135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Father Eugene Costa from the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception of Springfield. Father Costa."
- Father Costa: "Let us pray. Almighty and eternal God, all wisdom and all knowledge come from You. Look upon this Assembly of our leaders, fill them with Your wisdom, guide them in leading Your people. We pray through Christ our Lord, Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Klemm will give the Pledge."
- Klemm et al: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United
 States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,
 one nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice
 for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the record, Mr.

 Clerk. With 171 answering the Roll Call, a quorum of the
 House is present. Representative Getty, do you have any
 excused absences for today or yesterday?"
- Getty: "No, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser, do you have any excused absences for today, yesterday or tomorrow?"
- Telcser: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the record show that
 Representative Barnes is absent today because of illness?

 And she was also absent yesterday because of illness and
 last Saturday."
- Speaker Ryan: "How about Sunday?"
- Telcser: "I think I already excused her for Sunday? If not, let the record show she was also absent Sunday for illness."
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. On the Calendar, on page two, under the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 396, Representative Hallock. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 396, a Bill for an Act to amend the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

United... Unified Code of Corrections together with Senate

Amendment #2."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "House Bill 396 is a Bill, which you may recall, allows us to make license plates in Illinois prisons. At the current time, about 42 out of the 50 states make license plates in their prisons, but Illinois does not. We currently buy our plates, our license plates — our truck plates are bought from Texas, and our car plates are bought from New York State. This Bill passed before unanimously and is now back on concurrence. What the Senate Amendment #2 does is basically is technical. It allows the Secretary of State to contract with prison industries, correction industries to buy license plates from them. I urge your support for the concurrence Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Watson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Watson: "I rise in support of the concurrence, and I'd like to discuss it, if I wish. Some of us..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Daniels in the Chair, while you're... before you get started on your long, lengthy explanation. Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our correctional centers sometimes have the reputation of being Holiday Inns, and I'm sure that some of you who have toured the facilities throughout the state would have to concur with that. A lot of the inmates are doing nothing more than playing basketball or baseball, lifting weights and other recreational activity, and I really question sometimes the rehabilitation effort of our correctional centers. I think that a Bill such as this would allow for experience of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

inmates to work in the capacity and maybe even learn a trade and, hopefully, get out into society and be able to hold a job and get away from the people that have made them what they are, really, and put them into the correctional institutions the way they've...the way they've been. So, I think this...this type of measure is important, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Miller."

Miller: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Miller: "Representative Hallock, does this allow the State of Illinois or the Secretary of the State to contract with any other penal institution other than ones in the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "At the present time, the Secretary of State contracts with New York and Texas to make... have our current plates made. This Bill would allow, first of all, them to contract with the Illinois Department of Corrections and; secondly, in the future, hopefully to make plates for those eight other states which currently do not make their own plates."

Miller: "But it does not preclude the other states from continuing to produce plates?"

Hallock: "No, it does not."

Miller: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago,
Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative, this Amendment also deletes a portion of the Bill that amends the Secretary of State's powers and duties. What are those powers and duties that has been...

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

that have been eliminated or amended?"

Hallock: "I believe those powers are inherent within the Secretary of State's powers and did not need to be enumerated there in the statute."

Mulcahey: "Again, John?"

Hallock: "Those powers are inherent with the duties of the Secretary of State and do not really need to be in the statute."

Mulcahey: "Okay."

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

Pierce: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "Does this Bill, in concurrence, say that the state
prison shall produce the license plates even though they
produce it at a higher cost to the state than could be done
by handicapped persons or by other private ventures?"

Hallock: "Well, Representative Pierce, that's an interesting question. What we would like to do currently is start the program in Illinois in the prison system, but we also left open the option that someday in the future, perhaps, they could also be made by handicapped people. And, therefore, I would accept that in the future as another possibility."

Pierce: "But that's not in this Bill."

Hallock: "It does not specifically state that they shall be made by handicapped people within our state system."

Pierce: "But, could they be made if a bid was lower from the handicapped people under this Bill, or are you procluding lower bids and going for the higher bid from the prison?"

Hallock: "Well, we... we've talked about that with the vocation and rehabilitation people, and they've agreed that they may want to do them in the future. But this year we've decided, in order to pass the Bill and make it possible to

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Illinois prisons. This not only would save taxpayers great money in this time of crisis, but also give prisoners something to do and also give them a skill which is good for machine shop operation on the outside. It's an excellent idea. It has passed unanimously before, and I urge your support now. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 396. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Tazwell, Representative Ozella, to explain his vote. The timer's on. Representative Epton, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Epton: "No, after you finish announcing the vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 157 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 396.

Representative Epton, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Epton: "For the purpose of making an announcement, if I may, Mr.

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Speaker."

Epton: "Ladies... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may have your attention for just a moment. I think everybody on the floor will be interested in this. A few years ago I had the privilege of introducing the Commanding General of the Eighth Air Porce in our gallery. Through shear chance today, we have... I'll go back a little bit in history to remind you that D-Day was on June 6, 1944. Even... Even Auditor Cronson remembers that great day. However, after the allies landed in Normandy and Omaha, they had difficulty in breaking through the German lines. On November 18, 1944, for the first and only time, the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Eighth Air Force and the British Air Force flew as one unit. Eight thousand airplanes bombed 'Duranochen' in Three weeks before that, General 'McNare' breakthrough. had been killed by our own bombers who bombed in error. that time, every lead crew leading that entire flotilla 8,000 planes was commanded by the Executive Officer of General 'Spatz' who, which General Officer was the highest commanding officer to fly combat. I had the dubious honor flying on that plane with the gentleman dropped...ordered the dropping of the bombs which enabled the breakthrough at 'Duranochen'. And today, we have t he gallery the gentleman who commanded that entire flotilla. It's my pleasure to present General 'Inder' and his wife, Lillian, who are in the gallery with us today."

Speaker Daniels: "The Order of Concurrence, page two of your Calendar. House Bill 891, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to CORCUE Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 891. Excuse me. Ι do this somewhat reluctantly, because House Bill 891, as it went to the Senate, included some things that I would like to see in the law. But I'm persuaded that, at this point, if this Bill goes to Conference Committee, it will include a whole lot more things that I like even less. Senate Amendment #2 requires the Illinois High School Association to submit to a post audit by the Auditor General and deals with the question of a Board of Education employing and assigning noncertified employees. It says that a tenured teacher who is removed or dismissed in a reduction in force procedure and later recalled goes back with whatever tenure rights they had to begin with, and provides that a high school... essentially that, with

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

state high school basketball tournament, if they re going... if the tournament is going to have one format for the mens' tournament, it must have the same format for the Amendment #3 is a clarification of... women's tournament. essentially a clarification of #2. Again, I stress I have some questions about some of this. I think that whatever problems there may be can be worked out between the Governor's Office and the High School Association. that if you send this Bill back to Conference Committee. where I, as Sponsor, will lose control of it, it into control of the Conference itself; that you will be much - anyone who has any doubts about it will be even more unhappy than they are now. I think the provisions are ones that we can live with. So, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 891."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

Johnson."

Johnson: "I realize this Bill is going to... going to pass concurrence, but I really think everybody ought to be aware, particularly, what you're doing if you concur Senate Amendment #2. We're... I represent Champaign/Urbana where the state tournaments are held every year. There has never been what this Amendment purports to be: that we've never had that kind of a system. The reason we haven't, and the reason we went to the system that we had last year was because, when we had one tournament, AA and A combined with eight teams playing there in the girls! tournament weekend, the crowds were absolutely abysmal very small crowds; and, in that, with the new format of having eight teams, a Class A and a Class AA on the same weekend, we are able to add to the... to the sizes of the crowds and to make it at least still financially losing but not losing by quite so much. And I think what

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

you're going to do, in an attempt to try to make all of the tournaments exactly alike, is that you're going to destroy the financial viability of having two tournaments. that, or you're going to require IHSA to go back to one tournament with A and AA combined which effectively eliminates the ability of A schools to compete with AA. The fact of the matter is, ever since 1922 or 1918, we boys class basketball tournament, and it's always been extremely well attended in A and AA. It's a winner for IHSA. They fill up the assembly hall, virtually full, in both tournaments. 1 fully support a basketball tournament; but, when you try to do what this Amendment does, to have an A, an eight-team tournament, and a AA, an eight-team tournament, the crowds are going to be so tiny that there's going to be an IHSA move, I bluom presume, to eliminate the tournament altogether. As far as know, there was no outcry by anybody last year as to how the tournament worked. We had one tournament... or one weekend, an A and a AA, with semi-finalists and finalists in each class, and it worked extremely well. was a Bill that Representative Levin proposed to do what Senate Amendment #2 does: and, as far as I know, it either got defeated overwhelmingly in Committee, or it never got called. I wasn't on that Committee. There's also a question of what we ought to be doing to force the IHSA, which is a private association, to take particular actions particular areas. The cost, the days off of school for kids - if you go to four weekends from Thursday through is just going to throw the whole thing out of Sunday off. kilter, and you're going to wind up destroying what's wound up being a very, very good thing for everybody right now. I'm really not criticizing Representative Reilly, because I think he's acknowledged, in his introductory remarks, that

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

doesn't agree with all the substance of all the But I think it's real Amendments. dangerous to vote something out of here and give it to the Governor and presume that, because we've got a good symbolic thing, that it's paing to work well. Wе who represent Champaign/Urbana, and I think Legislators who represent different teams who have been particularly successfuly in the tournaments lately realize how well it's going now. if we try to change it, if we try to have four weekends, if we try to divide the classes and do the things this Amendment does, we could wind up killing the golden goose. I don't, you know, I don't care how you vote on it, but I think I ought to ... everybody ought to be aware of what you're doing. And you also ought to be aware fact that a Bill was put in to this effect that got overwhelmingly defeated, or either defeated or didn't called in the appropriate Committee. So, I urge you to look at what you're doing before you wote on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle." Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I realize there's a concern that this or other Bills would go to a Conference Committee and may be dressed up in a different fashion with different clothes, if you will. My concern is not that. My concern is as that of Representative Johnson. T think the Amendment, with regard to sex discrimination, does just what Representative Johnson says. It goes too far. destroys the goose that laid the golden egg, so to speak. has the potential of destroying the High Association Class tournaments in the name of getting rid of sex discrimination, in the name of equality. We've gone too far on this issue. We're going to destroy the whole system if we keep doing this sort of thing. As well, there are no teeth in this Amendment as to a

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

purports, on one hand, not to hold that Association or Organization that sponsors the tournament to task for sex discrimination. It holds the high school that participates in those activities accountable for those actions. not fair either. And, on the other hand, there are penalties if they do that. The whole Amendment seems to me absurd. It ought to be killed. It has no reason, or rhyme or cause for passage. It ought to go down. It ought not to be decided this issue on the question of whether or you think a Bill's going to go to Conference Committee. you thought that, and you were concerned about that, then you'd never let any Bill get by here and go into a This particular Amendment is bad for the Conference. people of this state. What it purports to do and what it. will are entirely different things. iust Representative Johnson said. And, for those reasons. to be nonconcurring in this particular action, instead of concurring just to keep it out of a Conference. It's a bad Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question for the Sponsor. Would be yield?

Speaker Daniels: "He said he would."

Ropp: "Alright, Representative Reilly, a question dealing with
Amendment #2 in that it says it allows the Board of
Education to employ and assign uncertified employees. Does
that have reference to teachers being noncertified?"

Reilly: "It does not deal with... We're talking about people other than... other than teachers; janitors, secretaries, whatever they may be."

Ropp: "Alrighty, thank you. Now, in regards to the Bill as the two previous speaker had mentioned, I'm certainly in support of the intent in providing opportunity for young

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

ladies to play basketball, but it seems to me, from a practical standpoint in terms of when we look at the coverage that I think was ably covered this last year, if we broaden this out, even from a financial standpoint, going to see that that TV coverage will you re terminated. And what had hoped to advance the cause of young ladies playing good quality basketball - you're going to see not that exposure throughout the State of Illinois. So, I think, in all good faith, in an attempt to continue provide for this kind of opportunity, that we shouldn't come out all aboard right now and say, "We're going to have to have two solid days or eight teams of AA and A basketball tournament. From a practical standpoint, the revenue is just not there at this point, until, ultimately, we have a larger following where you're going to have sponsors that will want to cover it and sponsor it on TV. And, on this particular Amendment, Amendment #2, I should be defeated."

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

Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Braun: "Actually, I have a question of the board. The board seems to indicate we're on concurrence on Amendment #3, but the discussion so far has revolved around Amendment #2.

Representative Reilly?"

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman is moving concurrence in both Amendments. So, you may inquire as to either 2 or 3."

Reilly: "I'm sorry. What was the question?"

Braun: "Is your Motion for concurrence on Amendments 2 and 3 or just 3?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun. The Gentleman's Motion

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

ladies to play basketball, but it seems to me, from a practical standpoint in terms of when we look at the TV coverage that I think was ably covered this last year, if we broaden this out, even from a financial standpoint, you're going to see that that TV coverage will terminated. And what had hoped to advance the cause οf young ladies playing good quality basketball - you're going to see not that exposure throughout the State of Illinois. So, I think, in all good faith, in an attempt to continue to provide for this kind of opportunity, that we shouldn't come out all aboard right now and say, "We're going to have to have two solid days or eight teams of AA and A basketball tournament. From a practical standpoint, the revenue is just not there at this point, until, ultimately, we have a larger following where you're going to have sponsors that will want to cover it and sponsor it on TV. And, on this particular Amendment, Amendment #2, I should be defeated."

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

Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Braun: "Actually, I have a question of the board. The board seems to indicate we're on concurrence on Amendment #3, but the discussion so far has revolved around Amendment #2.

Representative Reilly?"

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman is moving concurrence in both Amendments. So, you may inquire as to either 2 or 3."

Reilly: "I'm sorry. What was the question?"

Braun: "Is your Motion for concurrence on Amendments 2 and 3 or just 3?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun. The Gentleman's Motion

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

is on 2 and 3. You may inquire on either one."

Braun: "Alrighty. Representative Reilly, with regard to Amendment #2 and with regard to the Section pertaining to sex discrimination, as I read the analyses, it seems to me that it doesn't do anything but restate what is already the law, and does not provide for a penalty but, rather, is just an affirmation that the schools should follow Title IX in providing for athletic opportunities for young women as well."

Reilly: "What is the... I mean, that's correct. What is the statement... I mean, what is the question?"

Braun: "Well, that's my question. Is just restates the current law, as I read this analysis."

Reilly: "... Representative Levin, who is a Cosponsor of the Bill and originally had this language, would want to respond."

Braun: "My question, Representative Levin, is whether this

Amendment simply restates current law."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Representative is absolutely correct. I believe that the actions must fall within Title IX and the School Code provisions. There was, of course, earlier this year substantial concern about certain actions that were taken in terms of women's high school basketball, and this attempts to reiterate, you know, what we believe is, in fact, the current law."

