and I think the Treasurer has done a commendable job of doing that."

Dunn, John: "I really don't hear anything of..of substance. Has
the Office of the Commissioner conducted seminars or
arranged for meetings to discuss these problems and to try
to come up with recommendations for a solution, or try to
come up with a position to ..to take on behalf of the State
of Illinois to present to federal officials in the White
House and at the Federal Reserve?"

Vinson: "I'm not aware of whether they have done any of those particular things, Representative."

Dunn, John: "What is the staff of the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loans? How many positions do you have at the present time?"

Vinson: "Thirty-three."

Dunn, John: "Thirty-three for the entire state? That includes everybody; secretaries and everybody?"

Vinson: "That's everybody."

Dunn, John: "Is...Is that adequate? Can you..."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Collins: "Excuse me, Sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio, arise?"
- Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we seem to be getting into a dialogue here between our two colleagues. And I would move for the previous question."

  Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker Collins: "Well, your Motion is out of order, but I think your point is well taken."
- "Mr. Speaker, I'll terminate my questions and speak Dunn, John: to the Bill. We were discussing the appropriation for Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loans and that is.. that is the agency of this state to which is entrusted the care of the savings deposits of all the citizens of the State of Illinois, and whether they should or not, they have the impression that they can rely upon that Office to do something to protect their savings. And we read in the Chicago newspapers that the largest Savings and Loans our state are almost all in very serious financial trouble. number of them have been forced to acquire other Savings and Loans through the merger process to save them from going under. And in so doing, they have not only shown a loss in their operations, but they have watched their net worth reduced by as much as 50 percent in one year. This means that the Savings and Loan industry in our state has very serious problems, and we have only thirty-three people in the entire State of Illinois who are supposed to be worried about this problem. The Sponsor of the Bill has that the Office knows nothing about what is being done to attack the problem of protecting and the Savings and Loan industry in this state so that those little people, who are fortunate enough in these times to have a little bit to put aside, and who put it in a savings account, can have some assurance that it will be there a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

year from now and five years from now and ten years from At the present time, that attitude is very shaky. There is no real assurance about what will be here, let alone ten years, five years, what will be here next year. The Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loans should be taking an aggressive position. It should be showing leadership and demonstrating to the citizens and taxpayers this state that it is...it is determined to everything possible to protect the savings accounts of our That is not being done. I would urge an depositors. 'aye'..er..a 'present' vote on this budget until such time as we find that someone in this state is actively and aggressively trying to save the Savings and Loan industry." Speaker Collins: "Now, Representative Giglio, it would..it would

Giglio: "The previous question, Mr. Speaker."

be in order."

- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

  The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from..from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to close."
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I

  don't believe we'd have any impact on the Savings and Loan
  industry in this state and on its future if we added two
  thousand new employees to this agency. And so I would move
  for passage of the Bill as presented."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2220 pass?'.

  All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed
  by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
  Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, it's interesting that the..."
- Speaker Collins: "No, to explain your vote."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Leverenz: "Yes, my vote, and the Bill, the organization that is supposed to protect thousands of people with money in Savings and Loans, with 228 Savings and Loans in the state, can only get around to inspect and do the audits as they're supposed to do to 85 percent of those institutions. The exposure then runs to about 53 that get no visits at all during the year, and I think that's just absurd. I vote 'present'."
- Speaker Collins: "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 145 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 21 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2301. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2301, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."
- Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2301 appropriates fifteen million dollars from the Coal Development Fund to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources for the capital development of coal resources, that they add a power plant. The basic idea of this is to demonstrate a new technology to remove sulphur dioxide gas from the burning of Illinois coal, and encourage the development of Illinois coal and natural resources. There's been no Amendments placed on the Bill, either in Subcommittee or in Committee, or on the House floor."
- Speaker Collins: "Is..is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Collins: "Indicates he will. He says \*no\*. I\*m sorry."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Matijevich: "You've got to be kidding."

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

- Matijevich: "Representative Wikoff, this is an appropriation of fifteen million dollars. Was this in the Governor's budget?"
- Wikoff: "It was not in the budget, as such. This is from the

  Coal Research Bond Development Fund, rather than the

  budget."
- Matijevich: "Well, it's still in the budget. Those..those are going to be...Those bonds are going to be paid off with your tax monies just like they are with mine, right?"
- Wikoff: "Yes. But to answer your question a little more directly,
  we do have a letter from the Director of Budget, Dr.
  Mandeville, authorizing this."
- Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sure you do. But here's another example, Wikoff. Ι Representative remember vesterday that Representative Hoods Bowman caught all kinds of admonishment and heck from the other side of the aisle for some Amendments that were in the amount of a hundred thousand dollars or so. We caught beck for an Amendment that was three thousand dollars, yet here's a fifteen million dollars that is not in the Governor's In other words, what appears to look to all after the media is going to present what the General Assembly does is an additional fifteen million dollars beyond the figures given to us in the Governor's budget book. addition thereto, we ..we have a project here that is even thirty percent above what the Governor said would cost in his announcement to the press of February 26th. It's a thirty percent increase over that announcement. under estimates, this scrubber will cost current approximately two million dollars to operate annually, the Governor has told the University of Illinois that they

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

will be, quote, 'held harmless', quote, in effect meaning that all other higher educational institutions will be made to absorb the annual operating costs. What that means is that other higher ed institutions are going to be paying Now, that's going to be coming out of the costs annually. of education, of higher education throughout the State Illinois. Because of those reasons, and the fact that there's no supporting documentation, that converting to coal would provide a payback...that the conversion cost in one..in one and a half years, as was said initially when this project was proposed, because of those reasons, I really think that the responsible vote on this issue is a \*present\* vote. And I would urge the Members to vote 'present' on House Bill 2301."

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

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

Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

- Satterthwaite: "Representative Wikoff, I am looking at my Digest which indicates that the interest payments would run this total bill up to thirty-five point eight million dollars over the period of the life of the bond. Can you tell me under what time scale those bonds will be issued to come to that total cost?"
- wikoff: "That time scale estimate is on 25 years..on a 25 year issue. I think one thing that should be pointed out is the savings in..er..estimated savings in fuel alone is over four hundred and sixteen thousand dollars a month on fuel bills, as far as the University is concerned."
- Satterthwaite: "Is there an obligation that the bonds be issued for that long a period, or can they be issued for a shorter period of time?"
- Wikoff: "The state has been issuing some on ten years, which, of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

course, the interest rate would run a lot less if this is what is normally anticipated. But the ...I think with all expectations that there is no reason it couldn't be issued on a ten year basis. It's legal."

Satterthwaite: "Well. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. speaking on this Bill, I urge support for this Bill. find that it will be an added advantage to the state, as a whole, for this project to go forth, to be able to determine exactly what kinds of clean-up can be We have a system that has been burning Illinois coal. selected which will also result in a saleable product. instead of a waste product for which we might have problems The system that is being considered and, I of disposal. think, has been chosen as the one to be installed in this case, will provide a saleable product so that the waste disposal is not an additional problem. I believe that additional funds invested in this system will, in fact, pay off in the long run for the state in knowing exactly how we do conversions of this sort, and still end up by not polluting the air. I would urge, however, that we try to issue these bonds on a shorter term basis than the 25 year plan. When we're issuing bonds at a time of very interest rates, I believe, it behooves us to schedule them for payback in as short a time as possible so that we are not spending these extraordinarily high interest rates over this prolonged period of time, as a means of using Illinois coal and providing an experimental project that will really show how thoroughly we can clean-up the high sulphur content and still have a viable process. I urge support for this piece of legislation."

Speaker Collins: "Is there further discussion? Being...The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

if this..if this I would like to point out that legislation passes both Houses and the Governor signs it, then it's really authorization. And before the money can be spent, it has to be approved by the Energy Resources Commission. But, over and above that, I support it because this could be the .. the trial program for scrubbing equipment for all. for all of our state university systems, and for other state institutions, and could be a model for obtaining valuable research and information for industry to install scrubbers in their plants. The initial of fifteen, which could result in maybe being cost thirty-five million when you add the interest rates, could be invaluable to all other state facilities around the State of Illinois in..in obtaining valuable information and research that would result in lower costs for the types of scrubbers that they may put on their equipment. The bottom line result would be more Illinois coal being..being in Illinois, because at that point, purchased using scrubber...the scrubber process we can burn the high sulphur content coal that we have in the State of Illinois, which, in. which would again add many jobs and .. and would bring more money, more sales tax, more...different types of taxes to the State of Illinois. So, I would ask that the House support this Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The...Further discussion? Being none, the
Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, to close."

Mikoff: "Well, Representative Dunn and I are Cosponsors of the

Bill, and we'd just ask a favorable vote on the Roll."

Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2301 pass?'.

All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed
by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. Add Vinson, 'aye'. On this guestion there are 143

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2339. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to return House Bill
  2339 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment to
  be offered by Representative Terzich?"
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 2339 to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill will be returned to Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment # ... "
- Speaker Collins: "Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Terzich Topinka, amends House Bill 2339, as amended."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

  Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill adds 20 thousand dollars to the State Board of Election as a result of the passage of House Bill 2612, which provides for the automatic recount of the tabulat...of tabulating equipment for the elections. And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment #2 indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Speaker Collins: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I have leave of the
  House to hear the Bill on Third Reading at this time?"
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman now asks for the suspension of the appropriate rule so that this Bill may be heard on Third Reading at this time. Is there objection? Leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the State Board of Elections. In the Appropriations Committee we reduced the..the appropriation by five hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars. We have a new total now of four million, three hundred and nine thousand dollars. With the Amendment being added that's roughly four million, three hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is. 'Shall House Bill 2339 pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting there are 165 'present'. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 2399. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2399, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Scholarship Commission. Third

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Reading of the Bill."

adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan." Ronan: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Everyone's aware of what .. what we've got here. This is the nurse scholarship Bill, the Bill that พลร debated the last Session of the intensively during General passed it out of the House with Assembly. overwhelming vote last year, and it also passed out of the Senate, but unfortunately received a gubernatorial the Bill does is it provides scholarships for What they can obtain a baccalaureate registered nurses so The issue is very clear. We've got a nurse degree. shortage in the state. We need nurses to...to receive proper training so we can encourage them to keep in the profession. He're not doing health care any good if we're not providing the type of quality care that is needed for the citizens of the state who come under hospital nursing home or home health care needs. I urge for the

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf. J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Hembers of the House, again I must reluctantly get up and oppose this measure. As you we did act on it last year. The Bill did just know. Appropriations Committee, narrowly get out of the by one vote. It is eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I believe that's the figure, unbudgeted General Revenue Funds, and it is supposed to be for a scholarship program. Actually it's not a scho...it's not a loan, rather. It's really a grant because there's a year forgiveness provision in there and what it does four is it allows people, not on the basis of financial need at all, to acquire the so-called loan or grant and...in which

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

they would use to seek a baccalaureate to increase their salary, and once they have increased their salary through this, then if they stayed on the job for four years, the whole thing is forgiven. So it really amounts to a grant. It's eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars in unbudgeted funds, and I would be opposed to it."

- Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
  Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've all heard about the shortage of nurses. This adds to the quality of nursing and the quality of health care in the State of Illinois. We have programs in other areas of education in scholarship Illinois, and I don't see why the State of Illinois shouldn't embark on some modest type of scholarship program relating to the nursing profession. It goes to the matter of continuing education it's good. in the nursing profession, and I think that, in itself, I think in this era when we are looking to the matter of better health care for all of our citizens, that this is a good approach. So, I would urge the Members of the General Assembly to support this. The Sponsor had reduced it significantly...significantly from its original introduction. So, I would urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I do, indeed, reluctantly arise to oppose House Bill 2399. Let's simply say at the onset that this Bill just, like many Amendments which we debated today, have little by little added more and more to the budget, the bottom line of which we cannot totally disregard and turn our backs on. I would also like to repeat what the Gentleman from Cook has said in his remarks. Number one, this is not even a student loan. It

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

turns out that after four years it becomes a grant under certain circumstances. This legislation, in my view, will not necessarily give to Illinois more nurses. It's very conceivable to me that this legislation could simply encourage, which is a noble purpose certainly, encourage nurses who have certificate degrees at this point in time. simply to go forward and pick up their baccalaureate degrees under this student...what amounts to a student grant program, the net results of which would be not to additional nursing care to Illinois citizens. Now, I don't quarrel with a nurse moving forward to get her..his or her baccalaureate degree. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for the Member...for the Members to believe that this legislation will automatically increase the number of nurses in Illinois simply is not the case. If this legislation had built into it certain standards and was indeed a loan program, perhaps it would get more support. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as the Gentleman from Cook said a few moments ago, this is an unbudgeted item and somewhere, somehow the Members of the Legislature collectively must look at the total budget program, and I suggest this is a place to start."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

As usual, the Najority Leader gave his candid rambling speech ...had to wonder in and oppose the budget increase.

However, I think you ought to do it on the basis of reality. Number one, the idea that on the matter of adopting this provision and does it indeed deal with the nursing shortage, in fact, it does. There is a dramatic shortage of qualified people at the baccalaureate level eligible to teach programs which would allow for persons

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

to acquire their appropriate degree in nursing. We don't have that. The Commission that was formed with the Majority Leader's vote, I'm sure, to study the nursing shortage in Illinois addressed that particular problem very specifically. We did have before us last year \*81 a number which some scholarship funds could be wa ys in distributed. They did include baccalaureate diploma That was one of the ways in hospital nursing schools. which we thought that matter would be addressed. indeed, I think we ought to look at it in that respect. Also, last week, or a month ago now maybe, we supported eighty..eight hundred thousand dollars for programs and hospitals for nurses aids. At that point I rose in opposition to say, 'How can we afford eight hundred thousand dollars for a nurses aid who has no..no formal training and..and does her or his role in the orderly or willing to spend eight nurses aid role, but we aren\*t hundred thousand dollars for nurses training in the baccalaureate level? . So I think the Majority Leader wrong. I respect his role as a guardian at the door of the budget, but before you make those statements, you ought to realize or at least read the Commission report which think was done in ernest, had some opposition, had some support, but it deal..but it did address the idea of the nursing shortage. This will help it. I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

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

I will rise on reality, as the previous speaker says we're

not rising on reality. Let me clarify just one point, that

there's not a shortage. It's a myth about having a

shortage of nurses. And I'm a little bit confused because

last year they tried to introduce a Bill that would let

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

Canadian nurses come into the State of .. State of Illinois practice nursing. Ιn talking to hospital administrators, he says there absolutely is not a shortage. The shortage is created by the nurses that we do have now that do not want to work nights. They don't want to work the night shift. They don't want to work the They want to work a four day week, and that's what creates We do have plenty of nurses in the State of Illinois. and this is not ... I want to clear up this myth once and for all. We have plenty of nurses in the State of Illinois. There's no shortage."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell." Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is classic special interest Bill. It applies only to one select group of people, and that happens to be the nurses. There is no reason or justification for singling them out and saying that they ought to have special ..special consideration in this time of high unemployment and difficult economic times. You heard the same arguments terms of teachers' scholarships. We need scholarships in order to develop teachers. He now have an overabundance of teachers, all of them unable to be employed. not apply to unemployed nurses. It applies to those who already are qualified nurses. Now, what they re asking is, that the rest of the citizens of the state pick up their bill. I suggest that there is no rational reason for it and if you want to check the figures on the returns that the people who receive scholarships and grants, it was the nurses who stood at the top of the defaults. They were the ones who did not repay the loans. Now, I suggest to you that this is indeed a bad precedent. We're cutting down the money that we're willing to give our students who want to make some kind of .. or at least get to

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

a particular level, acquire some type of skill. I suggest to you that we are indeed making a mistake. The passage of this Bill would simply testify to the special interests and the lobbying skills of the people who propose it. There is no justification for it whatsoever. It is a bad Bill, bad in concept, and it ought to be defeated. We find here the greedy attempting to get ahead of the truly needy in the State of Illinois. And the Bill certainly deserves a 'no' vote and a resounding defeat."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel." Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have to disagree with the last two speakers immensely. You know, the ... I don't where they re getting their figures saying that there's not a shortage in Illinois. I think any of you that have been the hospital in the last two years you realize the technology is increasing year by year. like any And. profession, what you're going to have to have situation where people are going to have to become more and more attuned as to the changes that are going on specific field. What we are doing by this Bill is just trying to increase the nurses...the qualified nurses we have in the State of Illinois. There is an acute shortage of nurses in the State of Illinois, and we're saying to them, 'Fine, if you will be willing to increase your knowledge in this specific field by going baccalaureate degree in the nursing field, hey, we're willing to work with you and to help you out on a year basis as far as retu...reducing the scholarship that you've gotten...that you have received from the state'. don't think there's anything wrong with the Bill. I think it is something that would definitely help the health care facilities in the State of Illinois, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2399."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you that saw combat know the services that were rendered by the nurses in the hospitals throughout the..."
- Speaker Collins: "Now hear this. Now hear this."
- DiPrima: "All I say, let's give a vote for the angels of mercy.