Braun: "Thank you. Then, to the Amendment."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. I, quite frankly, don't understand the babbling that's gone on, and I do mean babbling, about the sex discrimination Section of this Amendment. It only restates the current law; and, if we are not to turn this Legislative Session into an assault on

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

women and an assault on the rights that women have already achieved in the law... We've already seen the Equal Rights Amendment go down in this Legislature. To see this Legislature affirm that it does not support Title IX, which is already in the law, and it does not support equality of opportunity for young women in high school basketbal, would be a real tragedy and a shame, and I urge support for the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to echo many of comments that have been made by many of the previous people regarding the basketball tournaments. Every spring, we usually have two, three or four different Legislators from this august Body with the members of their high school team which has won the state tournament. They're down here introducing them to receive the accolades that are justly due them. I would point out that in Amendment #2 that any high school that is in viol ... that will be in violation of the law when it enters a basketball tournament that does conduct identically structured tournaments. placing the onus, I believe, upon the basketball teams and the schools. Many of the schools think it's one of the greatest honors they've ever had to reach Champaign to included in the... in the basketball tournament. I think we're opening a real basket of worms on this; and, if the Sponsor of the Bill would be so inclined, I think this is one issue that should be divided. I also would point out one other thing, as I read the analysis; that allows the Board of Education to employ and assign noncertified teachers. This, again, I think is... can be a very serious problem within the teachers themselves. This says 'employees', as far as the analysis is concerned, but what is the interpretation of an employee? Is a teacher an

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

employee? It's been one of the questions that's been raised, particularly in the schools in the Normal area, in the Urbana area with the University-operated schools, and I think this is something should be severely questioned. And I would urge the Sponsor to divide the issue, and let's... let's vote on this separately. Either that or I would urge a complete defeat of the total Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "Mr. Reilly, when this Bill passed the House, wasn't its only subject some silly idea of advancing the age from December 1st to September 1st for six-year-olds to enter school? Was that all this Bill was when it passed the House?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Pierce, when this Bill passed the House, it had the only good idea in it it's ever had which was that we advance the age. That is gone."

Pierce: "Now, what happened to that? Didnot the Senate like that idea?"

Reilly: "What?"

Pierce: "Didn't the Senate like that idea?"

Reilly: "Apparently not."

Pierce: "Well, why don't you fight for it in Conference
Committee, if it's a good idea?"

Reilly: "I am fairly sure other things will end up in here in Conference Committee."

Pierce: "...right now. Now, also, before that when you introduced it, it was an even better Bill. It had to do with increasing special education reimbursement by the state to local school districts. House Bill 891 sponsored by Reilly, Levin and wonderful people like Katz and

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Yourell. You completely dropped that idea, too? You're not going to fight for that in Conference Committee — special education reimbursement?"

Reilly: "I haven't dropped that idea. The Senate did."

Pierce: "No, you dropped it when you accepted Amendment #1 in Committee."

Reilly: "That's true, because we found last year we couldn't pass the Bill as it was introduced."

Pierce: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, on the Bill. Here's why we have disrespect for State Government. The Gentleman Jacksonville introduces a fine piece of legislation on tuition reimbursement for special education that would Then, in Committee, he drops that idea and increase it. picks up another idea, which may be good or ma y students can start school September dood. that eventually, if they're six years old, rather than December 1st as it is now. Then we sent it over to the Senate. We sent it to the Senate, and they knock out both those good ideas. And they put some silly Amendment about the ... Amendment #3 about the girls basketball tournament. Amendment #2..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Then Amendment #3..."

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

Representative Reilly, for what purpose do you rise?"

Reilly: "Firmly predicting that the people who are giving me the hardest time on this will be the sorriest if this ends up in Conference Committee, and then they'll be back up giving the same dumb speeches again, let's take this out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 1423,
Representative Henry. Representative Henry on the floor?
House Bill 1607, Representative Keane. Representative

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Keane."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1607, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act together with Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 on 1607 are fairly complicated. What happened was as the Bill... as the Bill went over, they stripped... they stripped the original Bill out, attempted to put it back in. In so doing, they made mistakes in putting in Amendment 3. We've got problems with a number of these Amendments, and I would ask for a Conference Committee. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 and request a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5. House Bill 1882, Representative Barkhausen."
- Barkhausen: "Out of the record, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2289, Representative Rigney.

 Gentleman on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill

 1532, Order of Nonconcurrence. Representative Hastert.

 Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you rise?"
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have some 4th of July speeches for anybody that might care to use them. That's it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Hoffman: "I have an inquiry of the last speaker, Representative DiPrima."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."
- Hoffman: "Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima, have these speeches been adapted so that we will be able to give

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

them on the 5th?"

- DiPrima: "These are updated. These are VFW speeches, 1982."
- Hoffman: "And, since we're going to celebrate it on.. the 4th on the 5th, are they... have they been..."
- DiPrima: "Don't rankle me with that. You know how I feel about them holidays. I'm still for the 4th of July. I don't like them..."
- Hoffman: "How about... Do you think the 4th should still be celebrated on the 4th, or should we do it on the 5th?"
- DiPrima: "You're playing games with me, lad."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, last night I indulged..."
- Speaker Daniels: "State your purpose, Sir. For what purpose do you rise?"
- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 68E..."
- Speaker Daniels: "You're not recognized for that purpose, Sir.

 House Bill 2038, Representative Keane. Representative

 Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a second. I have to get my file."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2038, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1.

 Senate Amendment #1 transfers the overview or the oversight of the Baccalaureate Assistance Law for registered nurses from the Illinois Scholarship Commission to the Department of Public Health. This has been agreed to by the nurses. It's been agreed to by the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, and all parties feel that it would be a better situation if they... if the Department of Public Health

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- oversaw this Program. I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago,
 Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of the Baccalaureate Nurses Funding Program, I strongly support this. It's essential that we have the administration run through Public Health to make it a better law, and I urge the adoption of the concurrence."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Keane, to close."
- Keane: "Thank you. I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2038. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Vinson. Have all voted who wish? Take the On this question there are 163 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House concurs #1 to House Bill 2038. Amendment Order οf Nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 1532, Representative Hastert. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1532, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act together with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Senate Bill 1532, I move not to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 on House Bill (sic Senate Bill) 1532."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede in Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 and that a Conference Committee be appointed. Any discussion? Being... Being

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- none, all in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede in

 Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, and a Conference Committee

 will be appointed."
- Hastert: "Mr. Speaker, I request that a Conference Committee be called."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. We made that part of your Motion.

 Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 67 (sic 97), Rea. House Resolution 1068, Koehler. House Resolution 1069, Krska. House Resolution 1070, Madigan. House Resolution 1071, Madigan. House Resolution 1072, Hanahan. House Resolution 1073, Madigan Democrat Leadership. House Resolution 1075, Bower."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senatè Resolution 97, Rea: that the General Assembly recognizes and promotes the establishment of the National Museum to be located near West Frankfort, Illinois to tell the story of one of the state's strongest resources coal. House Resolution 1068, Koehler: that we hereby proclaim September 19th through the 25th. 1982 as Illinois Prairie Week. House Resolution 1069. (sic - Krska). Whereas, Saint Peter and Paul Orthodox Church located the 23rd District will celebrate its Golden Anniversary on Sunday, July 18, 1982. House Resolution 1070, This House implores the Congress of the United States beyond the 1986 deadline for the allocation of the unspent portion of the de-designated Crosstown Expressway. Resolution 1071..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Conti-Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Conti has a unique way of mumbling

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

through these things. I would like to hear the last Resolution read with a little more alacrity so I can hear what it was about."

Speaker Daniels: "Which number were you talking about, Sir?"

Vinson: "I think it was 1070."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I did have a good tutor when I took this job, Zeke Giorgi. What does he.. What do you want me to do, read the Resolution in its entirety?"

Speaker Daniels: "No, just explain the last one that you were on."

Conti: "Pursuant between the officials of the Federal Government, the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago, there's two and two-tenths billion dollars of federal funds which has been designated for the construction of the Crosstown Expressway. All we are doing is imploring that, if we don't do it by a certain date, those funds will go to another state. So, we're imploring the Congress of the United States to extend beyond the 1986 — the deadline for the allocation of those unspent portions of de-designated Crosstown Expressway."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I object to any Resolutions of the Crosstown Expressway."

Speaker Daniels: "Will you remove that from the Agreed list,

Representative Conti?"

Conti: "Well, I will. As I told you before that Zeke says I'm entitled to ten mistakes, and this is only my second one."

Speaker Daniels: "I think that's your first."

Conti: "My first. The other one was somebody else's."

Speaker Daniels: "Right."

Conti: "House Resolution 1071 (Madigan). We extend our heartiest and most sincere congratulations to the Greater Southwest Development Corporation upon being recognized by

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

the Federal Government for its outstanding accomplishments. We commend Mr. James Capraro, the Executive Director of the Corporation. House Resolution 1072 by Hanahan. We indeed ... the entire nation was shocked and saddened by the crash McHenry County of an Illinois National Guard aircraft returning from a training flight. We are expressing our appreciation to the following coroners: Robert Babcox of Lake County, Wesley M. Hyland of Boone, Mary Lou Kearns of William B. Sullivan of DeKalb, James Reeves of Grundy, Robert ... Robert Stein, M. E., Cook, and Keith Von Qualen of Livingston, Robert Matthews of DuPage Seward, an M. D. from Winnebago. House Resolution 1073, Madigan and Democratic Leadership. Whereas, Jim Kirie, our former colleague, will be the quest of honor at a benefit dinner sponsored at the Holy Trinity Church. Jim Kirie being the Democratic Committeeman from Leyden Township was one of the first Greek-Americans elected to public office. House Resolution 1075, Bower; that we congratulate John Piland upon being named a Truman Scholar from the State of Illinois; recognize his leadership, hard work and potential for government service and commend him for pursuing a career in public service. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Conti, moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions with the exception of House Resolution 1070, which has been removed from the list of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolution.

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1070, Madigan. House Resolution 1074, Donovan - Tuerk."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Committee on Assignments. The Clerk has asked me to announce to the Membership that all action taken last night, in relation to all action taken last night, Messages were sent to the Senate at 8:30 this morning. So, for the Membership's advice, the Clerk has sent the Messages to the Senate as of 8:30 this morning. Representative Henry. House Bill 1423."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Pension Code together with Senate Amendment #1."

 Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry."
- Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move not to concur with Senate Amendment #1.

 There have been some questions raised. I think the only place that we can work this out at this late date is in the Conference Committee. I'm supported on this Motion to... not to concur by the Chicago Teachers' Union, and I ask the support of the Body not to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1423."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1423. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1423. Representative DiPrima at Representative Hoffman's desk. Representative DiPrima. Representative Diprima, you have an announcement to make at Representative Hoffman's desk?"
- DiPrima: "I've got some more of these 4th of July speeches for you lovable, patriotic Legislators."
- Speaker Daniels: "Those are 5th of July speeches?"
- Hoffman: "5th of July speeches. That's right. I'd like six of them please, since I'm so lovable."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I was asked to make an announcement. We'd like..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Secretary'."

make a point, need a break and a chance to meet to your constituents, Legislators Reception. When? Tuesday, 1982, 3:00 p.m. Where? June 29. State House Inn. Suite, Room 201. Governor's Cocktails, soft drinks, sandwiches and more provided. Sponsored by the Southern Association of Rehab. Pacilities. Co-host. Illinois Association of Rehab. Facilities. Please Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Speaker, I directed to inform the Secretary. 'Mr. an House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to Senate Bills 1180 and 1186, action the following Bill: Senate June 29, 1982, Kenneth taken by the Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills, 1231, 1247, 1299 and 1558, action by the Senate June 29, 1982, Kenneth Wright, taken

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dick Kelly, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some friends and some constituents down I'd like to introduce today who are up in the gallery from... They are Gary and Kathy Osterkamp from South Holland who are... who have with them their parents from Odessa, California, Mr. and Mrs. Osterkamp. This... They're represented currently by Representative Mike Getty, Representative Bob Piel and Representative Pat Grossi, and

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- are right up in the rear gallery. I'd like to recognize them at this time."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Winchester: "For the purpose of an introduction, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."
- Winchester: "I would like to introduce to the General Assembly a
 Gentleman from my district, a district that's represented
 in the chamber by Representative McCormick, and
 Representative Rea and myself, Mr. Ernest Patton, who is
 from Eldorado, Illinois. Ernest is 85 years old, and he is
 a third-generation Republican. And I'd appreciate it if we
 gave him a good hand in recognizing."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McBroom, for what purpose do you rise?"
- McBroom: "Thanks... That's very nice of you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1654.

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1654, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, can I have leave to take Senate Bill 1654 to the Order of Second for an Amendment?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Any objections? Hearing none,

 Gentleman has leave. Return 1654 to the Order of Second

 Reading. Any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #24, Currie Telcser."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie, Amendment #24."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Amendment 23, if you remember, created a Distressed

 Hospital Fund and made certain other changes in Senate Bill

 1654 as originally introduced. In the drafting of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

description of how hospitals become part of the Distressed Hospitals' Fund, we left out some important technical information, and Senate... the Amendment 24 makes the appropriate changes. I would urge adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the speaker yield, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie will yield."

Mautino: "Will the Representative yield? I'm sorry. For a question."

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Mautino: "On this change, Barb, we passed the 65% for distressed hospitals in yesterday's version, and this is 6% of the Department's estimated total financial fiscal year budget.

Now, that's directed, I would assume, at probably one hospital, and who were you addressing with this Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "What we're addressing, Representative Mautino, is the problem that we may not have adequately defined what would count as a hospital that relies substantially upon reimbursements from the Department of Public Aid to meet its fiscal obligations. We had two kinds of descriptions in the original Amendment..."

Mautino: "Barb, that's not my question. My question was what...

who are you addressing the Amendment to? Which hospitals?"

Currie: "We are addressing the Amendment to hospitals that assume

a very substantial responsibility for serving the Medicaid population. If you'll look at the initial Amendment we adopted, you will see there are two kinds of triggers; hospitals who, in the aggregate, serve 65% Medicare, GA, AMI and Medicaid patients and, at the same time, at least 20%..."

Mautino: "Let me rephrase the question, Representative Currie.

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Is it Michael Reese in Cook County?"

Currie: "My understanding is that Cook County Hospital would be included in this Amendment under the Department's figures. I am not aware whether other hospitals would be included as well, but I think the language of the Amendment makes it clear that we're looking for the opportunity to help out those hospitals who are serving a very substantial share of the state Medicaid population. That's the problem with the Fiscal '83 Medicaid budget. There isn't enough money for us to pay those people who are serving the poor of the State of Illinois. This Amendment makes sure that those hospitals that find themselves on the verge of bankruptcy, because they are performing this public service even though we can't afford to pay them in Fiscal '83, will not go belly up."

Mautino: "I only have one final comment. Ιf correctly, three or four years ago that was the identical formula that was presented to this General Assembly by then Representative James Taylor and seconded by Representative Don Anderson. Ιf I remember right, that same formula was basically a 15 million dollar bail out under a so-called crisis provision for Cook County. When I see it come back again, what I'm saying is that that first 15 million dollars was accepted by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor. This is an additional, what? T+ must be another 15 and a half million dollars. Right? Ιn that...How much is it?"

Currie: "The pool... The pool, Representative Mautino, is 15.5 million dollars. There is no way that one hospital is going to get 15.5 million dollars out of the Distressed Hospital Fund. That is not the intent of this Amendment.

All this Amendment does is to make sure that those hospitals that are eligible for the pool include the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

hospitals that serve the bulk of the state Medicaid population. This Amendment, Amendment #24 has the full support of the Illinois Hospital Association and the Illinois Department of Public Aid. This is not a special single-interest Amendment. We're talking about a program the Hospital Association supports, and the Department of Public Aid supports and the Bureau of the Budget supports so that we can make sure we meet our repsonsibilities to the Medicaid population of the State of Illinois and, thereby, to those hospitals that serve them."

Mautino: "One final guestion. The 65% for the distressed hospitals has a proposed funding of 15 and a half million dollars. The majority of these funds, under our Public Aid Code, would go to, probably, how many hospitals in this state?"

Currie: "I'm not sure we have the exact number, but I would think probably somewhere around 25, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Out of how many?"

Currie: "Several hundred, 280, something of that sort, but let me point out to you, Representative Mautino, if you'll look at Amendment 23 to Senate Bill 1654, you will see that there really are two ways to establish eligibility for the Hospital Hardship Relief dollars, the 15.5 million. It may well be that there will be enough money in that pool, not only to satisfy the hospitals in category A with high priority eligibility, but also hospitals who, due to restructuring and other kinds of requirements, are also in financial trouble during the... the Calendar months that comprise our Fiscal Year 1983."

Mautino: "Well, then, may I address the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Mautino: "I understand full well that there have been a lot of negotiations on this particular piece of legislation. At

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

the same time, I'm sure that whatever I say here is not going to have much of an impact, but I do... I do have some concerns that what we do in the final days of the Session, basically, helps certain institutions in this state at the detriment of certain others. I just happen to come from an area where there is not 65% of the patients in those... in those hospitals that are under that Section of the Social Security Act. And so, what I'm saying is that I'd like to be on record in stating my opposition to the proposal in general, and I'd like to ask for a Roll Call on the Lady's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Hoffman."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. House. The comments made by the previous speaker. believe, are ... are very well taken, but let me extend the little further. arqument even а T have serious reservations why it makes any sense at all to have Distressed Hospital Fund. The fact of the matter is, those hospitals probably don't deserve to function. They don't deserve to be in operation. If they are in such bad that we have to set aside 15 million dollars at the expense of other hospitals, it seems to me that it might be the better part of wisdom to, not only not adopt this Amendment, but take the 15 and a half million dollars that we have set aside for distressed hospitals and put with the other funds that are already in there. talked to friends of mine who are hospital administrators hospitals that work, and they think this is a bad idea; and, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose this Amendment."

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

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the The Distressed Hospitals' Fund was, in Lady's Amendment. large part, Representative Currie and my idea. The idea of the Distressed Hospitals' Fund, and I also disagree with Representative Hoffman, is, to the extent that the state causes problems for hospitals by underpaying them, ought to be a cushion. Under the rules, and please, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you come from any areas in Chicago, please at least listen to what we're trying to say. way the Distressed Hospitals' Fund works, as it currently is set up, is that any hospital that... the 65% figure is not a requirement. It simply says that any hospital that is hurt in terms of cash flow by underpayment by the state is eligible for the fund to apply. The 65% number comes in only when you're talking about if there is more than 15 and a half million dollars worth of claims of all the hospitals that are eligible. Then you go to a priority list. first priority are those hospitals that fall under the 65%. What this Amendment seeks to do is to put one, hospital into that priority Fund. Now, there are a lot of hospitals that could be in that priority Fund. I am not, and my voting record, I think, proves this, I am not anti-Chicago or anti-Cook County. They have problems. have problems, but this Amendment would put one, single hospital in a preferred position. Every other hospital in the state which may be impacted adversely by underpayment apply for the Fund. Only one hospital will guaranteed that, no matter what the priorities are, nα matter how many claims there are, they're going to get paid, and the total is a million, six. Now, a million, six is not all of 15 and half million, but 15 and a half million, frankly, isn't enough to begin with. To take a million, six out for one particular hospital when there are

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

a lot of other hospitals who would be in precisely the same situation - smaller: but, nonetheless, in precisely the same situation - is wrong. Now. let me tell you what happened and how we got here. Agreement was made the other night, night before last. Sunday night. It was agreed to all parties: the Hospital Association, the Republicans and Democrats in the House, the Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and the Governor's Office. **A11** those people agreed to it, and it was a good compromise agreement. Then all of a sudden one group said. 'Hey, wait a minute. We got to guarantee the position of hospital. And so, the deal got changed after we had all signed off on it. We had all worked on the wording, and we had all come up with a reasonable compromise. Amendment destroys the compromise. If this Amendment goes I and I hope every other suburban and downstate Legislator in the state is going to vote against the Bill itself, because there is no reason to change the agreement we made just to benefit one hospital in this state. It's wrong as a matter of ethics. It's wrong as a matter of politics. It's wrong in terms of principle. This is a bad Amendment and should be defeated."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates she will."

Leverenz: "I've had now cross signals. One person says this helps Cook County. Another person, our staff, says that it, in fact, it does not help Cook County. That's 180 degrees out. Does this address those hospitals that we read about that can't make payrolls, and they've had the employees then contribute back some of their salaries or take a week without pay or something like that just to get the cash flow situation straightened out because of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Public Aid load?"

Currie: "Amendment 23, Representative Leverenz, was precisely concerned about those hospitals. Those of you who don't like the idea of Hospital Hardship Relief, because of the inability of this state to make financial payments on its should have been voting against Amendment 23. commitments. That's where the Hardship Relief idea was established, it had full support from both sides of the aisle. Amendment makes a technical correction to ensure that all hospitals who meet that criterion, hospitals that are going severe financial problems because the Illinois into Department of Public Aid, because this state is not in a position to make good on the responsibilities it's asking these hospitals to serve for the poor people of the of Illinois. If you think that it makes sense to say that hospitals should be able to make their payrolls, that those hospitals that serve the poor people because we ask them to should not be out of luck during Fiscal '83 because we can't afford to reimburse them at anything even close to a cost level, if that's your concern, you should not only have voted for Amendment 23, which almost all of you did, but you certainly should be supporting Amendment 24."

Leverenz: "Then, with this Amendment and the, I guess, the Sponsor that so eloquently pointed out that he was instrumental in cutting a deal for a previous Amendment, it kind of remakes the deal. It does that, correct?"

Currie: "Well, I must tell you, Representative Leverenz, I wasn't part of any original deal. I wasn't part of any negotiations."

Leverenz: "Well, neither was I, but..."

Currie: "My understanding is that people from our side of the aisle were not participating in those discussions. I don't know whether any Legislators from the other side of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

aisle participated in those negotiations, but I would say to you that... that Amendment 24 does have the support of the major negotiators who were involved in the discussion of the Medicaid budget over the weekend."

- Leverenz: "Can you name the major negotiators as compared to the minor negotiators?"
- Currie: "Well, as I say, having been neither minor nor major, I'm
 not sure who all was there, but it sounds to me like we're
 talking about the Illinois Hospital Association, the
 Illinois Department of Public Aid and the Governor's
 Office."
- Leverenz: "Without this Amendment, Cook County would be excluded?"
- Currie: "Without this Amendment, Cook County Hospital, which serves a larger proportion of public-paid patients in this state than any other hospital in this state, would not count as a hospital that would have access... or would have priority access to the Hardship Relief Dollars. The hospital which is primarily responsible for meeting this state's obligations to the health care of the medically indigent would not qualify."
- Leverenz: "You're a quite eloquent speaker. The question again was, without this Amendment, Cook County Hospital would not qualify. Is that statement, yes, correct, no?"
- Currie: "Cook County Hospital could, without this Amendment, be
 excluded from access to the Hospital Hardship Fund. They
 did not qualify last year, Representative Leverenz, and it
 certainly seems reasonable that, under the language that
 was adopted in the first negotiations, Cook County Hospital
 probably... or could, could indeed be excluded; but, to say
 that it might be included by virtue of Amendment 24, is not
 to say that Cook County Hospital is the only hospital with
 access to those funds. In fact, there are several ways

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

hospitals can establish eligibility."

Leverenz: "Then 24 just gives everybody equal access."

Currie: "Exactly, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you for such a short answer, Representative."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support the Amendment for a number of reasons. While the couple of people who rose in opposition to the Bill, given a certain set of circumstances, may indeed have valid concerns, to me that their concerns are based purely on speculation which, in my view, would not occur. The fact that that large institution moves up to the first class does not, in of itself, make it a surety that there would be no money available for those institutions which are in a different class of providers who are eligible under this piece of legislation. Those institutions, I believe, in that first... that so-called first grouping are those such as one we're discussing who serve a very large, huge and I believe that Amendment #24 to population, Senate Bill 1654 answers the unique, complex problems associated with that institution. However, I am convinced that there are enough funds available in the 15.5 million which we're talking about to satisfy the needs of all of the hospitals which fall into that particular class or any Senate Bill 1654, with the adoption of other class. Amendment 24, I think will assure citizens of Illinois that they have adequate medical care, and that their are adequately reimbursed for the services they render; but, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that Senate Bill 1654, with Amendment #24, does more than provide for the needs in the fields of ... of hospital services or medical services. It helps collectively to do the responsible things in terms of

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

preventing Illinois' bankruptcy. This Bill is critically important to Illinois' fiscal condition for the rest of this year. So, I think it's very, very important that the Members realize we're not only dealing with the subject matter of hospital costs and health care, which clearly is paramount importance; but, on the same level, we are talking about the financial life of Illinois. And, if we neglect our responsibilities, all of us collectively, all of us collectively will be the recipients of the wrath of So, this Bill has two very, very Illinois voters. important aspects; those of medical care and those of fiscal responsibility. I think Amendment 24 is suitable for the Bill. I think it helps resolve a problem that we've had up until this point, and I think that we could adopt the Amendment and then pass Senate Bill 1654 over to the Senate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Madigan: "Representative Currie, is it true that Senate Bill 1654, as amended by Amendment #23, deals with the guestion of a Distressed Hospital Fund?"

Currie: "Yes, it is."

Madigan: "Could you explain what is the intent of a Distressed
Hospital Fund?"

Currie: "The intent of the Distressed Hospitals' Fund is to make monies available for those hospitals on the verge of bankruptcy because of the failure of the state to reimburse at reasonable levels during Fiscal 1983. For... It's for the state's responsibility with respect to patients that these hospitals serve."

Madigan: "And could you tell me, Representative Currie, under

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Senate Bill 1654 as amended by Amendment \$23, but not with Amendment \$24, would Cook County Hospital qualify as a distressed hospital?"

Currie: "Cook County Hospital might qualify for eligibility under Amendment 23, but there is no guarantee that it would, and I would... I would say that a hospital that serves as large a proportion of Illinois public-paid patients as 6% of the total should certainly be one of those hospitals that our inability to reimburse should mean that it... it would be includable in any kind of program to meet distressed economic circumstances."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Amendment?"
Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the adoption of Amendment #24 to Senate Bill agree wholeheartedly with those who advocate hospital cost containment for the State of Illinois under the Medicaid Program, but I say, to those who have spoke before me and who have offered down threats and inferences as to their intent relative to hospital cost containment, you say to me that Illinois shall have a hospital cost-containment program which contains а Distressed Hospital Fund and Cook County Hospital does not qualify as a distressed hospital, then I say to you, that is ludicrous. And don't expect any reasonable person to support such a plan which would say Illinois shall have a Distressed Hospital Fund, but Cook County Hospital shall not qualify as a distressed hospital. I say, again, that is ludicrous."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

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

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the.. the issue pretty clear one. We've created, by Amendment 23. a Distressed Hospitals' Fund, a fund to enable those hospitals that serve the public responsibility to avoid absolute disaster and bankruptcy during fiscally-troubled Fiscal Year 1983. There's no question that a hospital, which serves a substantial portion of our responsibility, the patients that are our responsibility through the Department of Public Aid belong in that category. If this hospital does serve as many as 6% of the total responsibilities of the Department of Public Aid, there is no excuse for not including it as eligible under that Hospital Hardship Relief Fund. I urge everybody to support this Amendment supported itself by the Illinois Hospital Association, by the Department of Public Aid and even by the Bureau of the Budget."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #24 adopted? . those in favor signify by voting 'aye', All opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Catania, to explain her vote. Timer's on. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who who wish? wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye', 63 'no' and none voting 'present', and #24 Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to hear this Bill on
Third Reading right now?"