  That's what I call them. Angels."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."
- "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen Hoffman: of the House, I would rise to remind you that very shortly we're going to be voting on appropriation Bills for general education to get young boys and girls to the point where thev can pursue a professional career and appropriations in the General Distributive Fund, alone, are a hundred million dollars less than we appropriated last year. And I think this is the kind of legislation which we have to give serious consideration, you know, to what kind priorities are we going to operate on. Are we going to say that all the boys and girls in the State of Illinois need the maximum amount of resources and we're already saying we're going to withdraw a hundred million dollars in one particular professional group, however deserving they may be, are going to get an increase in the neighborhood of ..well, four hundred thousand dollars over what they're present time. For this reason, getting at the Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I must vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek."

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

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and is Representative Hallock going to close? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock, to close."

- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. 1 should just allude to what Representative already said and to incorporate his remarks in mine. just let me remind all of you that, in 1973 we passed here a very good program called the Nurses Baccalaureate Assistance Program. The Members of the House strongly supported that idea. But since that time we have not funded that concept, and as a result we have in Illinois a current crisis, a nursing shortage exists Nurses are leaving their field and few nurses are entering the field as they have in years gone by. I would say to all of you here today, simply put, this Bill will resolve that dilemma, encourage nurses to remain in profession, go on to get further education and help all the people of our state. I say to you it's the right thing to do, and I ask for your support. Thank you."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2399 pass?'.

  All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hanniq. One minute."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to..to explain my 'yes' vote on this issue. As has been explained throughout the debate, there is a very severe shortage of nurses in Illinois. What we are trying to do here is provide an incentive for those people who are interested in this program to attend classes and become nurses so that the State of Illinois can solve this problem. We're talking about an amount of money which is

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

less than one million dollars. Just two Bills earlier we passed out a fifteen million dollar appropriation. I see we have an appropriate amount of votes. Thank you."

- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. The significant contribution of the nursing profession to the health and welfare of the state is well known. And this measure deserves your deliberate consideration and adoption at a time when we face the exodus from the field of the very best and qualified of these practioners."
- Speaker Collins: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Not to belabor the point, because the votes are there, but we..we realize that the nursing profession has to be upgraded along with the whole health system. As we get more and more complex in the kinds of equipment that we use in our health systems, we depend more and more on those service providers to have expertise of a very specialized nature. This is one way of helping to plug the nurses into those advance training programs that they need. They will, in fact, be a very great adjunct to the medical profession and help to take the load off those medical practioners. And I am happy to see that the votes are there for passage."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "I can see, Mr. Speaker, my pearls of wisdom aren't needed on this fine Bill, so I would just leave the time up to someone else."
- Speaker Collins: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 143 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2422. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2422, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2422 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Office of the Secretary of State. Received, I think, a hearing in the Appropriations Committee. The budget amount for this coming Fiscal Year request is one hundred and thirty-seven million, one hundred and seventy thousand dollars, as opposed to one hundred and thirty-one, forty-five, the year before, for an increase approximately five point five million appropriation..over appropriation for a four five ... four point ... four point two percent general increase. The operations part of the budget does call for raises for the employees averaging out the operations part, a nine point five percent increase. The head count of the office is reduced from thirty-seven twelve to thirty-six ninety, a reduction of twenty-two. The library grants are up approximately six percent from 18.107 million to 19.184 million. The federal grants received for various activities are roughly the same in each of the categories. However, there is an overall decrease of approximately three hundred thousand dollars, so that the federal grant monies would be reduced from six million to five point ... five point seven million dollars. The appropriation does provide for an increase i n

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

commodities and ... Section of the budget of approximately nine hundred thousand dollars. That increase is due to the purchase of additional license plates, which the office does need to maintain its supply. The library grants, as you know, are tied into the monies received by the schools. They are tabbed at approximately five point ... well. approximately six percent. as Ι indicated. appropriation does contain the agreed settlement between the various unions involved and the Office of the Secretary State regarding salary increases for the employees. is strongly supported by the Library Associations and the Library Boards around the state in terms of that particular portion of the budget. It is a budget which any Secretary of State can work well with and provide adequate services the people of the State of Illinois. I would ask and move the adoption of House Bill 2422."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to support Jim Edgar's budget. There were some questions posed to the Secretary of State by some Members of the Appropriations Committee. I received responses to most of those issues. Representative Leverenz had quite a few issues that he had asked questions about. I'm sure through some inadvertence, Representative Woods Bowman wasn't satisfied because one of his questions was not responded to. And I would hope that that was through inadvertence. But I do intend to support the measure and would urge Members of the ...this side of the aisle to also approve this appropriation."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

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

Speaker Collins: "Indicates he will."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Levin: "Representative, I've heard a rumor that a substantial number of positions..."

Peters: "Representative, it's false."

Speaker Collins: "The rumor is false. Are there... Is there further discussion?"

Levin: "If I may articulate what the rumor is. I think that
Representative Peters does know what I'm talking about,
but, I've heard a rumor that a substantial number of
positions in the Chicago area are going to be eliminated
and there's going to be new positions downstate. Now, you
know, I'm not somebody that gets involved in patronage. I
leave that to Representative Roman. But..."

Peters: "Representative, in answer..."

Levin: "...I, you know, I'm concerned about that rumor."

Peters: "Representative, in answer to your question, the total budget contemplates a reduction of approximately twenty—two employees. There are no plans in the office for any shifts of the kind that you are indicating are rumored some two or three hundred people, none whatsoever. As you may imagine and know, however, on occasion there are one or two people transferred continually between one office or another and that's a..a practice that has been under every Secretary of State because people have to go where they're needed at the particular time. But there are no..no plans for any major shifts of the kind that those rumors have instigated."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Representative Peters to close."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would just ask approval of the budget."

Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2422 pass?".

All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. 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 163 voting 'aye', 2

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Record Representative Hoffman 'aye', O'Connell 'aye' and Sandquist 'aye'. Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2455. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2455, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2455 represents a substantial amount of money. It's six hundred and sixty-three million dollars. In the legislation is embodied downstate and Chicago teachers retirement pay outs, drivers' education and the federal funds for grants and aid. This Bill was amended in Committee slightly downward by two and a half million dollars in federal funds. To my knowledge it has no controversy and I would move for the passage of House Bill 2455."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
Bill 2455. Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Fred, is your..is your dollar amount the one related to the pay out for this Fiscal Year? And if it is, can you tell us the percentages for the teachers retirement system?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, it represents about ..well, two hundred and twenty-eight point nine million dollars, and it's my understanding that this represents about a seventy to seventy-five percent range in pay out level. It's not a full funding, but I've been assured that the dollars represented in this amount will naturally assure every

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

teacher in the downstate and Chicago teacher retirement  $\mathtt{fund}_{\bullet \bullet \bullet}{}^{\mathsf{n}}$ 

Schneider: "If it's not ... Now we know that ..."

Tuerk: "Beg your pardon?"

Schneider: "Where...if that's seventy percent of the pay out, the other thirty percent is coming from where?"

Tuerk: "The.."

Schneider: "To reach one hundred percent."

Tuerk: "Hell, the money that's in the fund is invested, as you know, and the ...the interest from those investments help to meet the normal pay outs for teacher retirement."

Schneider: "So the investments are being reduced in order to meet
the pay out for this coming Fiscal Year, reducing
therefore, the dollars for future investments."

Tuerk: "Well, that's a possibility. But, the fact remains that that money in the fund is invested and there's always a naturally a...well, the higher interest rates of course would bring in more money. And therefore, it's going to make sure that that fund is sufficient so that the teachers will get their..their pay out level..."

Schneider: "Fred, just to give you one more question, and that is...Is the reason for the seventy percent that we need..those funds are being used for other programs in the state, or education programs? Is that your understanding?"

Tuerk: "Yes."

Schneider: "To the Bill, then, Mr. Speaker, Members. I would...Last year I think most of us were very ...pretty compliant about the nature of the budget, pretty...not so much maybe this year as we perhaps should be. But I think last year when the Governor said that he would take one hundred and ten million dollars out of the teachers retirement on a one-time only basis, that it could absorb that shock, that he would not do that again. I guess we

### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

all took him at his word. We all have a lot of wavs of viewing the budget, whether your priority is education or nurses scholarships or other things, but I really think we ought to give serious consideration before you vote in support of this as to how much longer a retirement absorb this kind of a beating. I can tell you only from my personal experiences, and I'm going to out of that, that of all the issues that are controversial on the funding side of education, the one most obvious teachers, like other retired people, that or anticipating retirement, resent seriously the fact that their dollars are going to be utilized for current programs. Because of that I think a proper vote is a 'no' that we ought to look to other programs coming across from the Senate to address our shortages as the decoupling provision, for example, and I would encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen the House, I, like the past speaker, am a member of the downstate teachers retirement system. I, too, prefer not to fractionally fund the pay out for this particular system. But I'd like to like...make two points, Ladies and Gentlemen. One point I'd like to make is that unless this General Assembly is willing to make the commitments that are necessary to enhance the revenue this state, we have no alternative but to look at those places in the budget of where we can share the burden that must be placed in order to support ongoing programs. of the logical areas to look is to look into the funding of the pension system, and looking into the pay out level of Ladies those systems. and Gentlemen, the teachers

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

retirement system has never been funded at a higher than it is at the present time. We're funded at 53.7 percent for ..at the end of fiscal year '81. dramatic increase in the funding level from 30 percent in So, given the 'givens', Ladies and 1972. Gentlemen, don't believe that we have any alternative but to support this appropriation Bill at this particular level. certainly would do us no good to defeat this appropriation and leave it unfunded. And certainly decoupling program and other revenue enhancement programs come across from the Senate are improved by this House, the opportunity to increase the funding of this particular program would be enhanced. I would suggest to you also that there are other appropriations in this, including the Driver Education Fund, which we did enhance the revenue levels last year, and you'll notice that that is at fifteen million dollar level. So, for those two reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to support the Motion made this legislation, and would encourage an the Sponsor of 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "What percentage of the drivers" education will be borne by local school districts under this budget?"

Tuerk: "There's more money in this Bill for drivers ed this year than last, and I am told that, with the increase for drivers ed, that probably forty-five, fifty percent by the local school district."

Darrow: "Well, is this a lower percent than last year? You and I both will go back to our districts, and we'll be criticized for not fully funding the mandates and here's the first

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

mandate we consider, drivers ed, and we're funding it to forty-five to fifty percent. What percent is this increased over the years, or have we gone down and we're coming up again?"

Tuerk: "I am told it is seventy-seven percent increase over last year. Local school districts will be paying less for drivers ed as a result."

Darrow: "Thank you."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have no problem with this Bill with the matter of federal funds. I have no problem with the matter of the increased support for drivers\* education. The issue that troubles me deeply is the matter of the seventy percent of pay out level for the teacher retirement system. us through the years who have been here for some time have received letters from teachers who have been on retirement, who have been deeply concerned over the years aren't adequately contributing the state's share in teacher retirements and other retirement systems. And for years many of us were able to answer our mail by saying, don't worry about it. We've always paid at the one hundred percent of the pay out level. And we're always going to do that, and we've felt comfortable about that position. all of a sudden, last year we changed that position. The first time in the history of Illinois, that we paid out at sixty some percent of the pay out level. All of us were told at that time, this is going to be a one-time thing. many times last year on the floor of this House there were Members who stood up on the floor and said that we had better be careful about the precarious situation of the retirement systems. If we were talking about priorities,

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the State of Illinois should be concerned about those matters that we have a commitment toward. And surely the retirement systems are an area that we have a definite commitment. We've got to make sure that the state lives up to its commitment in not only the teachers retirement systems, but all of them. So, and let's take the matter of the decoupling issue. If the decoupling issue comes to the floor, and we are saying that we aren't for decoupling, are in a sense saying that we are turning our backs to those teachers or those others in the retirement system who we have an obligation to, to fully fund their retirements, and we are saying that the corporations can get a tax break. Not any increase in taxes, but just paying to State of Illinois the obligation that they are paying this That's the matter of the decoupling issue. year. decoupling aside, I think that if you vote for this appropriation Bill you are saying that we are build in permanently probably that this state is not going to pay at one hundred percent of the pay out level. That s going backwards. I don't think any of you really want do that. You are only bending to the Governor's position. I see the Senate has bent, I guess, to that position. Ι think it's a mistake. I think we have to protect those who have done a service to their profession, have educated our children through the years, and now all they ask that they live in retirement. We have an obligation that they do that. And I'm going to vote 'no' because of the dangerous precedent that was set last year and now we look...it looks like we're going to build into it permanently. And I don't want to do that, and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Kelley."

Kelley, Jim: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous guestion.

The question is, 'Shall the main guestion be put?'. All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it. Representative Tuerk to close."

Members of the House, I, too, am concerned Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, and have been over the years, having been the Sponsor teachers retirement Bills over the past ten years or so. I'm concerned of the percentage reduction, naturally. can only assure you that even last year when the funds were cut appreciably, that no teacher in the state on retirement lost one penny in a retirement pay out. I would like to see it at one hundred percent level. I feel that over the years we can build back up to that level. I can tell you this, that this year's appropriation represents about million dollars additional funds over forty-three the present year. I would say that this is going to he mare than adequate to take care of the normal pay outs for teachers retirement and therefore,....And incidently, might remind the Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee, that the people he should be talking to are bis Democrat friends in the Senate, who, I understand, want to cut this even more and therefore, he ought to be talking to those people, convincing them that it should remain at this particular level, and should they cut the funds in the Senate, I would resist those cuts when it comes back to the House. I think this appropriation is at an adequate level. I would ask for passage of House Bill 2455."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
Bill 2455. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2455 pass?'.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by
voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Oblinger?"