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman asks leave to hear the Bill on Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

granted. Representative Telcser. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1654, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1654, I think, has been explained thoroughly Amendment #3 (sic -23) and Amendment 24. went through Amendment 24. To remind you, the provisions of 23 include a formula for hospital rate computation based upon data resources inflation indicator information. Those cost reports will be trended forward to January 1, 1983. The hospital utilization formula, as proposed by the Department of Public Aid, will be incorporated into the Amendment on hospital reimbursement for Fiscal 1983. There is an appropriation in the Bill of 782 million dollars which will be used for the 12 month spending reimbursement during Fiscal 1983 with the additional 15 and a half million dollars which we discussed today. The total spending will be 797 million point five, and the interim hospital rate payments will be reconciled in Piscal '84 at a level not to exceed 170 million dollars. The payment will be made... pursuant to House Bill 811 for Fiscal 1982 on or before September 15, 1982-A continuation of the regular payment program is incorporated into the Amendment. I think those are the highlights of the Bill, as it now stands. I appreciate a favorable

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as has often been mentioned, this is a deal. The Sponsor of the Amendment and Representative Reilly and a number of other people have discussed this as a negotiated

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

settlement, a deal, many other terms. We all heard about the Health Finance Authority. The Chamber of Commerce was in favor of it. The major unions were in favor of it. Senior citizens groups were in favor of it. but That's gone. We passed that out of the House, but it's killed in the Senate, part of this deal, part of this We don't care if the costs to the hospitals negotiation. stays skyrocket. We don't care how high they go. doing away with the Health Pinancing Authority Act as part of this deal. We let the hospitals off the hook. lobbied and they lobbied, and they got what they wanted. And the Governor got what he wanted. You'll recall we saw number of hospital administrators down here with 30% buttons; buttons saying that their funds were going to be cut 30%. saying that the private patients were going to have to take the burden of taking care of the couldn't pay for the hospital stays, lobbying the Governor. Well, the Governor's taken care of here. We're letting him off the hook. He's worked it out so that he WOD # + embarrassed by not adequately funding the hospital stays; and, lo and behold, Amendment 24 bailed out Cook County Hospital again. Now, that brought in the Chicago Legislators. So, we have a cozy group here. This legislation won't help my district one bit. It won't help any other ... other downstate districts. It won't help any of the downstate Democrats. It might help some downstate Republicans, because they're helping their Governor. vote whatever you want; but, remember, this is a deal. The forgot are the people of the State of people we Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have reservations about Senate Bill 1654 as well; reservations

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

that reflect the kind of mortgaging this Bill creates for the taxpayers in Fiscal Year 1984, the kind of mortgaging of that year's budget that this Bill creates for that General Assembly, for the Governor who will be in place in our Fiscal Year 1984. A hundred seventy million dollars we're talking about putting over into the Piscal payment year. A hundred seventy million dollars - first call on those dollars will go to the hospitals who the needs of the ill poor during Fiscal Year 1983. I would like it if we could arrange to make the same kind of commitment for the general assistance recipients, whose benefits are being cut, who are taking the state's budgetary problems in the neck just the way the hospitals I'd like to be able to put in the 1984 budget first for those GA recipients on the dollars that they've call like to put been cut, the 162 down to 144. I'd monies in 1984's budget so that they can go to their bankers just the way the hospitals can if Senate Bill passes and make sure they can survive until the Piscal '84 budget is passed. That's not going to happen: although it's unfortunate, I think that we will be creating 170 million dollars worth of debt for the Fiscal *84 budget and for the taxpayers of that period. I don't think we have any choice: but, to adopt Senate Bill 1654 today, the hospitals that are taking the Medicaid cuts in the neck are the hospitals that are meeting the responsibilities of this state to the poor people in our state within our not in good health. They are meeting a public responsibility. If, unfortunately, under Thompson's budget we don't have the money to pay them the full cost of that care in Piscal '83, it makes sense to say we will repay them, we will reconcile their payments in Fiscal *84. It's unfortunate, but it's a fact of ... of the economic life of

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

the State of Illinois right now: but, I think responsible Members of this Assembly have no alternative but recognizing its problems. Cast a 'yes 'vote for Senate Bill 1654."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I, again, move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Telcser, to close."

- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me also tell the Members that the original Bill provided that the Department of Public Aid may use funds from the Public Assistance Emergency Revolving Pund to assist recipients in obtaining legal documents needed to determine recipient eligibilit... eligibility. And, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1654 provides a service to every, single citizen in this state; upstate, downstate, suburbs, Chicago. All of the people of Illinois will benefit by Senate Bill 1654. I appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1654. Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1654 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. The timer's on."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know it's futile to speak against the Bill at this point, but I think what we are doing by allowing the Department of Public Aid, not only to have as much as 170 million dollars of their obligations reconciled in Fiscal *84*s budget, but also giving them an unlimited provision to roll over expenditures for services that were incurred before July 1st of this year into next year's budget is a precedent

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

that we not... ought not to put into effect without noting that we are making it more and more difficult to track the funding that goes through the Department of Public Aid and have any kind of idea when we are really deficit spending. And my fear is that, at both ends of the scale now, we are giving an open option to the Department to delay expenditures to have...(cut off)..."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, to explain his vote.

 The timer's on."
- Bowman: "In explaining my "no" vote, I'm am voting "no" for two reasons. One is, I don't like the other half of this deal which calls for the abolition of the Health Finance Authority. I don't think we ever gave it a good chance, and so I object to that. I also object to writing into legislation obligations for the out years. 1984 is provided for in this Bill, and I think that, considering the precarious financial position of the state and what we're doing with inheritance tax proposals, we're just layering more and more obligations on the state for '84. And I also object to that particular component of the legislation, and that is why I'm voting 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Lady from DuPage, Representative Pawell, to explain her vote."
- Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will just take one, brief second to remind my colleagues from the Chicago area that, when we went down to Cook County Hospital last year, one of the questions I asked the administrator was, 'Have you used your tax levy up to the maximum, as we have in DuPage for our St. Edwards Hospital?'. And I was informed, no, they have not. Perhaps, if they are that short of money, it might do well for them to look to their own city and raise their own taxes, instead of everyone else's."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

LaHood, to explain his vote."

- Ist, one of the hottest issues in this House was the Illinois Health Finance Authority. Representative Telcser offered very persuasive arguments. The Governor's staff asked me to vote for it. The unions in my area asked me to vote for it, and now we're saying that it's not any good; that we don't need it, that the deal has been made, and I don't agree with that. I think it's deplorable. I think this is a sellout to the City of Chicago to bail out their hospital, and I think it's a very bad vote for anybody downstate. And I encourage more red votes. I think its deplorable."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Excuse me. Representative Hallstrom, I didn't see you back there.

 Representative Hallstrom, to explain her vote."
- Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, was for the Health Finance Authority.

 And I was concerned about being part... it was part of the deal, but I also understood that it already lost in the Democratic Senate; that the President of the Senate was not for the Health Finance Authority, and that's where it got lost. It didn't get lost in this deal."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 128 'aye', 40 'no', 2 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 1654, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2461, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House board... On House Bill
 2461 there are a string of Amendments...There were a string
 of Amendments that were added in the Senate, six in number.

 I can divide the question or take them, but I'm going to

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

move to nonconcur on Amendment #2. an Amendment that was placed on the Bill in the House by Representative Kane, one which I heartily endorsed and that the Senate removed, and to nonconcur on Amendment #3 which reduced the salary the Director for no apparent reason. And I have no idea in the wisdom of the Senate where they were coming from. the... with the pleasure of the Chair. T'm going nonconcur on those, and I think that concurrence... or nonconcurrence will prevail. So, if we can just do that Motion and not address the other Amendments, they will all be... We all endorsed the other Amendments. They will put back in in a Conference Committee should it get there." Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Amendments #2 and 3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #2 and 3. Representative Davis, do you

Davis: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Yes."

wish to concur in Amendments #1, 5 and 6?"

Speaker Daniels: "Would you explain those?"

Davis: "Surely. As soon as I can find them. Oh, yes.

Amendments #5 and 6 incorporated the... the provisions of
House Bill 2530 that created the Illinois Criminal Justice
Trust Fund into the Bill, and Amendment #6 required the new
Department to establish an internal audit guideline for the
state code Departments. There were some problems with the
guidelines that needed to be renewed. I'm sorry. I didn't
have my paperwork in order."

Speaker Daniels: "And Amendment #1, Sir."

Davis: "Amendment #1 seems to be alright with us."

Speaker Daniels: "Any questions or discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 5 and 6. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's... Have all

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 155 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1... Representative Slape 'aye'. 156 'aye', 1 'no', none 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 5 and 6 to House Bill 2461. House Bill... Order of Concurrence, page two of your Calendar. House Bill 93, Representative Epton. Representative Deuster."

- Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 House Bill 93 has been fully discussed. Everybody knows
 what it is. This is a Bill.."
- Speaker Daniels; "Excuse me, Repres... Excuse me, Representative.

 Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise,
 Sir?"
- Natijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to make a point of order on this Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."
- Matijevich: "So that it is entered into the record, at least. I'm going to make the point of order, under 36, wherein the rule is, after a Bill has been passed, no Member may add his name as a Sponsor. I'm going to make the point of order, for example: if this Bill had passed the House on Third Reading and the Chair had declared it passed, and it went over to the Senate, at that point, under Rule 36(c), if a Member had requested to add their name as a they would violate that Rule and would need 107 votes to suspend that Rule. I look on the Calendar today, find that Representative Pullen, Representative Riquey, Representative Miller and Representative Leinenweber have been added, not only as Sponsors, but as Co-Chief Sponsors on House Bill 93. I ask a ruling of the Chair that, as a point of order, that their names cannot be entered under

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Rule 36(c) the Bill having already passed the House, and I would, in support of that, say to the Chair... it is a dangerous thing, I think, that we would allow that to happen. Everybody knows, after a Bill has passed one chamber and then you add names as Co-Chief Sponsors, that you allow... by allowing that to happen, they can play some political games with a Bill once you start adding Amendments from the other chamber or going to Conference Committee, etcetera. So, I would ask a ruling of the Chair."

- Speaker Daniels: "Parliamentarian advises me that that Rule is applicable as to final passage. The Bill is before us now on the question of final passage. Some Senate Amendments were handled, and the Order of Concurrence would be final passage of this Bill. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I knew he'd make that ruling. So, because he that ruling, I'm going to ask, pursuant to Rule 69, and I'm going to add Laz Murphy - I haven't told him this, but he's my roommate; and, I know he'll go along - as two Members. Add that we respectfully dissent from the action of the House in permitting the names of Representative Penny Pullen, Representative Harland Rigney, Representative Steve Miller and Representative Harry Leinenweber to be added as Co-Chief Sponsors of House Bill 93 after the Bill had passed the House on Third Reading. By allowing additional Chief Sponsors onto a Bill after it has passed one House, we are allowing a procedure whereby Legislators can deals and maneuver in ways that may be injurious to the public interest. I might add also that this is another example of why, I think, that the next House ought to consider, as I've recommended before, that we eliminate that procedure of having Co-Chief Sponsors. It's gotten us into trouble before. I think it's going to get us into

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

trouble today, and we all know the reason for it.

Everybody's trying to avoid the issue of electing an Illinois Commerce Commission, and they're trying to make some political hay out of House Bill 93. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Your dissent will be noted on record by Representative Matijevich and Representative Murphy.

Representative Deuster, House Bill 93."

Deuster: "Yes, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I'll be very happy to have anyone Cosponsor this Bill or support it. I think it is a good Bill, and I welcome the enthusiastic interest of the Members in this legislation. House Bill 93 does abolish the Illinois Inheritance Tax. You've heard a lot conversation at various legislative stages on this Bill about what a cruel and unfair tax the inheritance point that has not been made in debate. I think. earlier is that guite often we find estates and money. property, leaves the State of Illinois to escape this tax. and it goes to the sun belt states, like Arizona Florida. And that we believe that the revenue loss will be offset by the retention of estates and property in the State of Illinois. I think that we've all waited long... a long time to do this. This Bill is supported by the Farm Bureau. as you know, the Illinois State Chamber Commerce, the Illinios Retail Merchants. the National Federation of Independent Business, the Illinois And I think for all of us the most Association. for this Bill is the people themselves who think support that the time has come to abolish the inheritance tax. your support, would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on this legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Sangamon,
Representative Kane."

135th Legislative Day

Kane:

June 29, 1982

nur. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill being presented to us at this time is part of the mad rush to fiscal chaos in Fiscal Year 1974 (sic - 1984)., we've already put off until Fiscal '74 (sic - '84) 174 million dollars to pay for hospital services that we're going to receive in 1983. We've already put off 126 million dollars in school aid that we borrowed for Fiscal '83. We're going to put that off and repay that in Piscal '84, and reduced the pay out in pensions below the pay out amount of 110 million in 1982 and 180 million in 1983. That all adds up to a deficit of 600 million dollars in expenditures in Fiscal '83 that we're putting off until Fiscal '84. add to that 600 million the 160 million in revenue Bconomic and Fiscal Commission shortfall that the forecasts, and then you add on top of that the 100 million dollar cut in state revenue that we're going to vote on if we eliminate the inheritance tax for Piscal' '84, that comes to a shortfall in revenue or a borrowing in... or necessity to repay in Fiscal *84 for actions taken in Fiscal *83 of some 860 million dollars. And that doesn't take into account the deficit financing for bonds, which the Governor has asked, of 350 million dollars in additional principal. if you add those... that deficit financing along with And. the increased... increased incurred interest. we re talking about 1.4 billion dollars that we are going to be spending in Fiscal '83; that we're going to start having to pay back or it's going to come due in Fiscal *84. So. what we're doing is putting off until after the next election massive tax increase in the State of Illinois. And, if you think that you can get past Fiscal '83 and past the election, the bill is going to come due. And those of vou who are here then are going to have to pay that bill. I · B not going to be here. Representative Epton indicates that

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

he's not going to be here, but the Governor that's going to be on the second floor come January, and the Legislature that's going to be sitting here and in the Senate next January is going to have to come up with something like 1.4 billion dollars in additional revenue just to pay for the additional expenditures that we are authorizing in Fiscal '83 but we're refusing to pay for. As I started off, this is a vote for it. It's part of the mad rush to fiscal chaos and higher taxes in Illinois. You know, the current administration has prided itself as being fiscally responsible, but it's only a juggling act. juggling act that has gone on for six years, but it's only going to come crashing down come January, immediately after the election. Now, we're talking about the inheritance tax and repealing the inheritance tax. Well, the inheritance tax in Illinois, of all of the taxes that we have, progressive. There is an exemption before anybody even pays any of the tax, of some 40,000 dollars. what about the income tax. You get a 1.000 dollar exemption, and then you start paying at two and a half The sales tax, you start paying the sales tax on percent. the first loaf of bread that you buy. The utility tax, you start paying the utility tax the minute you turn on the light or you turn on the heat. The inheritance tax, you get 40,000 dollars of free money before you even start paying one penny of the tax. Now, people have said that it's ghoulish to levy a tax on inheritance. They say it's tax on death. Well, I would submit that it's even more ghoulish to tax the bread and milk that goes into feeding a baby than it is to tax an inheritance, of which you already get 40,000 dollars of free money. There is others who have said that the inheritance tax represents a triple tax; that you pay a tax when you earn it, pay a tax when you spend

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

it, then you pay a tax when you pass it on. Well, first of all, that doesn't make any sense, because if you spend it you can't pass it on; so that the most that you can get out of the inheritance tax is a double tax. When you earn you pass it on. But I would submit to you that most of the money that one pays an inheritance tax on never taxed when it's earned. Most of the inheritance tax is not on small business or on the family farm. comes on stocks and bonds and the passing of real unearned...or a lot of it unearned money. A lot of it a11 that passes from one generation to another and represents an ability to pay a tax, but which, in fact, is never taxed because most of it comes through the loopholes. removal of the inheritance tax is part of the conservative agenda for this country in which the idea is to remove the tax on the wealthy and to tax the poor, to concentrate wealth to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. part of the idea of supply side economics. We've already what supply side economics has done for us at the national level. You know, the oil companies said you needed to have a tax break in order so that they could have additional money to explore for oil. And what did they do? They went out and they spent all that money to acquire additional companies. Steel asks for a tax break, and then went out and used that money to buy Mobil. You know, only thing that's going to get the economy going is to put more money into the pockets of the working person, and less into the pockets of the wealthy who are only out and buy up additional businesses. You know, there's an old saying among some peasants, said that if, you know, if the birds are thin and you have to feed the birds a little bit more, what you do is you give the horses additional oats, more oats. Let me tell you, the repeal of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

inheritance tax is only going to give more oats to the horses, and the birds are only going to get the leavings.

I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Epton."

- Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is

 my moment of supreme glory. For the third time in

 succession, I will move the previous question."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall the main question be put?". All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Representative Deuster to close."
- Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, your favorable vote would be appreciated."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 93 pass?'.

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

 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kociolko to explain his
 vote. The timer's on."
- Kociolko: "Sp...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year when the repeal of the inheritance tax was before the Revenue Committee, on which I serve, I and several other Republican Members opposed the repeal, because we sincerely believed that the state could not afford that reduction in revenue. Before our vote, at that time, we release were treated to a canned press from the Minority Leader in each of our distinguished newspapers denouncing us for having prevented the repeal of Well, I and the others have this onerous inheritance tax. since changed my position. We believe the state can afford and that this is in the best interest of the citizens But, I noticed that the distinguished of our state. Minority Leader is once again voting 'no', as he did each time this measure was brought up last night. I suggest that the Gentleman should be the subject of a chapter in a

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

new book entitled, Profiles in Hypocrisy.

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Miller to explain his vote.

 Timer's on. Sir."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chair...Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The triple tax is the income tax, the property tax and the inheritance tax. I hope that clears up one point. The super-rich are not going to avoid the Illinois inheritance tax because the federal pick-up tax will still be in effect. This is indeed a people's Bill, and the...unless you are a closely related relative, you will have to pay Illinois inheritance tax on a rather modest sum unless we support this. I was proud to be asked...added as a Cosponsor, even though I wasn't asked. I think it represents some fairness on those of us who have been working on this issue, and I'm proud to be a part of it. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Beatty to explain his vote.

 Timer's on."
- Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to vote against a tax repeal; however, the state cannot afford it now. The state needs a rehash of all the tax laws. I don't like to vote to repeal a tax and then have the man that's going to succeed me in office in my district have to come in here and increase the income tax. I don't like to see Cook County, the County I represent, losing taxes. I think that the tax should be repealed, but not now. I think all the taxes should be reviewed and then the proper move made."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative John Dunn to explain his vote.

 The timer's on."
- Dunn, John: "Mr. Speaker, I just ask leave to add all those
 voting green as chief hyphenated Cosponsors of this fine
 piece of legislation."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie to explain her vote. The

135th Legislative Day timer's on." June 29, 1982

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think it's going to be a terrific fall campaign. I can see that many people in this House will go out, talk to teachers, talk to their state employees and explain to them between Fiscal '82 and Fiscal '83 we have underfunded their pensions by 290 million dollars. We can tell them how proud we are that we've cut funding for their golden years of retirement. At the same time, we can tell that we managed to end the inheritance tax, and I'm sure it's going to make them all feel a lot better, all those teachers, all those state workers. Tell them, when you tell them that we repealed the inheritance tax, that we've done a terrific service for at least one person in our district, one out of 100,000 people who will receive a substantial benefit from this, 5,000 dollars or more. That's all we're talking about. We're talking about the Clement Stones and the P. K. Wrigleys. So, when you go home and talk about the good things you've been ... "
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen to explain her vote. The timer's on."
- Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after working since March 1979 for this day, I just want to say thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich to explain his vote.

 The timer's on."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, like everybody...not like everybody, but I was...I had my vote on green. But after what I know what is going to happen when we leave this Legislature, I can't responsibly vote for it. And, you know, I always hear people say, 'If we're going to have taxes, let's tax those that it hurts the least'. Let me tell you, when you're dead it won't hurt you a bit."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dwight Friedrich to explain his vote. The timer's on."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, nobody ever mentions the fact that those who make over 25,000 dollars a year and that's a lot of people these days pay 95 percent of the federal taxes. That's this money that you're getting back here. Now, if we paid tax on it once, you paid tax on it once, you're in that category, and this Bill will relieve you from paying tax on it a second time after it's gone through the ringer once."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock to explain his vote. The timer's on."
- Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to respond to one of the gadflies that castigated the Minority Leader. The pure fact of matter is, he should be happy that we've got our version of voodoo economics in House Bill 93. But, as is so typical of those who posture themselves and pay homage to voodoo economics, the real referendum on this will come November. And I'm sure the same fate awaits HB 93 and all of the cheerleaders of voodoo economics that will await the Governor who's going to lead this pack to defeat in November, and I want to help encourage as many 'no' votes as specifically, I want to possible. But. say, Representative Pullen, you got your wish, and in November the citizens will give you an additional wish."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye', 34 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #3...Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 93. Representative Epton."
- Epton: "I'm sorry I didn't get your attention before. I move to,
 having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

the vote by which House Bill 93 was adopted."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I move that that lie on the table."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deuster moves that the Motion lie on the table. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion prevails. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, rise?"

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair.

Is it the intention of the Chair to call 1992 and 2417?

You've skipped over them about 18 times already. If
there's a problem with it, why the hell don't you say so?"

Speaker Daniels: "We'll get back to you. House Bill 2417,
Representative Yourell, page three of your Calendar."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 2417, when it went out of the House, House. provided for an increase of the fees paid to the county collectors throughout the State of Illinois for the annual sale of tax delinquent property from 10 dollars to 20 what this did was provide also for the dollars. Now, increase in the Indemnity Fund to protect those buyers, tax purchase buyers, in case of an error by the county clerk in the dispo...dispensation of the property. Pre...Previous the...this to Bill, the Indemnity Fund would be three-hundredths of one percent of the equalized assessed valuation of the county or 50,000 dollars or ... which is under the new Bill. The old Bill called for 25.000 and up 500,000 or a million dollars. Senate Amendment #1 provided that the confirmation of the sale by the county of tax delinquent property does not affect the personal liability of the property's owner to pay the delinquent taxes on the interest and penalties. Additionally, the sale of tax delinquent property cannot prevent

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

commencement of a lawsuit to collect any amounts remaining due after the sale. I have no quarrel with Senate Amendment #1 to House...House Bill 2417, and move to concur in that Amendment."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment \$1?". All 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. On
 this question there are 163 'aye', none voting 'no' and
 none voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate
 Amendment \$1 to House Bill 2417. What purpose does the
 Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, rise?"
- Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was requesting leave of the House so that the Elections Committee could convene in room 122B while we are in Session to address some business of, specifically a Committee Report on a recent election challenge, which we're ready to clean up. I don't think we'd be gone more than 15 or 20 minutes."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion; requests
 leave of the House for the Election Committee to meet
 immediately in room 122B while the House is in Session, and
 moves to suspend the appropriate rule. Are there any
 objections? Hearing no objections, unanimous leave is
 given, and the Election Committee will meet in room 122B
 immediately. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House stand in recess until the hour of 6:30."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Hotion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House will stand in recess 'til 6:30."
- Clerk Leone: "I unde...I understand that it is raining very hard outside. If any Members have their windows down on their

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

car, they ought to ... "

Speaker Daniels: "House will come to order. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. the House of Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the in the adoption of the following Joint Resolutions: House Joint Resolution 108 and House Joint Resolution concurred in by the Senate June 29. 1982. Kenneth Wright. Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House Secretary. of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to House Bill 2266. I have further been wit: directed to House of Representatives the Senate has inform t he requested a First Conference Committee Re...be formed; taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. action Ken...Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following titles, to wit: Senate Bill 1663, with House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1663. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendments: House Amendment #1 and House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1663: action taken by the Senate June 29. 1982. Kenneth Wright. Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Ar. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the Senate Bill 1603 with House following title, to wit:

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Amendment #1. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur in the House in the adoption of the following Amendments: House Amendment #2; action taken by the Senate Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. •Mr. Speaker, directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from their Amendments #7, 13, 14, 16 to a of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2135; action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. Senate (sic - Kenneth) Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to the Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1938. I am further directed inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has requested a First Conference Committee; action taken by the Senate June 29. 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. "Hr. Speaker, I am directed inform to the House Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments of the following titles: Senate Bill 734 and 1579; action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2504, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Leverenz, quiet down. House Bill 2504, I move to nonconcur...to refuse to concur in Senate Amendment #2.

This has a considerable amount of discussion going on between the Governor's Office and the Auditor General. I move to not concur so that the matter can go to Conference Committee. I understand there may be some agreed Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Leverenz."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Leverenz: "Exactly why do you want to do this?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Well, because on your...your advice and the other
Members of the Legislative Audit Commission, I find this
Bill in its present form to be intolerably bad, and I have
advised the Governor's Office that they ought to negotiate
with the Auditor General. I understand they have done
that, and that there may be some agreements. In any event,
the Bill as it stands is not in a position to pass. I
would certainly not support it, because you and...and
others have told me that it's bad. So, I want to go to
Conference to see if we can't come up with a good Bill."

Leverenz: "In that case, I support what...your efforts, but would admonish you for your previous statement."

Reilly: "Which previous statement?"

Leverenz: "The ... "

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Matijevich: "From what you have said, Representative Reilly, you are going away from the very strong language that you have in Senate Amendment #2, which would give the Governor, really, the authority to do what he has been so critical of, when he ran for office initially; and that is to have a procedure where we would again have ghost employees. Are you going to, with the new Amendment or agreed - I don't know who's going to agree to it - but are you going to have another Amendment which would bring us closer to the present law which eliminates ghost employees?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Matijevich: "In that case, I support it. I don't know..."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from Morgan moves that the House nonconcur in Senate

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2504. Messages from the Senate."

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

 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has ceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a First Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to House Amendments to Senate Bills 1285, 1363, 1374, 1386, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1409, 1411, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1422, 1425, 1426, 1428, 1445, 1514, 1516, 1524 and 1678; action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982.' Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While we have a lull, I just thought I'd like to announce to the Body that my seatmate from Duran has had double distinction this year. We recall earlier that his son was selected as the Attorney General at Boys State. We just heard over the national news wire earlier today that now his son-in-law, who is Allen Rayhorn, one of Illinois' finest basketball players, has been drafted in the sixth round by the Seattle Supersonics. I think that's quite an accomplishment. We ought to give him a hand. And he's only been married to his daughter for a month, so he's moving on up."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will stand at ease for ten minutes.

 The House will come to order. Supplemental Calendar #1,

 Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 1271,

 Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill

 1028, Representative Hoxsey. Senate Bill 1028, Conference

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Committee Reports. Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, yes, I move to accept the Conference

Committee Report on Senate Bill 10...1028."

Speaker Daniels: "Could you explain the contents of that for the Membership?"

Hoxsey: "The first two Amendments that were put were...Administrative Services, to give them the ability to grant easements to public utilities, and everything was in agreement, was an Amendment withdrawn οn m v here iust a minute. You want a and...hang in total...total...all the way down, Ted? Can't you just take my word that it's all right? Okay. Anyway, in the Conference Committee, I think we satisfied both sides of the aisle on the problems with granting Administrative Services the ability to grant easements in regard to public utilities, and there wasn't really any problem. I think Representative Getty, everybody's concerns were taken care of, and I suggest that you give me an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Hoxsev: "Yes."

Mays: "Wa...Was there an Amendment on this that dealt with earmarking funds from the sale of state property for a nursing...veterans' home fac...nursing care facility?"

Hoxsey: "No."

Mays: "That is not in this Conference Committee ... "

Hoxsey: "That is not in this Bill."

Mays: "Thank you very much."

Horsey: "You're welcome."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
maybe to help expedite this, if you'll look at those who
have signed it, in addition to Representative Hoxsey, the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Conference Committee Report, we have on this all ten Member of that Conference...Conference Committee have signed it; including both Representative Pullen and Representative Al Greiman. Now, there's two diversion philosophies, and if they've both signed it, it's got to be a good Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, thank you. I served on the Committee, and I think that we did some...some things that made sense. The Bill provided...allowed the of Administrative Services to grant public utilities, ¥e. recognized that we were giving away a power that this General Assembly has generally exercised. So, we provided for some...an oversight provision in either House of the General Assembly: so that, while we're in Session anytime while we're in Session... In the first place, they have to file the easements that they give; and, secondly, we have a right to withhold approval. Any one House has the right to withhold approval; so that we can stop any bad things from being...easements from being granted. We also provided for some...a half acre of land in the City of Marion, on a very limited basis, very tight basis. They must use this for a public purpose or it reverts back to the State of Illinois. It's actually land that Marion gave to the state, and now we're...they gave us 44 acres. We're giving them back a acre with some very stringent kind of restrictions. There was also a...we receded from...Representative Hoxsey an Amendment to the Bill that dealt with the Soldiers and Sailors Home in Bloomington, and that's been receded And I believe that the Bill is probably in passable shape at this point, and I would certainly give it an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of the intent

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

of the Sponsor on the legislation, I had some reservations on Section 7.3, and I'd like to make this for the record. Last year when the elimination of the investigators for surplus property were eliminated from the budget, if you'll process for holding inventory and recall: then the dispersal of surplus property came under the administrative...the Department of Administrative Services. I have no problem with Fred Uhliq and the job that he does, but I do want to point out that this is all a result the laying off of the people that took the physical inventory of the surplus property in the state. For example, like at Dixon Developmental Center, University of Illinois, East Moline, Lewis College, it is...it's a result of, I think, what was done wrongly a year ago. But I would like to have everyone know that what you're doing is you're authorizing the Director to get rid of surplus property without having to tie it through other agencies."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Leverenz. Excuse me."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Rep...excuse me, Sir. Representative Hoxsey, for what purpose do you rise?"

Horsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer Representative Mautino. That is not the intent of the Bill whatsoever. The point of the Bill is to be able to allow the Administrative Services to offer to...for example, a city wants to establish a sewer system. They have to wait to come back to the General Assembly for the authority to do so. There is no reason why they should not be able to go ahead and offer that, and what Representative Mautino has suggested is not part of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion?"

Howsey: "That's the way he wants to read it, and that's not the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

intent."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from..."

Hoxsey: "The intent is to save money to allow them to be able to offer the easements that are necessary for public utilities all the way across the line, and not have to wait 'til the General Assembly comes back to go through the channels this way. And we have put all the safeguards in here, as Representative Greiman has said. We provided the safeguards for Administrative Services to be able to answer to the General Assembly for their actions, and I'm suggesting to you that..."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will."

Leverenz: "On the granting of easements, the analysis shows that
the easement may be granted, unless either House adopts a
Resolution opposing such approval within five legislative
days of filing. Would these only be filed, apparently,
with the General Assembly the day we convene?"

Howsey: "That, Representative, is already part of the law, part of the statutes."

Leverenz: "Well, what if we are not in within five days of granting an easement?"

Hoxsey: "It's five legislative days, Representative."

Leverenz: "After... Whenever we come in, correct? Okay."

Hoxsey: "That's correct."

Leverenz: "The second question, apparently in this Committee

Report #1, you have broadened the ability dis...to dispose

of state property or to dispose of it entirely..."

Hoxsey: "No."

Leverenz: "...by selling it to the public. Is that correct?"

Horsey: "No. You're...You're interpreting it wrong. That is not true."