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, because I'm the recipient of this
program, I think I should only vote 'present', rather than

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

have a conflict of interest."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote.

  Timer's on, Sir."
- Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of all times, it's very obvious we're letting down to a commitment we've made over the years. We've tried to retax really sound funding for many years. And the last two years or three years, sent legislation to the Governor and he keeps telling us that we can't do it because we don't have the money. And so we couldn't get any benefits. So we went along with that, and now we come up with a..with a program that's not going to fund the..the teachers pension as it should. We're talking about the same thing they're talking about in the Federal Government. People don't want their Social Security 'cut. They don't want their teachers' pensions cut, and that's the direction we're heading. And I would say, we ought to have a lot more red up there."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we ought to
  be voting 'yes' on this. The Senate has reduced the
  funding level of the teachers pension to sixty-two percent,
  which I think is unacceptable to most of us in this House.
  And I think that is the alternative. By passing this Bill,
  we are sending back a message to the Senate, that we feel
  the sixty-two percent level is unacceptable, and perhaps we
  can negotiate from that point. So, I would certainly urge
  additional green lights on that Board."
- Speaker Daniels: "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 90 'ayes', 67 'no', 9 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from DuPage,

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Representative Schneider, requests a verification. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk, requests a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Terzich, your light is on, Sir. Terzich?"
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees: Abramson. Bradley.

  Cullerton. DiPrima. Farley. Garmisa. Henry. Kane.

  Keane. O'Brien. And, Ronan."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Bradley as 'present'.

  Proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Ackerman. Alstat. Barkhausen. Barnes. Barr\_ Bartulis. Birkinbine. Roncek. Bower. Capparelli. Catania. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Domico. Jack Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Pawell. Findley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griffin. Hallock. Hallstrom ... "
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider, Representative Jack

  Dunn requests leave to be verified. He's right here, Sir.

  Does he have leave? Right there in front of you. Okay?"
- Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of Clerk the Affirmative: Hastert. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Karpiel. Jim Kelley. Klemm. Kociolko. Koehler. Krska. Kucharski. Kustra. LaHood. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Margalus. Martire. Mays. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCormick. Ted Meyer. Roland Meyer. Miller. Murphy. Neff. Nelson. Olson. Peters. Pullen. Reed. Robbins. Reilly. Rigney. Bopp. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Harry Smith. Irv Smith. Stanley. Stiehl. Swanstrom. Tate. Telcser. Topinka. Tuerk. Van Duyne ..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, change Representative

  Bell from 'no' to 'aye'."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative: Van

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Duyne. Vinson. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Zwick. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Ninety-one, Mr. Speaker. Ninety-one? Representative
Alstat?"

Speaker Daniels: "He's here. He's in his chair."

Schneider: "Representative Bartulis."

Speaker Daniels: "Bartulis, he's in his chair."

Schneider: "Davis."

Speaker Daniels: "Jack Davis, in his chair."

Schneider: "Show your forehead, Davis? Let's see. Alright that's close enough."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Schneider..."

Schneider: ".. Not that I don't trust the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider, Representative Bower walking up the aisle there asks leave to be verified. Does he have leave. Sir?"

Schneider: "Fine, that's alright."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Schneider: "Kucharski?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kucharski? He's in his chair."

Schneider: "McBroom?"

Speaker Daniels: "McBroom, Ed McBroom? Representative Ed McBroom? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Margalus?"

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Pechous wishes to be changed from 'present' to 'aye'. Record Representative Pechous as 'aye'. Okay. Further questions?"

Schneider: "Margalus?"

Speaker Daniels: "Margalus, Representative Margalus? He's in his chair."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Schneider: "Ropp?"

Speaker Daniels: "Gordon Ropp? Representative Ropp? He's in the rear."

Schneider: "Rogers? Stanley, Representative Stanley?"

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative McBroom has returned to the chambers. Return him to the Affirmative Roll.

Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "Yes, give me a..a weak 'aye'..very ... 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Record ... Representative Terzich has..."

Schneider: "...Is that a fireman retirement 'aye'? Is this a...How weak an 'aye' is this?"

Speaker Daniels: "...Excuse..Change Representative Terzich from
"no" to "aye". Proceed, Sir."

Schneider: "Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Roger Stanley is in his seat."

Schneider: "Representative Telcser."

Speaker Daniels: "Telcser?"

Schneider: "In his office?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. I can..would you like...Would you like him to come out, Sir? Okay. That's alright."

Schneider: "That's all. Those are all the requests. I fold."

Speaker Daniels: "Is that it? What's the count? Representative Vitek?"

Vitek: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "You're recorded as 'no', Sir."

Vitek: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Vitek from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Piel wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Bianco from 'no' to 'aye'. Telcser is in the rear\_ Representative Kornowicz as 'aye'. Change Representative Kornowicz from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative DiPrima from 'no'...er..record him as 'aye'. He's not voting. believe that's 98-67. Is that right, Mr. Clerk?

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Ninety-eight. Alright. Record Representative Laurino....change Representative Laurino to "aye" from This Bill...There are 99 'aye', 60 'no'...Change Representative Richmond from 'no' to 'aye'. There are 100 'aye', 59 \* 00 \* This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2476, Representative Neff? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2476, a Bill for an Act to appropriate funds to the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Neff."

- Neff: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2476 is sponsored by Representatives McNaster, McGrew and myself. This appropriates twenty-two thousand dollars from the Agriculture Premium Fund to the Department of Agriculture to replace a cattle building at the Mercer County fairgrounds. This cattle barn burnt down about ..almost a year ago, and they need this money to replace it. They have six thousand dollars insurance. The building is...will cost twenty-eight thousand, and in this Bill we're only asking for twenty-two thousand."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."
- Ewell: "Mr. Sponsor, how come the building was only insured for six thousand if you're going to spend twenty-eight to get a new one?"
- Neff: "Representative, you know, a lot of us are underinsured.

  You might be under insured by your home. I think most of
  us are the way the costs have gone up, inflation has moved
  up the cost the last few years. And probably, thirty years
  ago when that was built, it could have been built for six
  thousand dollars."
- Ewell: "Well, in this... Is this in the budget? Is this

116th Legislative Day

١

•

May 26, 1982

- appropriation in the budget?"
- Neff: "As far as I know, it isn't. I haven't talked to anybody about it, but this comes out of the Agricultural Premium Fund, and you know, the people from downstate do put money into this. There's pretty good attendance at the race tracks and so forth where this money comes from..."
- Ewell: "Where...Where did you say this money comes from? I mean,
- Neff: "Well, it comes from the Agricultural Premium Fund and that comes from..."
- Ewell: "Is that the Fund that's filled...the coffers are filled by the people who attend race track, that evil and sinister race track, that gambling?"
- Weff: "Yes. You know, we have a lot of people downstate that do attend those."
- Ewell: "Doesn't it tinge your conscience to reach in and touch this tainted money?"
- Neff: "Well, Representative, you know, we don't get much money downstate. We don't...In these rural areas we don't have civic centers, McCormick Place, which we've put in over a..I'm sure over a hundred million dollars. And, out of this same Fund, and we're only asking for twenty-two thousand dollars here and I know you won't deny us this."
- Ewell: "Well, no, no. I just have to make a comment or two on it. And the thing that bothers me is ever since I've been here, year after year, I have rebuilt, I think, about four hundred now county fairs almost it seems. Every five or ten years they burn down. The snow weighs the roof down. It has a little damage and I hear the same plaintive cry that we don't have enough money to rebuild this fairground. And these fairgrounds, to my estimation, have only been used, say, once or twice a year, and I can't understand in this day of tight money policies where the Governor is

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

choked for every single dime that he can get, how we can just continually cause little gaps of twenty-two thousand for this fair, thirty for the next one, forty for the next one, and we use some magical formula to say that this isnot really money that we're spending. It's only Agricultural Premium Funds. It's still dollars and cents. I a d like to point out to you that here, again, you come to us, the Members of the General Assembly, to protect a real little tiny special interest in your district. We turn a We always hear you, and I want to know, kind ear. do we have any assurance that if we vote for this money, that you won't be back next year for some more fairs that have either burnt down or you'll put in a Bill to make sure that they insure them at the proper amount?"

Neff: "Well, Representative Ewell, we hope that we don't have any fires this year, and any damages done where we have to come back. And I'll tell you, Representative, that we would like to have you come down. I certainly would give you an invitation right now to come down this summer and attend some of these fairs, and I'm sure, after you've attended them, you will agree with me that these are great things to educate theng farmers, 4-H clubs and so forth, on cattle raising and breeding so that we, in the cities, will have some extra food on the table. And maybe we can cut the costs a little bit which we hope we can do to the city folks."

Ewell: "Well...With that special invitation, and in this day of everybody trading votes, I think I'm beginning to see the light. And so I understand it. It's sort of like a little Arts Council down there for the fellows on the farm. So I'm going to go along with that and encourage everybody to give you an 'aye' vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Representative Ewell."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Neff to close. The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2476. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McGrew?"
- McGrew: "I would like to thank the Members on this side of the aisle for the 'aye' votes. Representative McMaster put through a Bill like this for the district some time ago, and I'd hate to think that now that I'm here we couldn't do it. So I appreciate it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 158 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2477, Representative Klemm? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2477, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Klemm."

appropriates Klemm: "House Bill 2477 six hundred and seventy-seven dollars and ninety-three cents to the Comptroller for payment to \*Harold Keck\* of Crystal Lake to replace four warrants rightfully paid to him in March of 1978 under the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act, which warrants were mislaid never cashed. I might add that Mr. Keck is 83 years old and partially blind. He was not home at the time that the warrants came to his home. They were misplaced by members of his family, and he just located them and tried to cash In checking with the Comptroller's Office, this was them. the appropriate procedure in having him ...have these warrants replaced that were rightfully due him, and I move

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

for favorable passage of 2477."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2477. 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 168 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2558, Representative Hoxsey? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2558, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey."

Howsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 2558 appropriates eighty-five thousand dollars for the purchase of property adjoining the 3rd District Appellate Court building in Ottowa. For the last two years, because of the need for additional space, due to the increased case load and the advent of the research department, the 3rd District has been renting the second floor of this property. Unexpectedly the owners, who live on the first floor, have decided to sell the property and move into an apartment or a smaller home. The 3rd District in 1858 is a very outstanding Appellate Court built building with a very historic background. placed on the historic register in 1973, and reason it's almost impossible to get permission to add to the building, and if one did get that permission, it would be very expensive and very difficult to match the decor of the present building. So, the opportunity to add this property to that particular site would be something that

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

needs to be done now, in the most economical way, in the most ...and the best opportunity to add to this site. I would ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Lechowicz: "Where is the substantive Bill on 2558?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "The Supreme Court already has the authority to buy property for this purpose. That is already in the statutes."

Lechowicz: "I don't believe they do. In fact, that's the question of the Bill. And that's why I asked you about the substantive legislation..."

Hoxsey: "...No.."

Lechowicz: "...Because the Capitol Development Board is supposed

to be the agency that handles the property for the state
and the Supreme Court."

Hoxsey: "Well, we have already investigated this. I had a substantive Bill, and it was decided that it was not necessary, that that authority was already allocated to the Supreme Court. And they already have that authority to do this."

Lechowicz: "Do you have that in writing, Ma'am?"

Hoxsey: "I beg your pardon?"

Lechowicz: "Do you have that in writing?"

Howsey: "Joe Fennesey and Toby Barry both have investigated that, and that's what...this is what they came up with, the fact that you didn't need that authority...Supreme Court, in the statutes...And I think if you'll check with Representative Getty he'll substantiate that."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Lechowicz: "Unfortunately, it does ...it does not say, by our staff analysis...they...they say that it needs CDB, and that's why I asked you if you had anything in writing so we could verify it. But I'll take your word for it. Thank you."
- Horsey: "Well, I think, Representative, if you'll check with Representative Getty, he'll substantiate what I say."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
  Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, both former Representatives Toby 'Barry', now an Appellate Judge from the 3rd Appellate District, and Representative 'Pennessy', now the Clerk of that District, were in Committee, and I did discuss this issue with them. They feel there was not the need for the substantive legislation. They also documented to me the need for the Bill, and I would urge the Members to support the Bill, House Bill 2558."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey, to close."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey moves for the passage of House Bill 2558. The question is, Shall House Bill 2558 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 Mr. Clerk, take the record. wish? There are 160 'aye', 7 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Najority, is hereby declared passed. to the Order of Third Reading. We're still on the Order of Third Reading. We're going to go back and pick up the Bills that were passed over. House Bill 2198. Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2198, a Bill for an Act making

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. Representative Davis..."
Wolf: "Representative Davis."

'Speaker Daniels: "Are you going to handle that, Sir?

Representative Davis."