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- Leverenz: "Well, it just says the Administrator is given much broader authority to transfer or assign state personal property among agencies, or otherwise dispose of it."
- Hoxsey: "Representative, it limits their power to disposal of their property, and it limits it to inventory, Representative."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion?"
- Leverenz: "Well, I'm still not satisfied, Speaker, with the answer."
- Hoxsey: "Well, this is the same, Representative, situation that you have with DOT, the same as you have with Conservation."
- Leverenz: "What is the broader authority we are giving the Administrator in terms of the disposal of property?"
- Hoxsey: "Only...All you're giving them is the... You're not really giving them any authority that the other departments don't have. All you're doing is allowing them to grant easements to public utilities; because of the fact that we're not in Session all the time, and we're saving money for contractors to be able to go the route of them granting an easement, so it's a sewer system or whatever. You're not granting them anything that we don't grant the other departments."
- Leverenz: "Well, that's not what I have in my hand, and I suggest to you that the analyst is not that inaccurate, ever, we are giving the Administrator broader authority in the transfer or to assign state personal property different agencies. Apparently, that in.. ability to that is controlled much more by the agency director currently, or to otherwise dispose of it. You cannot tell me, then, how it is done now and how it will be done under this that you propose in the Conference Committee Report. What...What's going to be new?"
- Hoxsey: "We're talking about easement. We're talking about

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

easement, Representative. We're not talking about disposal of state property. We're talking about easement across state property."

Leverenz: "Then I would suggest a red vote on the Conference

Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1028."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

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

Hoxsey: "Yes, I would suggest that, we've gone through this thing in Conference Committee, and when you get both sides of the aisle in agreement, I think we're in good shape on this Bill, and I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the Conference Committee Report #1 be approved?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present', and Conference Committee Report #1 is adopted, Senate Bill 1028. ...Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I...I'm just curious. Is my light working there on the board?"

Speaker Daniels: "Your green light is."

Brummer: "How about the speak light?"

Speaker Daniels: "It is now. Yes, Sir."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Committee Reports. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Election Committee Report on the Schisler versus Mays election

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

contest. I do have a statement that I would like to read into the record. 'By agreement of the parties, a Motion to dismiss the contest was filed with the Election Committee Schisler. The Committee voted to dismiss the contest by unanimous vote of those in attendance at the meeting. The candidates were not at fault in this dispute, but appeared to have been the victims of improperly legislative district...district boundary lines. question before the Committee was a unique one. unfortunately we did not proceed far enough along in the contest to address the issue. There is a serious potential problem when local election officials alter district boundaries because of annexations. Not only does this affect the right of franchise, but it violates the one person-one vote rule. The Illinois statutes are silent on whether the General Assembly would have the authority to void the election, and asks the court to order a new one, in such a case. There are no clear standards for declaring an election void when such a problem occurs. Ιf election were ordered. the delay would affect the organization and procedure of this House. In addition, is possible that congressional or local district boundaries cha...boundary changes by election authorities could affect the one person-one vote standard. The Committee. therefore, recommends legislation be considered to clarify permanence of various electoral district boundaries.

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the adoption of the Committee Report. Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Committee Report 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? Take the record. On this

I now ask for the adoption of this Committee Report."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

question, 165 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the Election Committee Report is hereby adopted. Representative Mays, what purpose do you rise?"
Mays: "A point of personal privilege, I guess, because it really has been a personal privilege to serve with everybody that's been here in the General Assembly, the 82nd one.

And, rather than getting muckety-muck, I'll just let the business of the House go on. But, thank you very much, and I'm glad to have this thing resolved."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1663, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1663, I move to non-recede and have a Conference Committee appointed, please. Amendments 1 and 5, House Amendments that were put on in this chamber. 1663, Senate Bill.

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves to refuse to recede and a Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Amendments #1 and 5, and a Conference Committee shall be appointed.

Representative McBroom, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce a young man that I had the pleasure of meeting today. I know that introductions are forbidden, but perhaps since it's the son of C. L. McCormick, who's been here almost since the capitol was built, that the Members would indulge me for just a minute. I had the pleasure of meeting him at lunch today in the Rathskellar, and Representative Choate was there. And he pointed out to me...I told him that I'd been in his father's Big Dollar Store in Vienna, and he told me that I was always welcome there. He said, 'When Representative Choate comes in', he said, 'we ask him to remove his coat,

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

because we're just a little uneasy when he moves around the store. But, he said, 'Representative McBroom, if you come in, we would not ask you to do that'. He seems...He seems like a very, very fine young man, not at all like his father. And he's in...in law school, and it's a pleasure to have you here, Mike McCormick."

Speaker Daniels: "Who's the Gentleman behind you, Representative McBroom?"

McCormick: "A visitor."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Point of personal concern. Mr. Speaker, will we have the pleasure this Session of hearing C. L. McCormick do his thing on mosquito abatement?"

Speaker Daniels: "Would you restate that, Sir?"

Kosinski: "Repeat it? It was addressing C. L. McCormick. I was hoping that we'd have the privilege this Session of hearing your discourse on mosquite abatement. I look forward to that every time you're here."

Speaker Daniels: "The House will stand at ease. House Bill 1301,
Representative Schneider. The House will come back in
order. Members please be in their seats. Those not
entitled to the floor will retire to the gallery. House
Bill 1301, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I will move that we concur with Amendments 3 and 6 and nonconcur in 5. 1301 has become a Bill with a number of ideas, including the adult education proposal, which is very important for modifying and equalizing the funding for adult education. It also includes a proposal dealing with the regional superintendents authority on parent—teacher conferences. It really simply places in this...the practice in the statute. We have nothing really new there. Likewise, with the school board powers in which we allow

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

school boards to employ school counselors as certified by the State Certification Board. Also included is the Chicago Community School Study Commission, which has been before us in a similar form, and Amendment #6 makes a technical change to that part of the Bill. And I would ask that the Members concur with 3 and 6, and then I'll make a Motion to nonconcur in 5."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #3 and 6 to House Bill 1301. All those in favor signify by voting 'ave', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'aye', 1 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #3 and 6... Braun, 'aye'. 155 'aye', 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #3 and 6 to House Bill 1301. Representative Schneider moves to nonconcur in Amendment \$5. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 1301. The House will come to order. Senate Bill 1305, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, on the Motion of nonconcurrences, Senate Bill 1305, which is the drug paraphernalia Act, the Senate has failed to accept our Amendment #2, which was a preemption of local right as far as legislating in this area, and I would move to recede from our Amendment 2."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer, your light's not working, Sir. Now it is. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "First of all, you moved to recede. Did I understand

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

you correctly?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Brummer: "So, this would be final passage."

Ewing: "This would be final passage."

Brummer: "Okay. What was the Amendment, again, I didn't understand it, that you're moving to recede from?"

Ewing: "It was a preemption Amendment, as far as local governments legislating or passing ordinance in the drug paraphernalia area. The legal minds in the Senate felt that the preemption was too broad. It not only preempted from the area that this legislation covered, but other related drug paraphernalia legislation that local units of government might want to pass."

Brummer: "Okay, absent the preemption, then, can local units of government do something in violation of the drug paraphernalia Bill, by local ordinance?"

Ewing: "They could do something different."

Brummer: "Could they allow drug paraphernalia that would otherwise be barred by this Bill?"

Ewing: "I understand that they could."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Cullerton." Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen Ωf the House. Just to straighten out, perhaps, Representative Brunner's question, if we...when this Amendment off, we will go back to the original preemption language, and it really has to be... sure what it means, but it says, 'nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting a unit of local government from regulating the commercial traffic and drug paraphernalia by local law or ordinance, which is equal to but different from the provisions herein contained. Iºm

not sure what the means, but that's what the law's going to

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

be."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative Ewing, moves to recede from House Amendment #2. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion there are 158 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the House recedes from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1305. The House will come to order. House Bill 1060, page two of your Calendar. Representative Levin, on the Bill."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. You may recall that House Bill 1060 simply provides information to the Members of this Body moving up the time when the Illinois Housing Development Authority provides the Legislators in whose projects are proposed to be built with information about those projects. Amendment #1 makes a one-word change where there's a reference to the 12. Northeast Illinois Plan Commission. It currently says, they notify Legislators'. Amendment #1 changes that to 'shall'. I think it's noncontroversial, and I would urge the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Any discussion? Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill was on Second Reading in the House, I asked the Sponsor to accept an Amendment that, at that time, I thought was an appropriate and good Amendment, that would provide for an expanded notification process downstate. I have now been convinced that that expanded notification

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

process will significantly delay the construction of housing projects downstate. And it's my judgment that we need not do that; that we need the jobs and the projects as quickly as they can be done. And for that reason and so that we can take my Amendment off of it, the Amendment that I specifically asked for, so that we can remove it; I move...I ask...I want to submit a substitute Motion, 'do not concur' on the Senate Amendment, and that the House request a Conference Committee."

- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Vinson, offers a substitute Motion to nonconcur. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. House Bill 891, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We were on this Bill some time ago, in an enjoyable fashion, and I thought it was so good that I took it out of the record, thought we would come back at a calmer time."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Reilly.

 Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, when we left before, you were at...you had finished House Bill 1607 on the regular Calendar of Concurrence. Since then, it seems to me, under our rules you would have to come back, if you were coming back on the regular Calendar. You have, all day long, roamed the Calendar. Our rules provide that you cannot do that, Sir. Now, the next Bill, if you go back toward the Calendar, not the Supplemental, should be 1882, and should not be whatever you're on now. You...You just cannot, under our rules, roam the Calendar, Mr. Cl...Mr. Cha...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, having made that statement and shown my erudition

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- with respect to the rules, I appreciate your listening to me, Mr. Speaker, and know that you will heed my words at the appropriate time. Thank you, Mr Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Absolutely. Thank you, Sir. What purpose does the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, rise?"
- Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad Mr. Greiman pointed that out; however, would you please ask for leave when you peruse around the Calendar so we could object if we do not agree with you moving around?"
- Speaker Daniels: "I thought for sure that everything I did was with the approval of the House. Thank you, Representative Darrow."
- Darrow: "As long as you ask for leave, we have no objections."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek approves my action. Thank you, Sir. That having been established, back to House Bill 891, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "We're back on 891? Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 891. We discussed what it does earlier. I'll review it briefly. It requires the Illinois High School Association to submit to a post-audit. It allows the Board of Education to employ and assign non-certified employees. It says they got to be paid within a certain number of business days. It says any tenured teacher who is riffed comes back with whatever tenure they'd previously earned, and says that whatever the shape and size and scope of the high school basketball tournament for men, same has to be true for women. move to concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 891."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Reilly, has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3. Any discussion?

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson." Johnson: "Mr. Spe...Mr. Speaker...what's wrong with this thing? Members of the House, I...I think everybody should recall what the discussion was this afternoon on this Bill. not any different now and the Senate Amendments aren't anv different now than they were this afternoon. And I think as Representative Stuffle so ably pointed out this afternoon, and I think one of the problems with this Bill is that not too many people are familiar with how the state tournaments have been run in the past and how they ve run this last year and how well they're working. somewhat like talking about some legal technicality with somebody that doesn't understand that or talking to me about school financing. I don't understand it very well. this area, I think people ought to really understand what this Amendment's going to do. If you you require what this Amendment and requires, it will make girls' basketball tournaments in Illinois absolutely and totally unworkable. With the attendance you'll have, if you change it to four weekends, you'll be able to hold the tournaments inside of a...of a classroom, not a gymnasium. You'll lose the tev...T. revenues. It'11 make the whole thing financially unfeasible, and you'll destroy a situation that everybody is happy with. I don't know where this idea came from, but can tell you that, not only the people that run the tournament and IHSA, but the girls and basketball...girls' and boys basketball programs are extremely happy with the way the system is working now. I haven't heard a complaint about it. He had a tournament in Champaign this year; a AA and an A boys, and a AA and an A girls, we'll continue to have that. Everybody's going to play the same number of games. There's going to be the same number

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

of first, second, third and fourth, fifth, sixth and so forth places. Everybody will be able to compete according to the size. The only difference is that there'll be one and AA girls both, where the...where the weekend with A attendance will be feasible to continue to have it in The way we did it to begin with, we didn't have future. any girls basketball at all, and I think most people would agree that...that's a backward attitude. And we...we've developed women's athletics in this state substantially. and we came to a place where we played one weekend with one class tournament. But that discriminated against many of the small class A schools in the State of Illinois, so we went to a two class system, and the...and the situation everybody has agreed, and you ask the principals and the coaches and the players and the parents everybody else how well it worked and how well it's working, and then you try to change something absolutely no reason other than somebody had a Bill during the...during the Session that didn't even get out Committee, and now we want to put it in the Conference Committee Report. It just doesn't make sense. The only other alternative that IHSA will be left with if we go the direction that this Amendment wants to go is for them to go through a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Priday format, and require the kids to be out of school for four days, then doesn't work either. and that Ι quess the other alternative would be to go for a class A and AA boys! tournament with four teams each, which would revenues that keeps the whole IHSA system working. 1 believe and I think Representative Stuffle believes and 1 assume Representative Reilly and others believe that we ought to make both women's and...and men's basketball work in Illinois. And we believe in equality, but if you adopt

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

this Amendment, you're going to be absolutely destroying Now, I realize something that's working extremely well. the argument is, and a lot of the people on this side of the aisle have said if we don't concur with this Amendment, it's going to go to a Conference Committee and we're going to have collective bargaining - however you feel about that - and so forth. I don't think that's the case. But, in any event, I think it's our obligation to look and see what this Amendment is doing. I believe in equality, absolutely. But, if you adopt this Amendment, you're going to destroy women's athletics, and if that's what you want to do, you ought to vote 'yes'. Otherwise, you ought to vote 'no' on this Motion to concur, and I would also ask for a division of the question."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, the last...Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The last person who spoke is already establishing policy, yet made no reference even to the problems of boys high school, in which we are legitimately concerned about the student. They run these high boys, who we purport to be amateur athletes already heading for college, over a grueling weekend for the glory and the sake of boys' athletics in Illinois. He alth...also economics, but he addresses the question of the stresses IHS...IHSA, which is that enclave of officiousness and pompousity that doesn't recognize sports in any manner for anybody. I think we ought to put it to the IHSA quickly. They shouldn't be setting policy. In my own district, young women who played soccer in the park district couldn't even get organized for girls' soccer at Naperville North High School. It finally took a lot of effort, not only on my behalf, but on behalf of the girls in that building, to

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

a soccer league after they had been told by IHA ... IHSA that they didn't recognize that sport. Now, these are kids that are interested. It looks like the only way we get their attention and the only way that it makes sense is when we come from the federal level with Title IX. and when we go to the State of Illinois with a message. Maybe Mr. Johnson's right. You ought to tell them...tell the Illinois High School Association that this is the kind thing that we think is important. It's the kind of e...event that girls ought to have an opportunity participate in. Johnson seems to be worried about the economics. I know he's worried about making bucks for U. of I. I know he want the television revenues and whatever they're worth. But, let's talk about what it's...what's Athletics for boys and girls should be equal. They should be the kinds of things that we stress schools that help develop sound bodies and sound minds. They aren't things that are set apart for making money, and I think that's what has been focused on in the criticism of this Amendment. I think you ought to endorse it. I think you ought to bring the message clear and loud. I think you ought to tell the Illinois High School Athletic Association that sports is a developing process. It's for boys and girls. It's not competition for the sake of money. People need to develop. It's nonsense to hear the kind of criticism that we heard five minutes ago. Vote 'aye' on this concurrence."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen

of the House. I'll tell you honestly, Ladies and

Gentlemen, I'm shocked and, yes, somewhat chagrined to hear

people rise on the floor in opposition to this fine piece

of legislation. You know, we talk all about fairness and

135th Legislative Day

June 29. 1982

we talk all about equity. Those of us who are a little older to remember can remember when we were in high school, the only thing a girl could do was be a cheerleader. did you really like that, that all they... I'm even more shocked that I was when I rose to speak on this Bill after that kind of a response. Ladies and Gentlemen, those of us who have had an opportunity to work with young people this age over a period of time, and I've been there a few years, know how much better it is today for the young women in our high schools and their opportunity to participate. Do you realize, in the high school were I am, we've had to double the size of our equipment room in order just accommodate the growth in women's sports. It has been an outstanding opportunity for me to watch the growth girls' high school athletics. Now. all we're doing is...here saying be fair. is Вe fair. Ts that unreasonable? Ladies and Gentlemen, please ioin Representative Schneider and myself and the Sponsor of this fine piece of legislation and vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle." Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to the Notion to concur, as I did earlier today. as Representative Johnson did this evening and earlier today. You can talk about equal rights a11 you Representative Johnson happens to be a 'no' vote. I happen to be a 'yes' vote seven times in this House. This is the most ridiculous Amendment I've ever seen. If you want to destroy the high school basketball system in this state in the name of doing something to the Illinois High School Association, this is the Amendment to do it on. But, if you want to keep together a system that's worked for men and women, or boys and girls or whatever you want to call it, then you ought to defeat this ridiculous proposal.

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Representative Johnson's absolutely right. You can't make it economically feasible to put in the statute books you're going to treat both people the same way, on some whim because the boys from DuPage get up and say it's fair or equal or honest. This is a ridiculous proposal. arque that we're going to keep the Bill out of a Conference Committee, and it doesn't make the proposal one damn bit better. It's a very silly proposal. Things are working in Illinois now. Things are working in those tournaments. You can't force economics. You can't force reality on people, because it doesn't work that way. and Amendment won't work that wav. It's ridiculous. This Amendment put the onus on the high school not. to participate in the program. If the IHSA structures the tournaments differently, if they have fewer girls' than boys' brought to Champaign, that alone makes that high school that decides to participate, such Danville-Schlarman or Mattoon or a Chicago team, in violation of the law. And that's ridiculous to me. The whole proposal's ridiculous. So, you can back off and you can concur in this because some reason says we should get up on the cross and support the Amendment. We should say everybody should be equal, or we should say let's keep it out of a Conference Committee. But, the proposal doesn't make itself any better because of that. It's a silly proposal. Representative Johnson's absolutely right. If vote for this, if you put this on the Governor's desk, if he signs it, you're going to be back here next year being beseeched by your people to either do on thing or the other; either get out of the program, on one hand, because it still can't be conducted in the same manner, boys and girls, or because of the opposite reason, because there's no reason at all to have this and because it won't work.

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

it's unfair, it's not economically feasible, and basically it's a rather stupid idea. That's what it comes down to, and it ought to be defeated for those reasons."

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

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I take obs...exception to the remarks just recently spoken by the Representative from the other side of the aisle. have talked about for many years is the Equal Rights Amendment, and this particular proposal has nothing to with it. But, what we have said for many years is that if you believe that men and women, boys and girls have the same abilities and should be treated as equals, then when we have laws on the books or when we have regulations on the books that treat one sex or the other and give them some kind of advantage, the law has to be changed to give the same advantage to the other side. What people have said when we have spoken about the Equal Rights Amendment 'Tell me, please tell me some kind of concrete example of discrimination'. Here, for all of you to see, is a very concrete example of the discrimination that exists in our state that is not a...an example of statutory law, but is an example of discrimination. I think it is simply a very, very just decision to vote 'yes' on House Bill 891. T think it is not a whim. It is not silly. It is just the right thing to do, and I would appreciate 'yes' votes."

Speaker Daniels: "Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think most of you have noticed by now that when a Bill is introduced, there is usually a real good reason for it. I think, if you'll check in to the background of this legislation, I submit to you that they are trying to cut girls' basketball, and that is why this Amendment appears

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

before you. Now, I have some stat...statistics that show that since 1977, the attendance at girls' basketball is up by 35 percent, and you know what ha...happened to the attendance at the boys' basketball? It's down percent, in the same time, since 1977. So, economically, perhaps it is feasible. Maybe people enjoy watching it. There's another important issue, too. Where do you think girls who are good basketball players are able to be seen by the scouts who offer scholarships to these girls? is a great shortage of scholarships right now for girls who want to attend college. Now, if they can be playing in these tournaments in Champaign where people can watch them, will still. to these basketball they have access scholarships. I think it's most important. All saying is that we want equal share of a basketball tournament. When we were debating the Equal Amendment, all of those of you who stood up and said that you were going to vote against it assured me that you were You just couldn't support the Equal equal rights. Rights Amendment, and that you thought all the things were saying were right, but the Equal Rights Amendment wasn't going to do that. I think here's your opportunity to show us that, yes, you are for equal opportunity, for equal rights for women to make them equal to men. time, equal opportunity, that's all this says. I solicit your support for this...this fine Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Kendall, Representative
Hastert."

Hastert: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd

like to rise in support of the Amendment and the Bill. You

know, I've coached under H...IHSA rules for 17 years. I've

worked to bring rules changes under IHSA provisions. I've

worked for the class system, and believe me, 15 years ago

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

when you were from a small school, nobody listened much to You had to work for a class system. You had to work for equality between large schools and small schools. Well, I'll tell you something, the class system has worked, and it's worked in all types of sports. It's worked for boys and, believe me, it will work for girls. just brought the class system in for girls' athletics, specifically, basketball. They just have the program going right now. But, you know, to...to move over on another vein, a week ago we debated the Eq...the Rights Amendment in this chamber. I did not support that Amendment, but one thing I supported is that I believed and I talked about bringing equality for all people under the laws that we have in this State of Illinois. I believe in that, and if we can't apply equality under the law for boys and girls in athletics like we've applied equality for large schools and small schools to give everybody an opportunity to have their day, to have their day in front of the crowd, to have their day to win a championship, to have their day for equality. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an excellent Amendment, and I stand in support of it."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker, I move the next question."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved the previous question.

'Shall the main question be put?" All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Gentleman, Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I specifically had promised one Member during the debate that I would make clear that the intent of this, where it talks about organizations and associations under Article 23 and the requirement that they submit to a post-audit; the intention is that that entire paragraph

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

refer to Article 23, and that it refer only to state-wide organizations. Thus it does not refer to athletic conferences and so on, only to state-wide organizations. With that clarification and with the support that the Bill has received otherwise, it seems to me it's in reasonable shape, and I would again renew my Motion that we concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 891."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson, did you move to divide the question, or would you withdraw that?"
- Johnson: "I did, but I'll withdraw my request. I don't want to hold up the House."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman's moved that the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 891. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

 The voting's open, and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think an explanation is needed here. But give one of my vote anyway, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. What many of the previous speakers missed, in addition to this providing for fairness among the...the sports that are offered to...to men and women the area of basketball, it also provides for an audit of the Illinois High School Athletic Association. When one of the previous speakers talked about the system is now among the things that don't now work is the Illinois High School Athletic Association. That audit needed to see what they have been doing with the funds that we have provided them, and I thank you for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote.

 The timer's on."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, despite the remarks of the last speaker, I doubt very much if the Illinois High School Association could or should submit to an audit by the Auditor General, because they're not a public body. I don't know who put this together, but I'm beginning to wonder how an innocent Bill like the one that Representative Reilly proposed, just a child may start to school if they're six years old that September the 1st, turns into something bу that's...actually, something that's worked against the Illinois High School Association. I don't know if they have a parliamentarian or if anybody questioned the germaneness over in the Senate, but if I'm any judge, this material is not germane to the subject that was introduced by Representative Reilly. But the audit certainly is out of order in this Bill."

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 139 'aye', 17 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 891. House Bill 394, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will move nonconcur in the Senate Amendments. The Senate Amendment as it came over here, Amendment #2, is technically defective in that it failed to recite a certain case, which was titled 'The Process Color Plate Company versus Chicago Transportation District'. That case is presently the subject of litigation. Because of that, the Amendment is defective in that it does...did not set forth that funds be provided for and did requirement specifically set that out as one of the liabilities. Accordingly, I would move to nonconcur so that we can properly put that in in a Senate...in a...strike that, in a Conference Committee Report."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we...we amend that on its face."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Getty, has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 394. Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Por the purpose of an Mays: introduction, in the gallery behind us, we have with us Congressman Paul Findley and his wife, Lucille, parents of one of our own colleagues, Craig Findley, who is not with us at this point. But I'd like to introduce them. Congressman Findley represents the district that I, McClain and...and now Tate and a lot of other people represent. So, I'd like to introduce them."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will stand at ease, subject to the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. All those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, rise?"
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to go to the Order of Motions on House Bill 403 for purposes of making a Motion to take from the table."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave. Any objections?

 Hearing no objections... Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "I'd like the Gentleman to explain what the effect of his Motion would be."
- Speaker Daniels: "Pirst the Gentleman would like to go to that
 Order of Business, and then he will put the Motion. Is
 there any objection to go to that order? Hearing no

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

objections, we are on the Order of Motions, House Bill 403.

Now, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I..."

Speaker Daniels: "State your Motion."

Levin: "Yes, I would move, pursuant to Rule 63 (a) to take Bill 403 from the table. House Bill 403 passed both Houses year and was on the Order of Concurrence when June 30th passed into history. As I think most of you earlier today the Senate did not go along with the program on House Bill 2135, the passover election Bill. instead of sending that Bill to Conference Committee so that various additional Amendments could be added. noncontroversial proposals that have passed both Houses overwhelmingly, Senator Lemke receded and sent House Bill to the Governor's desk. There has been discussion on a vehicle to put the various noncontroversial proposals have been agreed to by both Leaderships onto House Bill 403. In every case, these are measures that have both Houses overwhelmingly. There is controversial in them. The list has been agreed to, and if there are specific questions, I would be happy to answer them."

Daniels: "Any discussion? Ιf no discussion. Speaker the 403 from the table Gentleman moves to take House Bill pursuant to Rule 63 (a). All those in favor will signify 'no'. by voting 'aye', opposed by voting The voting's It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? record. On this question there are 152 'aye', none voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails, and House Bill 403 is taken from the table and placed on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Levin." Levin: "Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this point to

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

- to nonconcur?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider the Motion to nonconcur? Any objections? Hearing no objections, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would move at this point that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments, I believe they are 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 403."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 403. We're waiting now for Supplemental Calendar #2 to be passed out. And while we're waiting for that to be passed out, we'll go to the Order of Agreed Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution 110. Hoxsey. House Resolution 1049, Bianco - et al. House Resolution 1070, Madigan. House Resolution 1076, McAuliffe - et al. Resolution 1077, Griffin. House Resolution 1079, Nelson -House Resolution 1080, Fawell - et al. Resolution 1081, Yourell. House Resolution 1082, Yourell. House Resolution 1083. Yourell. House Resolution Yourell. House Resolution 1085, Ryan - Republican Leadership. House Resolution 1086, McBroom - Ryan. Resolution 1088, Leon - Slape. House Resolution... House Resolution 1089 is general. Oh, House Resolution 1089."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti, Agreed Resolutions."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 110, Hoxsey. Whereas Mayor Thomas through principled and steadfast political leadership during his four years as City Commissioner and 15 years as Mayor, sincerely and singlemindedly contributed to the social, economic growth and health and welfare of Ottawa community. And he be presented this Resolution the day that they

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

dedicate the bridge. Bianco - Davis - Topinka, House Resolution 1049, that we urge Congress of the United States to enact a quilty but mentally ill verdict for the federal House Resolution 1070, Madigan, that we implore offenses. and...we implore Congress of the United States to extend beyond the 1986 deadline for the allocation of the unspent portion of the de-designated Crosstown Expressway and thereby enable the construction of the Central Avenue Overpass. McAuliffe - Stanley - Carey, House Resolution that George A. Moser is Chairman of the Board of 1076. Directors of the First National Bank of Hoffman Estates. only resides in the area but represents a Нe not very...variety of interest. Mr. Moser is Chairman of the Stonegate Development and at...Moser, upon many of his contributions of growth and development of Hoffman Estates. Be it further resolved that Moser be given a copy of this Resolution for his high esteem. House Resolution 1077, Griffin. The Order of the Arrow of this July...67th providing outstanding experience in camping and 350,000 scouts and 500 scouting for local councils nationwide. Nelson Favell and Hudson, that recognition of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Village Father of Downers Grove, we hereby extend our congratulations to the people of Downers Grove; officially recognize July 2nd through July 15th ... July 5th, 1982 Heritage Pest Days in the Village of Downers Grove. Resolution 1080, Fawell - Hudson - and Nelson, that this House congratulates the citizens of the Village of Lisle on the occasion of their Village sesquicentennial celebration. Yourell, House Resolution 1081. Joseph Nebel of St. Linus Boy Scout Troop will receive the Eagle Scout award. House Resolution 1082, Yourell. Martin Hecker of St. Linus Boy Scout Troop of Oak Lawn will receive the Eagle Scout award.

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

House Resolution 1083, Yourell. Kevin Hickey of St. Linus Boy Scout Troop will receive the Eagle Scout award. Probably no Boy Scouts left. House Resolution Raymond Cox of St. Linus Boy Scout Troop of Oak Lawn will receive the Eagle Scout award. House Resolution 1085, Ryan The House Republican staff has faithfully served the Illinois House of Representatives contributing professional, their technical, and political, organizational and clerical expertise to the legislative process, that we do hereby bestow our deepest appreciation on all the House Republican staff, too numerous to read here tonight, but they'll all receive a copy, suitable House Resolution 1086, McBroom and Ryan. copy. Herscher High School marching band has won first place the Class A competition of Marching Bands of America Summer National Championship in Whitewater, Wisconsin. Resolution 1088, Leon and Slape. The Republic - Democratic pages of the House of Representatives have invaluable services to the Members of the House throughout the 1982 Session of the 82nd General Assembly. Each page will receive a copy of this Resolution in appreciation for what they've done. House Resolution 1089, Daniels. The Department of Revenue has directed and studied advisability and feasibility of establishing a tax credit for the state income tax for purpose to provide shelter, food and support of other care and services to the citizens in this state. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolution."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1078, Rigney."