Davis: "Yes, I'd like to do that. The Bureau of the Budget request this year was 2,613,000 dollars for a net change of 13% below last year, and we further changed it by a small Amendment to take out some Social Security and equipment line items in keeping with the 90% solution that we applied very rigorously to Doctor Mandeville's budget. And I believe it's probably about as bare as you're going to get, and I would answer any questions that you might have or try to, if you're all primed to ask them."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Macon,
Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the "Thank you. Mr. In connection with the budget for the Office of the House. Budget, Doctor Mandeville, I'd just like the Membership to know that, during the House Appropriation hearings, Doctor Mandeville was present, and there was discussion during the course of those hearings about the condition of the economy in the State of Illinois. And Doctor Mandeville was asked, the Appropriation hearings whether he had underway, as of that date, which was I think the 4th of Mav of this any sort of contingency plan for State of the Illinois in the event that there was a downturn in the economy. And Doctor Mandeville persisted that the budget, introduced by the Governor, was balanced, and we all that that position is open to criticism; but, the important thing is that we're talking about spending two or three million dollars of taxpayers' money for an office,

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the auspices of the Governor, to be on top of all economic and fiscal matters in the State of Illinois and to plan ahead and be prepared in the event things change. Doctor Mandeville said that - I have his testimony here. find it, I will quote it. Doctor Mandeville essentially said that we don't have a plan, as of the date of those We don't need a plan, and the Governor of this hearings. state had not asked for any kind of plan. Now, I ask you if this is the kind of budget planning that we support in the State of Illinois. We all know that each agency starts months, and months, and months ahead of time preparing and planning for the budget they will submit to Doctor Mandeville's office for the next Fiscal Year, and we all know that Doctor Mandeville and his staff careful consideration all the factors they can concerning the status of the economy in the State of Illinois; but. according to his own testimony, the moment the budget message was delivered by the Governor in March. stopped this type of planning. The economy in the State of Illinois, as well as the entire nation, is volatile. Hopefully it will turn toward the better, but it's not very In the event there is a downturn, Doctor Mandeville and his staff ought to be prepared to do something. Doctor Mandeville, in questioning by me, was asked, essentially this. Revenue may stay the same as you project. I said. 'I certain hope for your sake and mine that it does; but, if it does not and, Doctor, you are expert, I presume you plan for awkward contingencies. that would certainly be awkward, if our revenues dip lower than they are now. Do you have a plan? Doctor Mandeville answered. "When that happens, the plan will be in place". Dunn said, 'No, the question is, do you have a plan Doctor Mandeville, 'No, because there is no need for a

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Dunn said, 'So, when would you propose to look into Doctor Mandeville, Well. I think if. response to Representative Matijevich, if the economic outlook turns down significantly again in May, I think ought to start looking. Is this the kind of appropriation you want to support with taxpayer dollars in the State of Illinois where the Director says, flat out, straightforward, with no qualifications that he doesn't care about a plan, doesn't need a plan. doesn't look into anything, and then, if someone tells him in six weeks, a month, two months that there's a downturn in the then and only then will he start looking into a ecomomy, plan and that the Governor of this state has not asked him. That was Doctor Mandeville's comment. The Governor of this state has not asked him to even look into the what to do in the event the revenues of this state take a downturn. I think we should send a message to Mandeville, and his staff and the Governor of this state by up this budget until we find out, and find out for sure what their plans are, if any; and, if they don't have plans, to make and force them to develop plans to take care of the situation we all know exists. The economy of this state is not as good as presented in the Governor's budget in March. We've been telling Governor Thompson message that his revenue estimates are at least 150 million too since the introduction Nothing. of that budget message, has changed anything that would make us Яe know there's a big hole in the Governor's budget. What is Doctor Bob Mandeville going to do When are we going to see a new budget? When are we going to see the real figures come in? When is Doctor Mandeville going to say to us that he does have a plan, that he's working on a plan, or that he's even started a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

plan? I urge a 'present' or a 'no' vote on this budget until we get the answers to these important guestions for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DeKalb,
Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I tried to get your attention. didn't think he was addressing himself to the Bill; but, in defense of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I'd just to say in the years that I've been here. that he's been here, I think he's done an outstanding job in directing the Bureau of the Budget, using a11 the assumptions and all of the other things they draw upon to make projections, as far as what we can assume for the Fiscal Year. He has to look into a crystal ball; and, of course, we all know that nobody has a crystal ball that's very accurate. And, we all know there's tough times out there; but, for years, the last six years under the present administration, we've had no increases in taxes, certainly. in the State of Illinois, are a lot better financial condition than any of the surrounding states. just think that's to the credit of the Governor of this state and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I'd like to be on record as saying that, and I certainly encourage an affirmative vote on this appropriation."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

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

I have the same affection for Bob Mandeville that all of
you do, I'm sure, and I think he works hard at his job. But
I do want to state, for the record, that Bob Mandeville,
this year, is not the Bob Mandeville of last year. Some of
you recall that the Governor made quite an issue out of
coming before the press, at different times during the

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

last year, and announced his change and budget Session adjustment in the state's budget, in the appropriations, because of the changing times, because of the changing outlook federally. And he would proudly come before the media and make those adjustments, and you and I know that it really wasn't the Governor doing that. T+ was the Governor doing that at the direction of his Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet, this year, strangely, Bob Mandeville is acting and reacting very differently, find it very difficult for myself, as one who works very hard and, I think, conscientiously on many issues that I would call the human services issues. I find it troubling when I hear a Director of the Department of Mental Health, for example, Department of Children and Family Services and human services agencies come before the department and react very nervously to some questions that Members of the Committee ask, because they're verv concerned that their answers may not be the answers that Director of the Bureau of the Budget looks favorably What I'm saying really is that I wonder if Governor even, himself, or the directors of the agencies were the ones that made the decision, for example, reduce the funding for rape victims. I don't think that that was their decision as much as it was the Director the Bureau of the Budget. I don't think the Governor even had an ounce of input into closing of the Institute for the Visually Impaired. He acted on orders really and marched to the tune of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and having made that decision, realized it was the wrong decision. I'm not sure even who made the decision to the closure of Adler, as to the closure of Bowen and the closure of Dixon, but I'm sure, in the way that I've looked at the budget process, that the Director of the Bureau of

## 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the Budget made those decisions. Those decisions are the wrong decisions. I don't think that the Governor probably made the decision to reduce the number of state troopers at a very difficult time, when we're talking about enforcement. I don't think that the Governor made the decision, or maybe he did, about the elimination of 112 truck weight inspectors, at a time when all of us know that the damage that the trucks are doing to the highways and other...causing with regards to potholes, is costing us taxpayers a lot of money. I'm not sure if the Governor made that decision; but, from where I sit, many of those decisions are made by Bob Mandeville in his position as the Bureau of the Budget Director. Another thing that troubles me, in the Appropriations Committee process, Bob Mandeville proudly acknowledged that he supports, totally, federalism and the... the Reaganomics and Reaganism, if you want to call it that. I, for one, denounce the new federalism. I, for one, say that new federalism is causing our taxpayers, at the local level, much more. 1 live probably in the poorest community in the whole State of Illinois, and my tax bill went up 335 bucks. My community is more..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, to the Bill, please,
Sir."

Matijevich: "That's to the Bill, because that's going to the heart of new federalism and the cost to local government.

Now, you may laugh or crap at that, but my community is over half a minority population; and, of the other half, probably half of that are senior citizens, and they no longer can afford that Reaganomics new federalism. And I'm telling you that, from where I sit, that Bob Mandeville is at the heart of many of our problems in the budgetary process. Now, I'll tell you what's going to happen. We're

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

going to go through this whole budget year, and we're not going to have any new taxes. You can count on that. We're going to go through this whole budget year, right up until July, and we're probably going to pass the Governor's budget pretty well intact. And I'll tell you what's going to happen. We're going to have the biggest mess in fall that we've ever seen in State Government here in the State of Illinois, and part of the fault is new federalism, and the other part of the fault is that neither Mandeville or the Governor have faced up to the fact that they don't want to be giving us an honest budget, because it's an election year. And I think it's about time that they stood up to that. Now, I'm going to show my disgust over that process by voting \*no\*. I think that Members on this side of the aisle should also show their disqust at that by either voting 'no' or 'present' on this budget, which is a very small appropriation in the whole 14 billion But you're looking at the man that has dollar process. more input over the whole budgetary process than anybody else; and, if you're for what's happening, you can vote 'aye', but I surely can't."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Dunn."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I think it's been adequately discussed and that Doctor Mandeville's a rat, and that we ought to vote for the Bill anyway because it's probably the leanest budget of any agency in State Government, regardless of what you think of him. And the harangues from the other side of the aisle are always

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

predictable, and they're minor variations on the same theme. But I believe this to be one of the best, if not the most adequate budget, in terms of leanness, that exists in State Government, and I would seriously recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Davis, moves for the passage of House Bill 2198. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2198 pass?'. 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, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 91 'aye', 53 'no', 10 voting 'present'. House Bill 2198, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2203. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2203, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis, are you handling that one too, Sir?"

Davis: "I quess."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis, House Bill 2203."

Davis: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. This is the Department of Revenue's ordinary and contingent expense. The total appropriation is 1,301,592,800 dollars. Several Amendments were offered in Committee, and we, indeed, did cut the... cut the appropriation significantly. It is now a change of some 10% below what it was last year, and I defer to the other side of the aisle for their harangues."

Speaker Daniels: "You want to start now, Representative Matijevich, again?"

Matijevich: "I'll try to be brief, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Matijevich: "In saying that I'm going to vote 'present' on this budget. The reason I am and, you know, I have a very good rapport, as I'm sure all of us do, with the Director. fact, I've got a lot of respect for him. I think he's a very good Director. In fact, there's only one problem I've got with the Director in all the time he's been T for the life of me, understand how he could have appointed the gentleman that he did for Assistant... Superintendent of the Lottery. That's been my real problem with it. Т was so amazed at that. I happen to know the former Superintendent way back in the days when he worked for Senator 'Arrington', Rich Carlson. I think most of you The Lottery was just getting ... really getting started when we started the Daily Game, which some of us like to call the numbers policy game. It really started rolling, and.. and I remember I was ín Committee. Subcommittee, if some of you remember, and I asked - I think LeRoy Van Duyne was sitting next to me, and I "Which guy up there is Michael Jones?". And he pointed him I said to LeRoy, 'Do you know I had him spotted, because I can spot a high liver when I see one. And what happened was there was really no justification that anybody knew why Superintendent Jones was picked as Superintendent of the Lottery other than he played racketball with the Governor. 1 don't know whether that's enough reason to hire him, but my really ... my real problem was that, he chose to say that he needed some real spiffy. I think his words were according to the guote, ... and sometimes spiffy quarters in Chicago. We're... The taxpayers, and the way I look at it, the poor guy that's putting that down for that Lottery; that poor guy is paying, and we're all paying, as taxpayers, for those spiffy quarters at 676 North St. Clair Street in Chicago at 17 dollars per

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

square foot. And then the Superintendent of the Lottery said that... that he's going to spend about 25,000 dollars for furniture for those offices in Chicago. Rich Carlson did quite well operating out of Springfield, and I know that you can harangue and say that, 'Oh, you've got to be That's where all the advertisements are coming in Chicago. from in commercials for the Lottery. You and I know that you don't need two offices. You don't need one in Springfield and one in Chicago. So, you know, that disturbed me quite a bit; and, in fact, I really think that the Director did poorly by naming him as the Superintendent Secondly, my other problem with the of the Lottery. Department. Many of us have been reading lately about the abuse, if you will, of the matter - Rich Mautino is doing a pretty good job of it - with the abuse in consultant fact, the 'Lee' Enterprises had a handout. Ιn One was in the <u>Decatur Review</u> and one was in the Rock One's called Clout, Island area newspaper. and one's called The Shadow Government, Illinois Shadow Government. What it hints to is the matter of the abuse of consultant services contracts. This agency, 20% of its operation spent for consultant contract... for contracts, and I think that's a very high amount. And I think, for those reasons and a few others, that I can safely vote 'present' on this appropriation Bill, and I would urge Members on this side of the aisle to also vote \*present\*."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel. Your light's on, Sir. Representative Huskey."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

have it. Gentleman, Representative Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well. thank you, Mr. Speakel... Speakel(sic). I will address Representative from the other side of the aisle's question that he's going to answer. The Lottery Office money is 51,000 dollars, and it's 3,585 square feet. And that's the question he was going to wasn't on the floor when his Amendment was offered yesterday to this Bill. I'd simply say to you that the total amount of this budget is rather extraordinary. and one of our Republican Members came over and asked me what the breakdown is. You must understand this includes a total amount for the Department of Revenue that ... transfers back the corporate and personal income tax refunds and all of the generation return of money in Department of Revenue back to citizens in the corporations in the State of Illinois that have that money coming. think it's a fair budget. I think it's... there are some questions that have been raised by the other side of aisle were raised in Committee and that adequately addressed. I think the budget's in good shape at this It's lower than it was last year, administratively, and throughout the budget in total dollars, and I think it deserves an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Daniel: "Gentleman, Representative Davis, moved for the passage of House Bill 2203. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2203 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, according to our analysis, the Department of Revenue has not made significant progress in hiring minorities or in hiring women. I stand here... We have a number of women

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Legislators. I guess they re content at getting 59 cents. We have a number of black Legislators. Statistics... Census statistics indicate that the income for blacks is lower than any other minorities, and I'm surprised they didn't address those two issues. Also, part of this money is coming out of the motor fuel tax, and so; therefore, I'm sure Harland Bigney will join me in voting 'no' for this budget. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kornowicz,
  to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Kornowicz: "Speaker and Members of the House, in regards to the... to the appropriation, we understand that, in regards to the Department, there's no enforcement in the Department; that the Department lost between 200 to 400 million dollars. I wonder what is the Governor going to do about the situation of this loss and in regards to the enforcement. Can the.... Can the Sponsor answer that?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Sir, we are on an explanation of vote, right now."
- Kornowicz: "Well, I was...had my light on before..."
- Speaker Daniels: "I will ask if he'll answer that in explaining his vote. Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne.

  Timer's on, Sir."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, very much, M.C. Speaker. Now you can understand why the Department of Revenue got the pickle award at the ... at the dinner the other night, really my reason for getting up is to ask Representative Davis if he would mind taking this Bill back to Second Reading so I can put my Amendment on, which I didn't get the chance to last night when I was temporarily off if he's so proud of this 51,600 dollars that floor. But, he's giving to Mr. Jones, why all I can do is just stand here and vote 'no' on the whole... the whole Bill. So, God

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

bless him."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 94 "aye", 45 "no", 23 voting "present".

  This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2205, Representative J. J. Holf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2205, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates 190,786,900 dollars to the Department of Children and Family Services for their operations. They've made great strides, in my opinion, in that Department over the last several years, in terms of child protection, child services. The budget is not as high as I would like to see, but it is a step in the right direction. I'll be glad to answer questions; otherwise, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in my estimation, this Department, Department of Children and Family Services, over the past couple of years, with the help and encouragement of the Members of this General Assembly on both sides of the aisle, have made tremendous strides in taking care of the abused children of the State of Illinois, and the foster children, and the welfare children, generally. We've got a long way to go. We haven't completed the job. There's a lot of things that have got to be done, both in day care and a lot of problems that we still have, but this Department, the people working

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

in the Department, again, with the help of people on both sides of the aisle, in a very open and bipartisan manner, have, in my estimation, done a tremendous job for State Government and for the people. And I would ask a very strong vote of support on this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Wolf tells me to be brief for he's got some other...some things that have to be done. I'll tell you, Representative Peters, when you're on the floor, there's no way to go but up. This Department was really on the floor, so there was no way to go but up, and I'll acknowledge that there's been some improvement: but, I'll also say that much of that improvement because of some legislation that many of you had a hand in. know Representative McClain worked real hard, and Representative Reilly and others worked hard on some legislation that just had to done. And, therefore, there has been a lot of improvement. However, we've got more improvement, I think, that we've got to show. There still are... are a lot of cases of child abuse, and the state has still got some ways to go, I think, in responding to the statutory 24 hours where they must respond to child abuse complaints. In my... In my district, for example, the Director and some of his staff were...were at some sort of a press conference, and somebody in the ... at the conference asked what the child abuse hotline was. the Director nor nobody on the staff could answer and even give information on what the number was. I have before a May 10th article in the Chicago Tribune which is titled, \*State Overbilled United States Forty-nine Million On Child Care, An Audit Had Found', and it starts by saying the Illinois Department of Children and Family regularly disregarded or misinterpreted federal regulations

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

and overcharged the Federal Government 49.8 million for foster care, child welfare and education and day care services. There are some people here on the floor of the House are concerned that the Department, that has been slow in responding to child care abuse complaints, may be the agency which will be the one to implement the day care funding in the State of Illinois and that is, I think a legitimate concern. The Department has also come fire from foster parents in the Chicago area who charge that they have often had trouble obtaining reimbursements. I think there is enough reasons why many of us, on this side of the aisle, ought to be voting 'present' on this appropriation. I will acknowledge the improvement; but, as I said, there's still a long way to go, and I don't think we ought to affirm that this Department has done everything perfect. They're a long way from it, and I, therefore, am voting 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Question ... Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Bradley: "I'm wondering if the private agencies are still in the budgets, private agencies such as Kaleidoscope; and, if you could give me the number of children that the private agencies are taking care of."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Representative, I'm not familiar with the particular agency you mentioned, but private agencies are still in the budget this year, just as they were last year. Now, if there's a particular grant situation that I may not be aware of, I may not be giving you the whole answer you want, but..."

Bradley: "No, I'd really like..."

Reilly: "... the money for private agencies..."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Bradley: "I'd really like you to be specific about Kaleidoscope.

  I'd like to know what the dollar amount is for that agency.

  It's a private agency, and I'd like to know how many children they're taking care of and why."
- Reilly: "The grants are not awarded to specific agencies anywhere in any year, until the budget... until they have a budget and know what the total amount is. The... I'm having him look now. In other words, the budget never has and hopefully never will line item specific grants. There is a general line item for... for grants in the amount of... in the amount of 125,132,200 dollars."

Bradley: "For private agencies?"

- Reilly: "That.. that... Some of that is for private agencies.

  Some is for day care, and those are the... that's the grant
  line."
- Bradley: "You mean... You mean to tell me that there's no way that we can tell, when we're voting on an appropriation Bill besides this, what that money is going to be spent for in private agencies? You lump it all together, and we can't tell whether... You know, this agency, in my opinion, has been doing such a lousy job for so long that we ought to know what it's costing us to take care of how many children that they take care of."
- Reilly: "If you can tell us the kind of private agency you're talking about..."
- Bradley: "Kaleidoscope is the name of it."
- Reilly: "They do not, never have no budget... No budget that we ever handle names the specific agencies; but, if you can tell us the kind of agency it is, whether it's like institution and group-home care..."

Bradley: "It's group-home care."

Reilly: "Alright. The total amount for that is 31,042,900 dollars."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Bradley: "How many... How many students or children do we have then living in group homes, out of the... that we're spending 31 million dollars on?"

Reilly: "I don't know."

Bradley: "Well, I think we ought to know those things before we're voting on a piece of legislation, and we'd like to know... I think we ought to know why the State of Illinois needs to spend 31 million dollars in group homes, in private agencies, when we could be taking care of some of those children ourselves. Whether we can or not, I think, that's the question and if the cost if prohibitive. Thirty-one million dollars for private group-home care, and you can't even tell me how many... how many boys and girls were taken care of with 31 million dollars. And I really think we ought to take that out of the record and get some of those answers."

Reilly: "Well... Well, Representative, that fact that I don't happen to know the answer doesn't..."

Bradley: "I don't expect..."

Reilly: "... doesn't, by any means..."

Bradley: "Well, I do expect the people standing next to you to have those answers."

Reilly: "It doesn't, by any means, mean that the answer isn't a knowable thing. Your staff could have found that out just as well as my staff could. I just don't happen to know the answer to that... to that question."

Bradley: "Well, I'm not on the Appropriation Committee, and the staff does not... I don't work with that staff, but you have the...your staff, the Appropriation Committee and the DCFS legislative liaison, I assume, standing right next to you; or, he should be standing next to you, and we ought to get the answers to those questions because, I think, without that, there's no way anybody should be voting for

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- this Bill, if we can't find out where we're spending 31 million dollars or why we're spending 31 million dollars with private agencies..."
- Reilly: "Representative, I can... I can tell you all that. That isn't what you asked me. You asked me..."
- Bradley: "Yes, it is. I asked you.."
- Reilly: "Alright. I'll answer it. The reason that we have to spend this money is because we have a great number of kids.

  Now, I can't give you the exact number; but, in my opinion..."
- Bradley: "Well, I think that's important to know. You know, a great number is what? Twenty-five, or 50, or 75, or a hundred."
- Reilly: "Representative, do you want an answer or not?"
- Bradley: "I'd like an answer with specifics."
- Reilly: "I've already told you. I don't know the exact number.

  Now, if that's the question, that's the answer."
- Bradley: "That's why I said we ought to take it of the record til we get the answer."
- Reilly: "Absolutely not."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook,
  Representative Piel."
- Piel: "I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniel: "Gentleman's moved the previous question.

  Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "I wasn't...I wasn't finished with the questions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, Sir, I asked you if you... if there was any further discussion. You didn't respond."
- Bradley: "Well, then I'll address... I'm sorry. I will address the Bill, if I might, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniel: "Proceed, Sir."
- Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I really am concerned about this piece of legislation and how it affects the boys and girls in the

# 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

State of Illinois, There's no question that, in my opinion anyway, we could be doing a better job in taking care of the boys and girls than we would be by hiring private agencies that cost something like, as the Sponsor said, million dollars, and we don't even know how many boys and girls are being taken care of for 31 million We're buying a pig in a poke here, and dollars. It... we've had some real serious problems with these at least in my area with Kaleidoscope, with Kaleidoscope in the City of Chicago. They're not doing the job that DCFS certainly would be capable of doing, in mу opinion, themselves. I see no reason at all for the State of Illinois to be spending some 30 million dollars, or don't even know. as I said before... And, information, Mr. Reilly, we have some 1400, our staff tells me, boys and girls living in private agencies, costing us 25,000 dollars a year, 25,000 dollars a year to take care of boys and girls in private agencies. isn't a better way, not necessarily that I'm saying that it has to be cheaper; but, my God. 25,000 dollars. if I ... if he would answer another question, which he won't, but we spend, I think, somewhere in the neighborhood of 250 to 300 dollars per boy and girl that are kept in a foster-care home; and, if my multiplication does me any kind of service at all, we're talking about 3,000 to 3500 dollars a year for boys and girls that DCFS has taken care of in foster-care homes. We turn around and spend dollars in private-care institutions, and you can't tell me we're placing in those homes, those group homes hard-to-place children; because, we have those ... those children in Bloomington. They're not hard to place boys and girls at all. We're getting taken down the patch. DCFS, somebody said, is doing a great job.

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

baloney that they're doing a great job. They're still spending 25,000 dollars a year in private-pay group homes that are a total waste of money, not doing any great service to the State of Illinois; and, certainly, this agency should be ... this appropriation should be held up. I suppose it won't be; but, if you... I don't know how anybody can justify 25,000 dollars a year for a boy and girl in a group home."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the Gentleman who just finished, if there's some particular problem with that particular home in his town, I think we ought to deal with that. The fact is that, as a matter, the kids are in these homes because they can't be placed other places. The Department is not crazy, in terms of times of budget cuts, when the Department would like to be spending more on day care and a whole lot of other They aren't putting kids in these expensive homes, if, in fact, there are actually available alternatives. would be delighted to get as many of those kids out those homes as we can. Some of them have special needs. Some of them are special-problem kids who foster parents To the extent we can get them out, we will won't take. certainly do so and have been doing so and will continue to try to do so. On the Bill, there has been substantial progress made by people on both sides of the aisle, because we haven't politicized this Department over the last couple years. Яе have had a bipartisan group of Legislators on substantive legislation and on who have worked budget for this Department. That's continued to be true this year. I would urge a large, favorable Roll Call this Bill so that we can get on with the business of trying to take care of the kids that are wards of this state."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2205. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2205 pass?'. those in favor signify by voting \*aye\*, opposed by voting The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the 128 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 40 voting record. There are 'present'. House Bill 2205. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2209 appropriates 100,939,300 dollars for the operation of the Department of Public Health. We've added several good Amendments to this that have strengthened the Bill. Again, I'd be glad to answer questions; otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Are you ready now, Representative Matijevich?

  Proceed, Sir."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Bill
  Kempiners has always been a good friend of mine. Bill
  Kempiners is a type of person I think ought to always be in
  governmental services. So, I have no problem with his
  directorship, nor the way he operates in State Government.
  However, I am going to vote 'present' on this appropriation
  of Bills. The Bill is in better shape than introduced, and
  I want to commend Aaron Jaffe for the pressure that he put
  by the introduction of an individual Bill in funding for
  rape victims. That introduction of that Bill forced the
  other side of the aisle to propose an Amendment so that
  that program would be funded. I also want to commend

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Representative McClain for his Amendment, which would include the funds for the Family Practice Residency So, the measure is much better than introduced; Program. however, I do have some problems because, in spite of the fact that the Director has stated on different times that the highest priority in his Department is trying to get to the matter of the continued high infant mortality rate Illinois; that we have not succeeded at all with regards to Also, as you may know that there are some block grants under the Department of Public Health, and we have found that there has been a lack of planning in the distribution of the block grant process in this Department. And, for those reasons, I have tried to be brief, and I would urge the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2209. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2209 pass?'. 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? Take the record. There are 122 'aye', 2 'no', 43 voting 'present'. House Bill 2209, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2210. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2210, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitative Services. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates a total of 95,592,900 dollars for the operation of the Department

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

of Rehabilitative Services. Again, we have made, I think significant improvement in this Bill, as it's moved through the appropriations process. I'd be glad to answer questions; otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "You ready, Representative Matijevich? Proceed, Sir."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again, I'd like to, and I don't see him on the floor right now, commend Aaron Jaffe for the Sponsorship of the Bill to keep the Illinois Visually Handicap Institute open. Sponsorship of that Bill and the... the news all over the State of Illinois on the closure did make the Governor retrench, and I would commend him and other Members, some, you know, on both sides of the aisle, who have, brought this money back into this budget. So, it does make it a better appropriation than introduced. highlight the fact, however, that we did have an Amendment which would have closed the Chicago area office Bureau of Disability Adjudication Services, and I bring that for two reasons. That was a 1,700,000 dollar reduction. I've heard many on that side of the aisle say all we do is add and add, but that was a reduction. there are going to be 105 persons hired, I guess, in the DuPage County area of all places that I have some question have some question, too, about the whole matter about. of the Social Security Disability Section. The reason I say that is that that division is implementing what seems to be a federal policy coming out of Reagan. And the fact that many of you will, in the next months I'm sure if you haven't already, as I have, seen that some.... who are physically disabled are being cut off summarily off the Social Security Disability benefits that they've been receiving. I... I think that comes close to being a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

crime, as far as I'm concerned, and it's not doing the taxpayers any good, because many of those people who are now finding themselves being taken off of the Social Security Disability, are finding that they can't work. So, where does that put them? That puts them on the Public Aid rolls. So, we're not solving anything by kicking them off of the Social Security rolls. So, I feel strongly, and Woods Bowman made quite an issue out of the fact in the Committee that there's been a lack of alternative services for the blind adults in Illinois. So, I feel strongly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we can responsibly vote 'present' on this agency's appropriation Bill, and I would urge Members of this side of the aisle to vote 'present' on House Bill 2210."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of House Bill 2210. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2210 pass?'. 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 110 'aye', 8 'no', 46 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2212. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2212, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Third Reading of the

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 2212, as introduced, would appropriate 10,568,600 dollars for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Committee action adopted an Amendment which added 75,000 dollars in federal funds under a public utility regulatory policy grant, to enable the Commission to explore ways to adopt innovate rate structures, which would have the impact of conserving energy and lowering consumer costs. Amendment #2, which was adopted, reduced the Commission's requested appropriation for telecommunications by 22,600 dollars; 21,900 of which is in the Public Utility Fund, 700 in Motor Vehicle Fund. As the Bill stands before you, it is a 10,600 ... 10,621,000 dollar appropriation Bill for the Commerce Commission, and I would move for its passage."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich." Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen on this side of the aisle, I would tell the Members on this side of the aisle, this is strictly my own feeling on this Bill, they can do whatever they want to do. It's just that I've had some real problems with the Illinois Connerce Commission and the fact that they are approving every rate increase request that comes their way. And, in fact, asked the Chairman of the Commerce Commission, would be give me a run down of the votes by the commissioners on those issues in the last three years. Now, he's been very faithful, in providing any answers to any questions Committee, both since I've been a Minority Spokesman and when I was Chairman of the Committee; but, for some strange reason, he has yet to provide me with that particular list. I think I know why, because I think there's a definite 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

pattern: that certain Members of that Commission are voting 'yes', are voting pro-utility on every issue that comes before them. So, I... this is only my personal vote. It's not my vote as a Member or as a Minority Member of the I am going to vote 'no' on this because of my Commission. displeasure with the fact that I don't think the Commerce Commission has been responsible at all. I have before me an editorial from WMAY radio, one of the first that seen all across the State of Illinois that is endorsing an... elected Illinois Commerce Commission. Many of Members have been asking and doing all that we can to at least have some Bills heard on an elected Commerce Commission; and, by voting 'no' on this, I think I can show people in my area, that I am thoroughly disquited of fact that the Conmerce Commission is totally pro-utility. And I think we need some balance. I don't want it to be pro-consumer either. I want some balance: and, by my vote of 'no', I'm showing my disgust."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As an extension to Representative Matijevich's conversation, you all might be happy, disgruntled, or whatever, or surprised because they've been up to their usual work today. They gave Ma Bell an 10% increase today."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, very briefly, also as an extension of the remarks of Representative Matijevich. I think this is one Bill where you can show your concern. We've had Motion after Motion on the Calendar week after week to hear the issue of electing the Commerce Commission. It seems to me, not only Representative Matijevich's perception, but my own and I know others on this floor, who have worked hard for an elected Commission, that that

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

willy-nilly accepts and does the bidding of the Commission utility companies in this state on schedule. They acting on their behalf and not on the behalf of the consumers. They're not using the professional expertise hand in the Commission. They're not acting on behalf of the people. They're not doing what they ought to be doing. appropriation ought to be defeated and send a signal to the Illinois Commerce Commission and send the signal to those who support the utilities that we don't stand beside them or with them, and we won't until the day comes, "til the people and this General Assembly are given the chance to decide on the issue of whether or not the people ought to pick that Commission and have some control over it. For those reasons and the reasons of the other speakers, I urge a 'no' vote at this time."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I join the previous speakers urging defeat of this Bill to show that the people of Illinois have the right to be recognized. and they have the right to be heard. And the Commerce Commission does not listen to the people of Illinois, the little people that come in and testify. And so, therefore, I urge a 'no' vote on this appropriation." Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman." Hoffman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Member of the Public Utilities ÀS a I have had an opportunity Committee. to watch the adversaries on this particular issue come before the Committee in an attempt to resolve issues that they unable to resolve at the Commerce Commission level. It's been my observation, as a Member of that Committee for the last two terms, that certainly this House and the Members of the Public Utility Committee are ill-prepared to the kinds of technical decisions and to make the kinds of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

judgements that need to be made in this very complex and complicated area. OT suggest that an elected Commission would make better decisions than an appointed Commission with expert staff, I think, is to beq the question. think the issue is that somehow we, as users of utilities, that certain segments of our society don't want to pay for them. They want the rest of the people to pay for them. They want the taxpayers, who may not even use the facility, to pay for them. They want the people who will pay their bills to pay... to pay the bills of those people who don't want to. And, if you come before a body of people with expertise and say, 'Here are our expenses, and here are our costs, and here is the kind of profit that we will be making on this that we can return to... stockholders', and then a decision is made on that. the kind of information that the Commerce Commission been using. To suggest that we should defeat this Bill because they re not making the kinds of decisions we would like them to make, based upon the prejudice of some people and, at the same time, overlooking the facts, borders sheer and unadulterated nonsense. You or I wouldn't run a business like that. We wouldn't want to be in a business and I don't think we should place any like that, organization, public utility or otherwise, in the same position. And, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this appropriation."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea."