Speaker Daniels: "Committee on Assignments. Supplemental Calendar #2. The House will come to order. All Members please be in their seats. Those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery. Supplemental Calendar #2. House Bill 1244, Representative Currie. Representative Darrow, for what purpose do you rise?"

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, as far as 1244, I have a copy of the Conference Committee Report on my desk, but I received it at 11:20. I believe there is a requirement for a one hour delay. Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, perhaps we could go ahead with the Conference Committee and let Representative Darrow wait an hour before he casts his vote, but, you know, really if we can move some of this legislation along in the interest of time as far as the House and the Senate is concerned, I think we ought to do it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Speaker, because...you know, he has a very nice sarcastic way of talking about the temporary rules. These are our rules. I wish we would enforce these rules regardless of what Representative Ebbesen thinks or feels. If you want to begin the debate and not vote on it for one hour, that's fine, but we should abide by the rules. We shouldn't be considering these until 12:20 or until tomorrow morning."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's point is well taken.

Representative Currie, we will have to hold your Bill for a

period...Representative Currie, we'll have to hold your

Bill for a period of one hour unless you wish to proceed to

ask the House to suspend Rule 68. Representative Currie."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the offer, but I think the sense of Representative Darrow's remarks is well taken, and we are well-advised to abide by the rules, even if they are temporary."
- Speaker Daniels: "Fine. House Bill 2285, Representative Piel.

 So you care to suspend Rule 68, Sir?"
- Piel: "I don't have to, Mr. Speaker. It's been on the desk for about two hours."
- Speaker Daniels: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2285, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we would accept Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 2285. Basically the way House Bill 2285 is right now is the way it left the House. the Senate. They added an Amendment that basically...well, it deleted everything after the enacting clause and completely rewrote the Bill. We had...in the Conference Committee we've added one thing. There was some questions brought up on the floor as far as the Retailers' Tax and the collection fee Occupation going to the wholesaler instead of the retailer, so we've Amendment on this that would put the two percent collection fee back in the hands of the retailer. So, the retailer would not lose that fee. This Bill passed overwhelmingly out of the House a couple of weeks ago, and I would ask for favorable vote and answer any questions the people might have in reference to House Bill 2285."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman, Representative
 Bower."
- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

House. Representative Piel, is there...my understanding, there's no tax increase at all in this Bill."

Piel: "No, it is not a tax increase at all, Glen."

Bower: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Wayne,

Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Piel, how much additional cost..."

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

Robbins: "... Is this going to be to the Department of Revenue?"

Piel: "Department of Revenue figures, — and I think they're a little bit high on their estimation — they figure the cost will be about four and a half million dollars, and it would take in additional income to the state of approximately \$25,000,000. So basically, we're making a net gain of about twenty and a half million dollars."

Robbins: "Where will the twenty-five million come from?"

Piel: "From the tax cheats in the State of Illinois."

Robbins: "I look at this thing, and I see two sets of...two sets of papers being filed for one gallon of gasoline, and it looks to me like this is a great deal of additional money to be put out by law and...when the Department of Revenue should just do its job. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, stand in support of the First Conference Committee Report on 2285. Basically, the credit provisions are very similar to what we do as it pertains to the alcoholic industry where the tax is collected up front and a credit issued afterwards. It seems to me that this is one beneficial way for the State of Illinois to have a good follow up on the taxing provisions under motor fuel tax and sales tax in the State of Illinois, and I

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

wholeheartedly support a lot of green votes on 2285 to solve that particular problem of what has been considered tax cheats as it pertains to retail sales of gasoline in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support.

Representative Mautino was absolutely correct. This Bill

will generate an estimated — and it's only estimated, and I

think on the low side — some \$25,000,000 in additional

revenue to the State of Illinois next year, and I don't

think things are going to be a whole lot better next year

in terms of revenues. We can always use the money. It is

an opportunity to cross—check the tax cheats in the

industry that is producing a great amount of tax cheating,

primarily in the northeast section of the state, and I

wholeheartedly endorse the Bill and encourage your

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek."

'aye'...support."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman, Representative Piel, to close."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would yield to my Cosponsor,

Representative Mays, to close."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mays to close."

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

A lot of work has gone in on this proposal. We passed this
Bill out 127 to 23 on May 18. I'd appreciate a similar
Roll Call, if not a better one at this point, because I do
think the merits of this proposal have been fully
discussed. Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Mays, moves for

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

the concurrence of the House in Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2285. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Conference Committee Report?'. All in favor signify by saying '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. On this question there are 141 'aye', 11 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2285. House Bill 2359, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi, do you wish to proceed?"

- Giorgi: "How's that? Darrow informs me we can proceed at 12:20."

 Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish to make any Motions with regards to your...Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Yeah, I think it is inappropriate for the Chair to be requesting Members to act contrary to the Rule."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi, out of the record.

 Senate Bill 1193, Representative Ted Meyer. Why are you snapping your fingers, Representative Mautino?"
- Mautino: "I would like to ask the same question that

 Representative Darrow presented. This hit my desk at

 11:17."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's not in the chambers. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1251, Representative Peters. Representative Swanstrom."
- Swanstrom: "Mr. Speaker, I believe this Conference Committee

 Report has been on our desks for quite some time. If there
 is no objection, I would like to proceed with it."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any objections to Representative Swanstrom proceeding? Hearing no objections, Representative Swanstrom on Senate Bill 1251."
- Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1251. The only

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

difference between the House and the Senate was in the...the make-up of the Committee. That has...the problem has been ironed out. The 12 Members of the Advisory Committee on Block Grants shall include eight Members of the General Assembly, two each appointed by the Leadership and four public members appointed by the Leadership of the General Assembly. I would move for its acceptance."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane. No further discussion. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 'Shall the adop...House adopt Conference Committee Report #1?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 161 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. The House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1251. Senate Bill 1487, Representative Bower. Representative Bower.

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

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "We did not receive a copy of this until 11:25."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "I would ask to suspend the appropriate rule."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rules. It takes...68 (d). On that Motion, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the rule that we have pertaining to having the Conference Committee Reports on your desk for one hour was placed there in order that we would be able to study these Reports and not be voting in the dark. There is no urgency this evening to vote on these measures. We can do

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

it tomorrow after we have time to digest them. If we start the precedent tonight of waiving this Rule...of suspending this Rule, tomorrow night when we do have things thrown on our desks that will come back in November to haunt us, we'll have the precedent established. I think it is a very poor move in asking to suspend this Rule, and I suggest that we all vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Bower, moves to suspend the appropriate rule. 68 (d), so that the Conference Committee Report #1 can be heard immediately. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 71 'ave', 57 'no', 5 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. The House will ease. The House will stand at ease until the hour of 12:20. We'll return at that time. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I move we stand at ease until 8:00 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir. We already are at ease."

Speaker Ryan: "On the Calendar. The House will be in order. The Members in their seats. On the Calendar appears House Bill...Supplemental Calendar \$2 appears House Bill 1244, Representative Currie. The Lady in the chamber? Read the...want your Bill heard, Representative? Read the Bill."

Clerk Esslinger: "Speaker Ryan in the Chair."

Currie: "Okay, House Bill 1244...1244 is an incentive for historic preservation. It's a Bill we passed out..."

Speaker Ryan: "Wait, wait just a minute, Representative Currie.

We're waiting...the Clerk hasn't arrived yet. Let the

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

record show Representative Martire has made it here for the week. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Revenue Act. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Currie on House Bill 1240."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1244 provides property tax assessment freezes for incentives for residential historic preservation. The Conference Committee Report would approve an Amendment in the Senate that tightens the historic preservation character of the restoration, adds some technical language, enables local governments participate to in the rehabilitative process but retains control in the Department of Conservation, insures that there is not dual assessment, and changes the effective date so as to meet problems of the assessing officers. I move that we adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1244."

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

Urban decay is a problem across the nation and truly here
in Illinois. This Bill would give an incentive to
taxpayers to remain in the city, the urban areas, restore
their homes and thereby get a tax break. I think in order
to enhance the future, it is the best to preserve the best
of our past. This Bill will do that, and I urge your
support. Thank you."

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "I just move that the House...I hope we'll all adopt the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1244."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady has closed, Representative Ewing. Did you want to explain your vote? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Committee...Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1244?'. Final action. All in favor

135th Legislative Day

- June 29, 1982
- will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'.

 Representative Ewing, you have 60 seconds to explain your

 vote."
- Ewing: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just think that the Lady should...this is an important Bill. She should have explained it. She didn't do anything. If that's the way we're going to do business here, I'll vote green."
- Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 144 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Just for the record, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ewing
 was the Chairman of the Conference Committee that adopted
 Report #1, and his commitment when he signed the Report was
 that I wouldn't explain it on the floor."
- Speaker Ryan: "House (sic Senate) Bill 1487, Representative Bower. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill...Senate Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act to
 provide for the preservation of Illinois farmland.

 Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bower, Senate Bill 1487."
- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Farmland Protection Act. The Conference Committee Report, which was agreed to parties, was...by the various agencies of State Government that are affected by the soil and water conservation districts and the Farm Bureau, clarifies House Amendment 1 to the Bill relative to the working agreements. The original language was not acceptable to a couple of the agencies, the Department of Transportation most notably. This is to clarify that. Also added to it was language which Representative McClain was interested in relative

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

projects that had already been approved by the various capital agencies, so that if they were already approved, that there would be no interference to the Farmland Protection Act. I would move for adoption of the First Conference Committee Report.

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 14...Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1487?'. This is final action. 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', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2359, Representative Giorgi."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2359, a Bill for an Act in relationship to loans granted to corporations from the Corporate Loan Fund. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is the...amends the Illinois lottery law and the State Finance Act and repeals the Corporate Loan Act. This Bill, 2359, passed the House with a vote of 154 to nothing, and the Bill hasn't changed except now it has the sunset clause for raffles and chances, and I urge the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall...the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2359?'. Final action. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 127 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1193, Representative Heyer, Ted Meyer. Representative Bartu...are you going to handle this for him, Representative Johnson? No? Oh, is Representative Bartulis here? Take that one out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the following House Bills 2455, 2456, 2459, 2458, 2422, 2447, Bills: 2223, 2220, 2218, 2216, 2215, 2214, 2212, 2208, 2207, 2199, 2198, 2193, 2191 and 2190, passed the Senate June 29, 1982.' Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Speaker...Message from the Senate bу Ar. Wright, Speaker...Mr. Wright. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker. directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bills of the following title: House Bills 2441, 2558, 2457, 2399, 2393, 2370, 2345, 2339, 2283, 2222, 2213, 2219, 2217, 2210, 2209, 2206, 2205, 2203, 2202, 2201, 2200, 22...2197, 2195 and 2194 together with attached Amendments, an adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit. Passed the Senate as amended June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. ar. Speaker, I am inform directed to the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1028. House Bill 654, adopted by the Senate June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

attached to the Bills of the following titles an acceptance to which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 1184. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has accepted Governor's specific recommendation for change and...which are attached to the Bills of the following title and accept...to which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 1183. I am further directed to transmit to the House a following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. I directed to inform аm the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for the First Conference Committee to consider the differences between two Houses in regards to the following Bills: Senate Bill 1251, 1452, 1518, 1532 and 1487, action taken by the Senate June 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede their Amendments to the following Bills: House Bills 1423, 712, 1607, 2439, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1087, Daniels - Hoffman - et al.

In respect to the memory of Gerald Weeks."

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately those of us that serve in the House, hopefully return next Session, have suffered a loss in that the 39th District in Illinois will no longer have Gerry Weeks who was nominated by the Republican Party to serve as its Representative to the General Assembly. Mr. suffered a massive heart attack a few days ago and is no longer with us. He had been nominated by the Party to serve the 39th District, and chances are, he would have served that District in the General Assembly in the next Session. Mr. Weeks has been a lifelong Republican, resident of DuPage County, served as Chairman of the County Board and several elected positions. Those of us that knew him respected him and enjoyed his sense of humor at times, his dedication to public service and his integrity. a family man, a good husband, and he'll be missed by all of us, and in particular, his family. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle be joined as Sponsors of this Amendment (sic -Resolution) and that it be adopted."

- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolution and asks leave to have all Members added as Cosponsors. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, allowing the Clerk about 10 or 15 minutes of perfunctory time, I now move the House stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at the hour of 10 a.m."
- Speaker Ryan: "I'd like to remind all conferees on Conference

 Committees that they begin at 9 a.m. in room 400. If you

 serve on a Conference Committee, be in room 400 at 9

 o'clock tomorrow morning. The House now stands adjourned

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

until the hour of 10 a.m."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and Pirst Reading of Bills. House Bill 2659, Brunner - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 2660. Daniels - et al. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 2661, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2662, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Act on Aging. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2663, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act...creates the Generic Medicine Assistance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 2664, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to Bill appropriate...making appropriation to the Genetic (sic -Generic) Medicine Assistance Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2665, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act on Aging. First Reading of the House Bill 2666, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens' Homestead Exemption Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2667, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of House Bill 2668, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2669, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act t.o amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2670, Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2671. Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2672. Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2663 (sic - 2673), Daniels - et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2674, Daniels - et al,

135th Legislative Day

June 29, 1982

Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Drugs Abuse Act.

First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."

09/28/82 10:11

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

PAGE 1

JUNE 29, 1982

HB-0093	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-0394	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
HB-0396	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	1
HB-0403	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	88
HB-0403	MOTION	PAGE	86
HB-0891	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
HB-0891	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-1060	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	72
HB-1244	CONFERENCE	PAGE	97
HB-1301	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
HB-1423	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-1607	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-2038	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
HB-2285	CONFERENCE	PAGE	92
HB-2359	CONFERENCE	PAGE	100
HB-2417	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
HB-2461	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43
HB-2504	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	58
HB-2659	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2660	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2661	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2662	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2663	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2664	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2665	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2666	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2667	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2668	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2669	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2671	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2672	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2673	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
HB-2674	FIRST READING	PAGE	104
SB-1028	CONFERENCE	PAGE	61
SB-1251	CONFERENCE	PAGE	95
SB-1305	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
SB-1487	CONFERENCE	PAGE	99
SB-1487	MOTION	PAGE	96
SB-1532	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
SB-1654	RECALLED	PAGE	25
SB-1654	THIRD READING	PAGE	38
SB-1663	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	68

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER EUGENE COSTA	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	20
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	22
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	24
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	2
RECESS	PAGE	56
HOUSE RECONVENES - DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	57
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	57
NESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	60
ELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	66
AGREED RESLUTIONS	PAGE	88
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	91
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	101
SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	97
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	102

09/28/82 10:11

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

JUNE 29, 1982

2

PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	103
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	103
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	105