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

I'd like to ask a question of the Sponsor."

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

Rea: "Representative Vinson, how much money is in there for rubber stamps?"

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Vinson: "For rubber stamps?"

Rea: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "Well, I don't believe there's any in there for rubber stamps."

Rea: "I think you probably ought to look very closely; because, apparently, this Commission has been a rubber-stamp operation, and they have not been responsive to the people of the State of Illinois. And this has been one of the number one concerns, as it relates to the ICC Commission, and we have not really dealt with this problem properly; and, as a result, the ICC Commission not been accountable, not been responsible and responsive to the people of the State of Illinois. I would ask that we stamp them out with a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Laurino."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A number of comments relationship to the appropriation Bill got into agency policy and so forth, and I think that's always appropriate in regard to an appropriation Bill; because, as many Members have indicated, it's the only time we really have a full way of dealing with an agency. I want to relate two Since this Governor has been Governor, he has had three appointments to the Commerce Commission. In case of two of those appointments, he has been lobbied very by consumer groups; Public Action Council, the Southern Counties Action Movement and so forth. Thev lobbied him to appoint Ar. \*Stallion\* to the Commission in 1977, when I happened to be on the Governor's staff. At.

## 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

particular time. the Governor appointed Mr. 'Stallion'. Now, those consumer movements, organizations are dissatisfied with Mr. \*Stallion\*s\* votes on utility issues in the Commerce Commission, but they were the ones who lobbied hardest for his appointment to the Commission. Last year, business strongly opposed Mr. \*Rosenbloom\*s\* nomination to the Commerce Commission. Consumer groups strongly favored it. The Governor appointed 'Rosenbloom', and I suspect now that the consumer ... those consumer groups are dissatisfied with Mr. \*Rosenbloom\*. any event, what would happen if we had an elected Commerce Commission, and I would suggest that every Member stop and think about that - every Member in this House. first person who would be elected to that elective Commerce Commission would be Pat Quinn. He's already campaigning on the issues. So, those people who are creating that are just creating a statewide candidacy for Mr. Quinn. I don't know that anybody in this chamber really wants to do that, but judgement on you can make your that. In relation to utility rates generally in Illinois, I would point out that Commonwealth Edison in Chicago has a utility rate half the level, one-half the level of Consolidated Edison York City. Now, what... what that really points out is that we have had a pretty efficient Commerce Commission You can criticize it. You can kick it when state. this it's down. It's a popular issue to kick at it. going to be appropriated. I do think that in looking at your votes, rather than prolonging this entire Session July 1st and July 2nd, the late hours of the night, we ought to dispose of this issue now. Those want to vote for it can. Those who don't, obviously, I would just point out, finally, that the teamsters and the truckers support the Bill, and I would urge an

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

'aye' vote on 2212."

- Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2212 pass?'.

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by
  voting 'no'. The voting's open. Who's snapping their
  fingers? Right away, Representative Bullock. Explain your
  vote. Timer's on."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman from DeWitt does indeed state in error the reason that the utility rates in New York are cheaper than those that are in the City of Chicago. As a learned counsel, and he usually does his homework, I'm sure he knows as well as I know that the very reason that you have those cheap rates, Representative Vinson, is because the people in New York do, in fact, use nuclear energy, contrary to some of the utilities here. They are 66 2/3 cents cheaper because of nuclear power. I don't know if you're advocating nuclear power or not, but I think that should be stated for the record; and, accordingly, I will yote 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti. Representative Levin."

  Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I wish you would have called on me earlier.

  I've had my light on since before this Bill was called;
  but, in explaining my..."
- Speaker Daniels: "That's probably why you weren't called. You had it on too soon."
- Levin: "In explaining my 'no' vote, I think the Sponsor is wrong when he compares our rates with elsewhere. If you compare Commonwealth Edison with the other surrounding states, our rates are substantially higher. I further suggest that we've been bearing about the poor business climate in the State of Illinois, but all of the recent national surveys of business have concluded that the number one concern of business, in terms of location, is the high cost of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

utilities. And Illinois is rated in a very, very poor position, in terms of its attractiveness for the cost of energy. I suggest that what business needs is a reformed Commerce Commission...(cut off)..."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye', 52 'no', 17 voting 'present'. House Bill 2212, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2213. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2213, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the Department of Corrections.

  Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe there's any particular controversy on this Bill, as compared to the last one. The Bill, as introduced, would have appropriated 270 million dollars to the Department of Corrections for their ordinary and contingent expenses. In the posture that the Bill stands before you, the only Amendments adopted are Amendments offered by Mr. Kosinski and Mr. Mautino. The total amount appropriated in the Bill is 271,094,290 dollars, and I would move for passage of House Bill 2213."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Hatijevich: "Mr. Speaker, most of my comments, which I think justify a 'present' vote on this appropriation, I made on Second Reading. So, I'll just quickly say that I really think the State of Illinois has no direction in policy with the matter of corrections. We are spending 13,000 dollars per bed just to operate prisons, 45,000 for construction of new prisons. In fact, 90 million dollars of our bonding

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

this year, in new bonding, virtually, all of our new bonding is for building prisons. That wouldn't be bad if we were getting somewhere, but the fact is the documentation is there that we really have no rehabilitation. So, and also, even though the Governor made a big to-do about security in our prison, we have really cutback in our security personnel, and I think that's a The early release program isn't dangerous precedent. working. We ve in the Chicago area where they ve seen. actually dumped prisoners with really very quickly not knowing on the day they're going to be released, virtually. And I think that's a dangerous thing for the areas in Chicago, for example, where they were dumped. We have no We have cutback really on juvenile corrections program. where I think it is more important. If we handle the situation with regards to crime for juveniles, I think we're going to have less adult criminals. For those reasons, I would urge the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just make the point that in the Department of Children and Family Service's budget we did have... we did preserve the 'UTIS' Program. That is not at issue, and I would move for a favorable consideration on House Bill 2213, the Department of Corrections appropriation."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2213 pass?'.

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. Stuffle 'aye'. There are 132 'aye', 5 'no', 24 'present'. House Bill 2213, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Bill 2215. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2215, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. Representative Vinson.

Representative Vinson, are you handling this Bill, Sir?

House Bill 2215, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2215 is the Department of Insurance appropriation for their ordinary and contingent expenditures. Amendment #1, adopted in Committee. corrected an error by the Department in their Social Security line item. It reduced the line item by 7600 dollars. The new Bill total is 7.716.400 dollars. I don't believe there's much controversy on this, and I would move for favorable consideration of House Bill 2215."

Speaker Daniels: "Are you ready? Representative Matijevich." Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, this is another Department where I have no problem with the Director. He and I get along real well, and my problem, I quess, is with the insurance companies. And the only problem I have with the agency is, I... I get a lot of complaints, as many of you do, I believe, with the matter from senior citizens with Blue Cross Insurance, these automatic increases that are coming so quickly that they can't handle. So, I'm going to show my senior citizens that I don't approve of that, 'present' vote on this Bill. I've also got some area of questionable concern about some... a contract that going to discuss with the Director. So.. and he's been very helpful with me; and, because of that, I would urge the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'present'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Matijevich h

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

indicated, appropriately, that the Director has been a most responsive and efficient administrator of the Department. I don't think there is any substantial controversy regarding the Bill, and I would move for its favorable consideration."

- Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2215 pass?'.

  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 103 'aye', 15 'no', 39 'present'. House Bill 2215, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2223, Second Reading. Order of Second Reading, House Bill 2223. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2223, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the furnishing of legislative staff, secretarial, clerical..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2247.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 222... 2247, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of State Appellate Defender. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill ... House Bill 2279. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2279, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2283. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2370. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2393. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2456. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2456, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the State Board of Education. Second Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 25... 2457.

  Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2457, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2458. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2458, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2459. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2459, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 2481. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act making

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

appropriation to the Department of Law Enforcement. Second Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. ... please have your attention. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're going to go back, start over on Second Readings. We're going to go through as much as possible, until the hour of 7:30. We're making every effort possible to get out of here tomorrow. So, if we can work until 7:30, have cooperation of the Members on both sides of the aisle, we'll make every effort to be able to get out of here tomorrow. So, we're going to start on Second Reading, House Bill... House Bill 2222, out of the record. House Bill 2223, out of the record. House Bill 2247. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2247, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of State Appellate Defender. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 and 3 failed in Committee. Floor
Amendment #4, McClain."

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

McClain: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #4 to House Bill 2247 is an Amendment that restores 176,800 dollars to the State Appellate Defender's Office. We believe that this is a compromise offer. It's an offer tendered by Mr. Telcser and myself to Mr. Davis who believes strongly in this matter. Mr. Davis had an Amendment to remove 11 new positions which would have handled court-ordered Supreme Court death penalty cases. So, what we're doing here is splitting the

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

11 new positions to make them five. This will replace five of the 11 positions that were in the original budget. Let me explain what happens if we do not do something here at the state level. What will happen is the court will order the local counties to represent these convicted people to represent them in front of the Supreme Court on the death penalty cases. So, this is a way for the state to alleviate some of the costs for local counties. Right now, we think we need all 11 members, but this is a compromise tendered to Mr. Davis from Mr. Telcser and I. And I would urge an "aye" vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser. I'm sorry. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, just briefly, Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the Amendment simply because I think our position is right, and appreciate the spirit of compromise, Representative McClain; but, I reject it, also to you Representative I just don't think it's necessary. within the confines of this rather large budget for of defending Appellate deci... defending or Appellate plaintiffs in the correctional system elsewhere, that there's plenty of money for the death squad that they're looking for. There's plenty of available and available for that particular function, there's a new pro bono or free legal service available under initiative of Justice Clark, I believe, or Justice I forget who - the Supreme Court to provide this agency with free legal expertise in other areas would free up staff for a death ... death unit, if you will. NOW, I understand that the number of death penalty convictions seems to be on the increase, which is precisely why we passed the capital punishment statute. I also understand that the Appellate provisions are adequate or

#### 116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the monies, in my opinion, are adequate and was never successfully explained to me why this unit was necessary for the kind of dollars even that we're talking about in this supposed compromise. I'm going to oppose it and continue to oppose it. I think it's adequately funded now, and let your conscience be your quide."

- Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'.

  All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed
  'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2279. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2279, 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: "Ploor Amendment #1, Leinenweber."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber, Amendment #1.

  Representative Peters."
- Peters: "I'd like to get the package together here, Rep... Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 appropriates \$37.81 for a what does it say check... for a check not cashed on the Illinois income tax refund. That's all it does."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Schraeder, amends House Bill 22..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder, Amendment #2."
- Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, all this does, it appropriates some back pay to a gentleman for a Civil Service Commission

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- ruling, 13,354, and I know of no opposition. I'd ask for the approval of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Marion, Representative Dwight Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "I, reluctantly, ask if he would yield to a question."
- Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."
- Friedrich: "Will the claim be paid if the Court of Claims denies the claim?"
- Schraeder: "I presume not. In other words it's subject to court okay."
- Friedrich: "Okay, thank you. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2.

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

  The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, McAuliffe."
- Speaker Daniel: "Representative McAuliffe, Amendment #3."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #3 has 987,962 dollars for awards made by the
  Court since the Bill was introduced."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, McAuliffe, amends House Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe, Amendment #4."
- McAuliffe: "Amendment #4 is 1,097 dollars for an award to William

  \*Greiny\*, a former Member of the Legislature. The Court

  cannot make this award due to the Statute of Limitations."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dwight Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Would the Speaker ... or the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Friedrich: "Senator 'Gruendel's' my friend and I don't want to
 hurt him, but what's the claim for?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Look Representative Rea."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "This was... In the settlement that was made, they failed to include the... the full amount of what was agreed upon, in terms of the settlement, and this would make up that difference."

Friedrich: "Settlement for what?"

Rea: "It was on a retirement... going back in terms of past retirement that was contributed to the system."

Friedrich: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 is adopted.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Stuffle - Woodyard, amends
House Bill..."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, this is a back-pay award, is similar to the one Representative Schraeder put on the Bill, taking care of the case that was decided on behalf of the employee in the Civil Service Commission. I would ask for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5.

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

The 'ayes' have it, and #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Matijevich, amends House
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich. Brief."

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

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Amendment #6 appropriates 25,475 dollars for payment to Goodwill Industries for electrical services rendered to the Department of Public Aid in the years '75 through '79. Former Representative Dan O'Brien, now Judge O'Brien, called and asked that we put on this Amendment. Because of the five year Statute of Limitations, the Court of Claims could only recognize 46,330 of the claim and, therefore, need this Amendment. I don't think the Sponsor... or the Sponsor of the Bill has any problem with it, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed \*no\*. The "ayes" have it. Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Matijevich, amends House
Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, Amendment #7."
Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw Amendment 7."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn. Representative Conti."

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

I know there's a quite a few of these that were
inadvertently not paid or the Court of Claims Statute of
Limitation ran out and everything else. I wonder if some
of these people that were real loud on some of the Third
Readings would be a little more clarity so that we
understand what we're voting for here. I just voted for
something here for Judge O'Brien; something about 46,000
samething. I don't know whether he meant dollars or
people. So, I wish I could hear a little bit more about
these Amendments that are going by voice vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, Robbins, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins."

116th Legislative Day

Speaker Daniels:

May 26, 1982

- Robbins: "Amendment #8 is for the sum of \$211.65. The gentleman found this warrant in behind his desk and it had only been there for about five years, and this is the only way that the state said that we could pay the warrant. So, I move for the adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #8.

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

  The 'ayes' have it. #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

  Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Hoxsey, amends House Bill..."

"Representative Hoxsey, Amendment #9."

- Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #9 for the amount of \$968.69 is payable to one
  Rita Wallace in the town of Sandwich, Illinois, which is a
  replacement of a lost warrant that was originally made
  payable to her deceased husband. The warrant was for
  retirement contributions made to her husband and were
- Speaker Daniels: "Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #9.

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

  The 'ayes' have it, and #9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

  Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2283. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

issued on October 26th of 1978."

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Davis, amends House Bill 22..."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis, Amendment #1."
- Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 makes a total reduction of 77,785 dollars in the Treasurer's appropriation. It reduces personal services by 16,000 and some change, retirement by 852, Social Security by 975, the

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- bond and coupon fees by 50,000 and the data processing by 9,000 dollars."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2370. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendments
  #1. 2 and 3?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendments #4 and 5 failed. The next Floor

  Amendment is Floor Amendment #6, Hoffman... Huff."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huff, Amendment #6."
- Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  Amendment #6 to House Bill 2370 increases the lump sum
  appropriation for the Chicago School Study Commission from
  30 to 70,000 dollars. I'll be happy to answer any
  questions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Currie, amends House Bill..."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, Amendment #7."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Representative Virginia Macdonald was wearing a 59 cent

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

button today. Maybe some of you wonder what that means. It means that women on the average in this country are paid 59 cents for every dollar that a man earns. Some of the reason for the discrepancy is individual discrimination against women in employment based on their gender. Other reasons may turn out to be that jobs that are traditionally held by women are paid less than jobs traditionally held by men, whether or not those jobs are distinguished by virtue of different degrees of responsibility, different kinds of skills required, or different kinds or amounts, degrees of Amendment #7 to House Bill 2370 preparation. would appropriate 50,000 dollars to the Commission on the Status of Women to do a comparable value study of jobs in employment to make sure that our classification scheme does not discriminate against individuals on the basis of gender, so that we can establish what value the job classifications we already have are actually worth in terms of dollars and cents. The Commission on the Status of Women supports a comparable worth study. The Department of Public Health has expressed interest in the examining classifications within its own departments. I urge support for Amendment #7."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that

Amendment distributed, printed and distributed?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir, it was. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she'll yield."

Ropp: "In the interest of equality, have you also introduced the same kind of Amendment for the Commission on the Status of Men?"

Currie: "Representative, this is an Amendment to an appropriation for the Commission on the Status of Women. To my knowledge,

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- there is not a Commission on the Status of Men. Were there such, perhaps, I'd be offering this Amendment to that appropriation Bill, but I didn't have that option."
- Ropp: "Well, if there's this strong concern for equality, it would seem to me like it would be only fair that you would offer the same; one for each, men and for women."
- Currie: "Representative, this Amendment does not create the Commission on the Status of Women. It merely adds an appropriation to that agency for a particular purpose."
- Ropp: "Okay, one final question. How much extra... How much money all together now is for the Commission on the Status of Women?"
- Currie: "This Amendment is in the amount of 50,000 dollars."
- Ropp: "No, I mean how... does this... does this add..."
- Currie: "I think we're on the Amendment to this Bill rather than the Bill itself or the appropriation for the Commission."
- Ropp: "This is not a new Amendment is it? I mean, isn't there already money... We already have this Commission already set up, right?"
- Currie: "And its appropriation, its basic appropriation is already contained in House Bill 2370. This is a minor Amendment to the budget of that Commission in the amount of 50,000 dollars."
- Ropp: "Which is... All I\*m trying to find out is what this, added to whatever is in the Bill, adds up to what amount of dollars."
- Currie: "Just a moment, Representative. I'm looking that number up, but this Amendment is 50,000 dollars."
- Ropp: "I know what this is. I can read that, but I can't read what's already in the Bill."
- Currie: "You might want to address that question to the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Ropp. It is 138,922 dollars."

  Ropp: "Plus this 50, then, makes 188,000."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Currie: "That's ... That's right, Representative."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's probably some of these Amendments I'm not too fond of later down the line. I happen to support this one, but sometimes we get exercised unnecessarily over some of these funds for commissions. I would think the better thing, because of the lateness of the hour, to pass these out on a voice vote. We all know that these are going to be considered later in Conference Committee, no doubt about it. So, I would urge us to move along, adopt them, and we'll work on them later."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker...Representative Currie, the Department of Personnel, am I right, does it have a statutory mandate to provide for nondiscrimination?"

Currie: "I believe it does, Representative. We're talking, with this Amendment. however. not about individual discrimination, bnt the possibility that doi classifications in Illinois State Government, as is true in some parts of the private sector, as has been established within California state job classification schemes, as has been established for the City of San Jose, California and the State of Washington, may turn out to be invaded by pervasive discrimination, based on gender, having to do not with the qualifications, requirements and skills of the job categories but the fact that some jobs, traditionally, have been held by women and some, traditionally, held by males. This Amendment would enable us, in the General Assembly and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the Department of Personnel, to have a better handle on how well we are doing with removing discrimination from our job categories and from our job activities."

Vinson: "Representative Currie, does the State Civil Service

Commission have a statutory mandate to insure that there is

not discrimination in state employment?"

Currie: Representative, in terms of individual discrimination, I think there are distinct protections for based on discrimination based on gender, but what this Amendment is about is not an individual complaint or an individual concern, not somebody who did not get hired or did not get promoted because of sex. What we're talking about with this Amendment is an examination of dor categories and classifications to try to discover whether there is some pervasive misclassification, based on the gender of the people who traditionally hold or have held that particular job."

Vinson: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, because I don't want to hear the speech four more times."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Vinson: "The... In addition to the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Personnel, the Department of Human Relations has the same mandate. The Appropriation Committees of both Houses require the re... Affirmative Action reports each year, and the substantive commissions have oversight authority... the substantive committees have oversight authority on this principle. I would urge a vote on the Amendment. I would ask for a Roll Call vote, and I would indicate an intention to seek verification."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "I move the previous question."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'.

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

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Eighty percent of the clerical workers in this nation are female. Clerical 8600 dollars a year. Six percent of craft workers average are women and the average salary in that field I do not dispute the capacity of the Department of Personnel, the Civil Service Commission, agencies of State Government to see to it that there is not individual discrimination based gender on in job employment, but I am concerned that this state is not aware how we may be discriminating against women, as a by virtue of job classifications, classifications that may bear no relation to the actual skill levels, preparation requirements or to the responsibilities thereby employed. This Amendment, Amendment #7 to House Bill 2370, would enable the Commission on the Status of Women to do an examination to hire the people to do the kind that would make it clear whether examination involved in pervasive discrimination in job categories. think the information from the study would be very useful to Members of this General Assembly, as well as to Departments of Personnel and the Civil Service Commission. I hope that this House will agree to adopt Amendment #7 to House Bill 2370."

Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish a Roll Call, Ma'am? Question is,

'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'. All those in favor
signify by voting 'aye', opposed by woting 'no'. The
voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? There have been indications that there will be a
verification. So, I would ask you just to... Have all
voted who wish? He're going to dump this, and please vote

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

your own switch. Ouestion is. 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'ave'. opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 64 'aye', 61 'no". Representative Vinson. Gentleman from DeWitt requests a verification. Lady, Representative Currie, requests a Poll the Absentees. Representative Zito 'aye'. Younge 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Alstat. Ralanoff. Barnes. Barr. Bartulis. Bradley. Brummer. Catania. Cullerton. Davis. Deuchler. Deuster. Domico. Jack Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Pawell. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Garmisa. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hoffman. Jaffe. Klemm. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Laurino. Loftus. Leinenweber. Leon. Macdonald. 5aT Meyer. O'Brien. Nelson. Pechous. Pierce. Reed. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Irv Smith. Stearney. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed with a Poll of the Affirmative Boll."

Clerk Leone: "Poll fo the affirmative. Alex..."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giglio and Representative Keane ask leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Bowman. Braun. Bullock. Carey. Chapman. Christensen. DiPrima. Doyle. John Dunn. Darrow. Epton. Ewell. Farley\_ Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Griffin. Henry. Huff. Hallock. Hannig. Jackson. Jones. Kane. Keane. Koehler. Kulas. La Hood. Katz. Lechowicz. Leverenz-Levin. Madigan. Margalus. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. Rea. O'Connell. Pouncey. Preston. Rhem. Richmond. Saltsman. Slape. Margaret Smith. Ronan. Steczo.

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Stewart. Stuffle. Telcser. Turner."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Telcser from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Van Duyne. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell.
Zito and Zwick."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

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

Speaker Daniels: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Daniels: "Christensen. Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Was he removed?"

Speaker Daniels: "He was removed, Sir."

Vinson: "Representative Darrow."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Ewell."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Christensen has returned. Return him to the Affirmative Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Zwick."

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

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

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Vinson: "Rep..."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove her."

Vinson: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Katz. He's in his chair."

Vinson: Representative Wolf, Sam Wolf."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Sam:Wolf. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Slape."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "What's the count? Representative Catania as 'aye'. Return Representative Darrow to the Affirmative Roll. There are 61 'aye' and 62 'no'. Amendment #7 fails. I recorded you as 'aye', Representative Catania. We're in the middle of a verification. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Johnson - Brummer, amends House Bill 2370..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #8, Representative Johnson.

Representative Brummer. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, just about an hour ago, Representative Peters was at my desk seeking my cooperation in moving through the appropriation Bills. We're more than willing to cooperate, but when people legitimately ask for a verification, it's not proper for you to drop your head down and deliberately ignore their reguest for a verification. This matter is of great concern to many Members of this House. If they wish a verification of a vote, they're entitled to it."

116th Legislative Day

May 26. 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan, her light was not on.

I looked over at her before I announced the Roll..."

Madigan: "Who's her?"

Speaker Daniels: "...and what was done was proper."

Madigan: "Who's her?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie. Did you want a verification..."

Madigan: "Then you...Then you do know that she was seeking recognition."

Speaker Daniels: "No, Sir. Her light was not on."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, that's the point I just tried to make to you. You ask for cooperation on the one hand, but then, don't be saying, 'Hell, I didn't see the light on. I was...I didn't see her out of the corner of my eye'. Be fair about the thing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, probably a way out of the dilemma is to proceed with the Amendments that we do have. And, in the spirit of cooperation, I would ask that the Bill...that the Bill be read the third time and that we leave it on Second. The Lady can refile her Amendment, and we'll vote on it again tomorrow. All right?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Yeah, I mean, I didn't ask for a...the stalling procedure that Representative Vinson employed. As you read the Roll Call, the final Roll Call, it's pretty clear to me..."

Peters: "... Daniels: "

Currie: "...that this Amendment would have succeeded had I been permitted the opportunity for verification. If Representative Peters is suggesting that he introduce this Amendment and guarantee us a voice vote and a 'yes' response, then I'm delighted to follow his suggestion.

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

But, barring that, the opportunity to come here again tomorrow and go through the same charade at...at a time when everybody will be crabby and cross..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, all that I can end up suggesting is that
the Bill be left on Second and the Lady file her Amendment.
I cannot guarantee that the Amendment will be adopted, no
more than I can guarantee that other Amendments to the
Constitution, or otherwise, will be adopted."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "If Representative Peters was so far amiss as to have voted on the prevailing side of that Amendment, perhaps he would like to move now to reconsider the vote by which that Amendment lost."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "That would be violative of conscience, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Representative Peters, maybe you have a friend who would be willing to make that Motion for you, and..."

Peters: "And the plan that I have...The next plan that I have,
Representative Currie, is to say I have tried as best I can
to accommodate the Minority Leader, in the spirit that he
agreed to and I agreed to earlier. And I made a suggestion
to you which Members on our side of the aisle and your side
of the aisle are not going to like, because they defeated
an Amendment they did not want to put on. But, I'm
suggesting to you, in the spirit of that compromise, we'll
keep the Bill on Second. You can have another shot at it
when your Members are here, as you were complaining to me
just four minutes ago."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since I was not on that Roll Call, I believe that I have the prerogative of making a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Motion to reconsider. Am I correct?"
- Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Representative. You were removed from the Roll Call in the verification."
- Zwick: "That's...That's what I mean. Since I was removed, don't
  I have the ro..."
- Speaker Daniels: "No, you would be...you would be not voting.

  I'm sorry."
- Zwick: "And...not voting, I can't."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yeah. No, Ma'am, sorry. Representative Ewell."
- Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't get a chance to see how I was recorded, again. I understood somebody bumped me when I went to the john. And I'd just like to be recorded, you know, get my vote recorded."
- Speaker Daniels: "You're recorded as not voting, Sir.

  Representative Breslin."
- Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #8...7 failed. And I'd like a Roll Call vote, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "Lady, Representative Breslin, having voted on the prevailing side, which was 'no', moves that the vote by which Amendment #7 fails be reconsidered. On that Motion to reconsider Amendment #7, all those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. A vote in favor, a vote 'aye', is to reconsider. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 77 'aye, 51 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. And the Lady's Motion carries. On Amendment #7, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted? . All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is Push your own switch only, please. Representative open. Conti."
- Conti: "In lieu of half of the floor being off of the...half of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the con...the Legislators being off the floor on legislative business - I want to make that clear for the press - they were here and they were working. I wonder if we can have the...at least understand what the Amendment is, because half of those that are voting on it don't know what they're voting."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, in explanation of your vote."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an Amendment appropriating 50,000 dollars to the Commission on the Status of Women for the purpose of conducting a study of job classification in the State of Illinois government, to establish comparable worth."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are companies who are in the business of studying job classifications and making recommendations to companies or governments or what have you as to what people should be paid. In other words, this study has been done many times over. To think that, somehow, we can throw 50,000 dollars at the Status of Women Commission and get a better study is an absolute waste of 50,000 dollars. Anyone voting green is kidding themselves if they think this is good use of state money."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If
the study has been done in Illinois government, it's been
suppressed, because none of us knows about it. There
certainly are companies that do it. 'Hay Associates' is
one of them. They come in and they evaluate jobs on the
basis of skills that are required, and it makes it clear
whether discriminatory practices are being used in
remuneration for performance of those jobs. If we're

#### 116th Legislative Day

table..."

May 26, 1982

afraid of finding out the facts and having someone like 'Hay Associates' come in and find out what our employees are really worth and what we ought to be paying them in a comparable way, then we shouldn't be willing to stand up and be counted in favor of this. But, if we want to find out the truth, we should be for it. And I would urge everybody to vote green."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman, Amendment #7, explanation of vote. Timer's on."
- Chapman: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an announcement of the Roll, please. Should there be a verification of the affirmative vote that...that would make a verification of the negative vote indicated, I would ask for such a verification. Now, since we seem to be having so much trouble with a simple little Amendment that is...indicates the need for simple justice."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 78 "aye", 60 'no', 4 voting 'present'. Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Johnson Brummer, amends House Bill 2370 on page 3, line 29 and so forth."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson. Representative Brummer. Gentleman on the floor? Representative Peters."

  Peters: "It's a rhetorical question."
- Speaker Daniels: "Your pleasure, Sir? Gentleman moves t
- Peters: "Representative Brummer here? I don't want to do anything for Brummer."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #8. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #8 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Johnson Brummer..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson. Representative Brummer. Gentleman on the floor? Gentleman, Representative Peters, moves...who are you pointing towards?"
- Peters: "No, I don't want to interfere with Representative

  Brummer. I wouldn't want to table this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Collins, moves to table Amendment #9. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #9 is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Stearney Getty, amends House Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney, Amendment #10."
- Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
  Amendment #10 would appropriate 225,000 dollars to Labor
  Law Revision Commission. If there's any questions, I'll
  answer them."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...I think Representative Stearney has been studying the methods of Representative Giorgi, and he's...he's done it very well. The appropriation for this Commission is 50,000, in two different Bills. I was wondering what the 225,000 was going to pay for and where...from whence it came. Would the Gentleman care to clarify that?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney."
- Stearney: "Do you wish me to answer that, Mr. Collins?Well, I believe there's been some mix-up. There's only going to be one Labor Law Commission, and this will be the appropriation for it. Last year when it did pass the House, the Senate, went to the Governor's desk, it had a far larger appropriation than what you mentioned. This is

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

the agreed on appropriation."

Collins: "Well...Well, who agreed, other than you and Ronan?"

Stearney: "Who agreed? Been agreed by a great number of Members of the House. No, but seriously, Phil, let's not joke around about this."

Collins: "Well, I'm not joking around at all."

Stearney: "There's nothing wrong with the Amendment, now."

Speaker Daniels: "Represe...Representative Friedrich."

Stearney: "Any other questions?"

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Are you anticipating a larger number of staff, or
 just higher priced staff members?"

Stearney: "Quality not quantity, Mr..."

Friedrich: "Quality?"

Stearney: "Quality."

Friedrich: "What...What would the the highest salary you anticipate to be paid by this Commission?"

Stearney: "I really don't know, as of yet. That hasn't been settled."

Friedrich: "So, this is kind of a blank check for them to pay
what they decide to pay."

Stearney: "Well, it won't be totally unreasonable. You can rest assured."

Friedrich: "Okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "I...I am sincere in wanting some clarification, and hear you elucidate on how 225,000 is going to be spent on this Commission. Now, I want some definitive answers."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Stearney: "Well, I imagine the...the greater number of dollars will be spent on labor, rather than materials."

Tuerk: "Bhat's that mean?"

Stearney: "Well, any other questions, Mr. Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "Yeah, I have a lot of questions."

Stearney: "Well, ask them."

Tuerk: "Tell me how the money's going to be spent."

Stearney: "It's going to be spent on labor, on employees."

Tuerk: "Rell, get a little more definitive than that."

Stearney: "Well, how much more definitive can I be than to say it's going to be spent on wages?"

Tuerk: "I want to know what this Commission's going to do."

Stearney: "Well, the purpose of the Commission, as you know, is
to revise the Labor Law Acts in the State of Illinois —
both Workmans' Comp and Unemployment Comp."

Tuerk: "Do you know that we used to have a Labor Laws Commission that, frankly, hadn't met for four years?"

Stearney: "No..."

Tuerk: "And what...what do you purport that this Commission will do that that Commission wasn't able to do?"

Stearney: "Well, you're saying to me that that Commission did nothing. Well, the opposite of that is that this Commission will do something, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "What? That's what I'm trying to ask you, and you won't give me an answer."

Stearney: "I just told you. It's going to be for the purpose of revising the labor laws — Workman's Comp and Unemployment Comp."

Tuerk: "And, how you going to go about that?"

Stearney: "We're going to sit down and have discussion between labor and commerce."

Tuerk: "Hell, to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Tuerk: "I think it's absolutely...ly ludicrous. The 50,000 is ludicrous. Now, we want to raise this to 225,000. That's super ludicrous. I would suggest to every Member of this Body to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Hell, in answer to the speaker from Peoria, I think if this Labor Commission had been working, you might have passed 2274. This is the type of Commission you need to enlighten the Chamber of the Association of Manufacturers to what's needed in labor law revision. Since 1975, when you and your troups went into the arena with the labor laws, you got snookered. You need a Commission like that to pull yourself out."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, don't think it's ludicrous to spend 250,000 dollars to help improve the business climate in Illinois; and get labor and industry together and work out a compromise, so they're not always at each other's throat. It's bound to attract more industry to the state. I think it's something that's very much needed. We just spent 50,000 on the most ludicrous thing I ever heard of, some kind of a study that they're going out and study...the Status of go Commission's going to do some study. If we could 50,000 dollars on something as worthless as that, we ought to be able to spend 250,000 dollars to help improve the business climate in Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Roman."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm appalled at listening to some of this discussion. This is the creation of a very important Commission that's going to do a yeoman's job in trying to address one of the most serious issues affecting the people of the state of

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Illinois. 225 - 250,000's a drop in the bucket for the quality of work that's going to come out of this Commission. It's important that we have a bipartisan approach to look at the most serious issues affecting the people of the State of Illinois, and I urge a green vote both on this side of the aisle. I assume this Commission will probably end up with 135-140 votes, because it's important and it's what we should be doing today. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Topinka. Representative Sam Wolf. Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, in answer to the Gentleman from Peoria, I must say that, perhaps, he's somewhat unhappy because the Commission cannot be dominated by just one particular segment of our society. I suggest to him that, in order for a Commission to be effective, it has to have its feet in both camps. And it's my intent to have people, both from labor and commerce, represented on the Commission, as I have voted in this General Assembly over the last eight years; on both sides of the question, and not solely on one side of the question. And, as to how the Commission is to be composed, I would suggest that it has ... as has other commissions, the purpose is to have qualified people, namely...not only attorneys, but qualified staff who can put together, revise and revamp the most confusing pieces of legislation that are on the books and all the various statutes. It is going to be spent intelligently, wisely and knowledgeably: hopefully to benefit all segments, both labor and commerce, in the State of Illinois and hopefully do a job and come up with something that can benefit labor and commerce. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Stearney, asks for a

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted?'. 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. ...son, 'aye'. There are 59 'aye', 85 'no' and 1 voting 'present. Amendment #10 fails. Representative Darrow."

- Darrow: "Speaker, there are people who are pushing switches here.

  Some of these Amendments are kind of important to the folks
  back home, I think, and they just ought to think about
  that, because when we go back we're going to have to
  explain some of these votes. I just point that out to the
  Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, you are correct, Sir. Is Representative

  Preston here? Gentleman in the chambers? Further

  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #11, Leinenweber Getty, amends House
  Bill 2370..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber. Representative Getty, Amendment #11."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Hembers of the House, Amendment #11 raises appropriation for the Uniformity of Legislation Commission from 30,000 to 40,000. There has been no increase since 1976 in the appropriation. There has already been filed a...an additional Amendment to take care of last year's deficiency. The increase in the by the Uniform Law Commissioners have increased by charged some one-third, and this reflects that increase The costs, other than that, are quite modest. I would ask for your support of this very modest increase."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?'. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #11 is

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Representative Peters. Amendment #12."

- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #12, Stearney, amends House Bill 2370..."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stearney, Amendment #12.
- Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Stearney is temporarily incapacitated. Amendment #12 provides an appropriation of 60,000 dollars for the Prison Studies Commission, House Bill 2280, which was approved by this House last week. I would move the adoption of Amendment #12."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Peters moves for the adoption of Amendment #12. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no". The "ayes" have it.

  Amendment #12 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #13, Hoffman, amends House Bill..."

  Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, Amendment #13."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment \$13 adds 922 dollars to the appropriation of the School Problems Commission. This is necessary because of a miscalculation that we made in figuring the retirement and social security for the secretary of the Commission. And I would ask your support of this Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #13. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #13 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2393, read the Bill,
  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendment #1 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

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

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendments #2 were withdrawn and Amendment #4

failed. The next Floor Amendment is Floor Amendment #5,

McClain, amends House Bill 2393..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Withdraw."

Speaker Daniels: "Withdrawn, Purther Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, McClain, amends House Bill 2393..."

Speaker Daniels: "Amendment #6, Representative McClain.
Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, McClain..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, Amendment #7.
Withdrawn? Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, McClain..."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, let's just withdraw all of them until 13, inclusive. I've made my point."

Speaker Daniels: "Including 13, Sir?"

McClain: "Including 13."

Speaker Daniels: "All right. Representative McClain withdraws
Amendment #8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #14, Van Duyne, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that 14 through
17 will be incorrect, so I'd like to withdraw all of those
and go with Amendment #18."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne withdraws Amendment #14, 15, 16, and 17. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #18, Van Duyne, amends House Bill

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

2393 ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Van Duyne, Amendment #18."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very simple Amendment. In Committee, the Attorney General testified that, in the event that the grand jury, the statewide grand jury Bill, that he would need 60,000 dollars in...in extra money to take care the extra work load. So, I think the Amendment is self-explanatory. Without the ... Without the statewide grand jury, there is no need for the 60,000 dollars. so, this Amendment simply deletes that 60,000 dollars. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Will Representative Van Duyne yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

- Davis: "Representative, I didn't quite understand your explanation. Why are your taking 64,000 dollars out of the budget? Or why do you seek to do it?"
- Van Duyne: "All right. In Committee, the Attorney General testified that, in the event that he was successful in gaining his statewide grand jury, that it would press his on-board people with extra work, whatever he meant by that extra work telephone calls, travel, overtime, etcetera, and that he would need the extra 60, not 64,000, to expedite the grand jury Bill that he...that he was shooting for. Now, as we all know, House Bill 2365 was withdrawn, and so that negates the need for the extra 60,000 dollars."
- Davis: "Well, thank you, Representative Van Duyne. Where...Where are you taking the money out of the budget, then, if that's the case? Frankly, I think the General misspoke himself in the Committee; was suggesting that if that Bill should become law, that they could work within the constraints of what was available to them on top, by doing double duty and

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

work within those constraints until such time as they saw what kind of monies were needed to pursue that course, and, as you so aptly have pointed out, the Bill was not called. We don't know whether it is coming back in the Senate or whatever, but whe...where are you taking the money out? I'm sorry."

Van Duyne: "Okay. If...If they all have a copy of Amendment #18, you can read it with me. It amends House Bill 2393 on page 1, line 23 by deleting '3,753,700' and inserting in lieu thereof, '3,700,900'; and on page 1, line 25 by deleting '198,900' and inserting thereof, '195,720'; and on page 1, line 27 by deleting '245,568' and inserting '244,548'. That is a technical explanation of where the money is taken out of, and it's called, I believe, public representation."

Davis: "Well, to...to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think we're on somewhat of a vindictive witch hunt here, and I believe though well-intentioned, and finally seeing Democrat Amendment to reduce an appropriation is...is wonderful thing to behold. But, I can tell you that I think this is simply some sort of personal vendetta or of some kind of vendetta from the other side of the aisle. This money will come out of ... of the total budget, representation or criminal justice: we're not really sure. yet, where...where the Representative is trying to take the But, it would, money from. ultimately, effectiveness of this current Attorney General or. God forbid, the next one that may not be this one. So, I would suggest to you that, ultimately, Representative Van Duyne is, once again, wrong. And you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "...done, Sir?"

Van Duyne: "No... Well, I just...I'll just close if I can, by answering Representative Davis. If I can have somebody's

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

I really resent the ... the witch hunt remark, Representative Davis, because, after all, we...your own Attorney General can...your own Attorney General and the candidate for re-election asked for this money, extra money in his budget, because of the fact that he was confident that he would have the grand jury Bill accepted. this is by his testimony, not by ours. And we were generous enough to have this placed in his budget in a general way. We were giving him the latitude as to how to choose to spend it. Now, we've taken a 70...in excess of 70,000 dollar Amendment reduction on the Treasurer's Bill. I can't see that there's any witch hunt or any specific quarrel between me and Ty Fahner. After all, he asked for the money. He doesn't have the grand jury Bill, money is not necessay to be in his budget. It's just as simple as that. And I ask... I ask all for an affirmative vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative

  Van Duyne, moves for the adoption of Amendment #18. All

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

  'nos' have it. Amendment #18 fails. Further Amendments?"

  Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. 2456, out of the record. 2457, out of the record. 2458, out of the record. 2459, out of the record. 2481, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act making appro...appropriations to the Department of Law Enforcement. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Schraeder, amends House
  Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schraeder, Amendment #2.

  Representative Schraeder. Withdrawn? Withdraw it.

  Purther Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. On the Calendar, page 5, Senate
  Bills Second Reading, Appropriation Matters. Senate Bill
  1385, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1385, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "None."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1392, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1392, a Bill for an Act to amend certain appropriation Acts. Second Reading of the Bill.

  No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1395, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1395, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
  making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship
  Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
  Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"
- Clerk Leone: "None."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1669, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1669, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
  making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health
  and Developmental Disabilities. Second Reading of the

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Wikoff, amends House (sic - Senate) Bill 1669..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative... Out of the record. Agreed
Resolutions. Representative Preston, for what purpose do
you rise, Sir?"

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to go
back to on the Order of House Bills Second Reading to House
Bill 2223 to call it and the Amendments to it."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir. The Sponsor of that Bill took it out of the record."

Preston: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 948, Bianco - Boucek. Resolution 950, DiPrima - et al. House Resolution 951, Braun. House Resolution...House...House Resolution 953, Ryan Republican Leadership - Madigan - Democrat Leadership. House Resolution 954, Kane. House Resolution 955. Kane. House Resolution 956, Topinka. Resolution 957, Mulcahey. House Resolution 959, Terzich -House Resolution 961, Krska - Braun - Bowman. House Joint Resolution 89, Hudson - Doyle."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, Agreed Resolutions.

Ladies and Gentlemen, could we please have your attention?

There are some Members that wish to listen. Representative Conti."

Conti: "All right. Fine. Ladies and Gentleman...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 948,

Bianco - Boucek and all Members, this House thanks the Conrady Junior High School music department for all its enjoyment and outstanding musical performance it has provided in the rotunda over many years. House Resolution

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

DiPrima - Ryan - Madigan - et al, the Republic of and the United States of America sealed their friendship by signing a Treaty of Friendship and Commerce in 1882, so they're celebrating a hundred years this year. The declaration of an International Family Day, by House Resolution...by...951 by Braun. House Resolution 953, Ryan Republican Leadership and Democratic Leadership, whereas the Illinois House of Representatives recognizes and welcomes these distinguished representatives of the Nigerian legal community who are visiting our state. Resolution 954, Kane, whereas James Lynn Herrick and Linda Ann Dixon were united in holy matrimony on March 19, 1982-House Resolution 955 by Kane, it has come to the attention of the House of Representatives that Thomas Eugene and Deborah Ann Herrick were united in marriage at 5:00 p.m. on April 2, 1982. House Resolution 956 by Park District will celebrate its 25th Anniversary by partici...by participating in the Nemorial Day Parade on May 31st. House Resolution 957, Mulcahey, whereas we'd like to commend Mrs. Frances Patterson on the occasion of her retirement from more than 30 years of service in the field of teaching. House Resolution 955...59, Reverend Joseph Pru...Prunskis, Roman Catholic journalist, priest and noted celebrated his golden anniversary in the priesthood with a special mass on May House Joint Resolution ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, here's a copy, Sir."

Conti: "Here it is. House Joint Resolution 89, whereas Hollis

Hawkins is a World War II veteran...incidently this is by

Hudson and Doyle. Hollis Hawkins is a World War II

veteran, U. S. Navy, a past Commander of Veterans

Assistance Commission. These fellows are going to receive

a citation merit to the...to the Commerce: Hollis Hawkins,

116th Legislative Day

- May 26, 1982
- Robert Mitchler, Lawrence DiPrima and David Hymes. They will be receiving this citation at a dinner on Friday. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Resolutions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Agreed Resolutions adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 947, in respect...Bowman, in respect to the me...memory of Adeline Terra. House Resolution 949, in respect to the...Katz et al, in respect to the memory of Robert Drake."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Mr. Conti, moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Terzich...and the Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Terzich, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Terzich: "Well, this is very important, Mr. Speaker. From Coach Capparelli, I'm sorry to inform all Members that baseball practice has been cancelled for tonight. I...I know...I know it hurts deeply, but be prepared next week. Get your exercise over the weekend, and be ready for practice next Wednesday."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fawell, did you hear that?

  Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, let me first remind the Members that they should be checking out of their hotels in the morning, and we will hopefully be out tomorrow afternoon sometime. We have about 15 Bills to handle. Mr. Speaker, I now move the House stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at the hour of 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Daniels: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed

116th Legislative Day

May 26, 1982

\*no\*. The \*ayes\* have it. The House will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning:"