136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Speaker Peters: "The hour of ten o'clock having arrived, the House will be in order. Representative Peters, in the Chair. The Chaplain for today is Father John Beveridge from the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, here in Springfield, Illinois. Father Beveridge."
- Father Beveridge: "Let us pray. The Psalmist says, 'To You, we owe our hymn of praise, Oh God in Zion'. To You must vows be fulfilled, You who hear prayers. It is You, Father, who have given us the beauty of all that is around us and opened our eyes to the wonder of the life that You share with us. We praise You for these gifts, and we rejoice this day. We thank You, Pather, for the freedom that You allow us to share, the gifts of wisdom and understanding, to deliberate, to decide, to help. We ask You, Lord, to bless all of these gifts within us and enliven them this day, that together we may work for others, we may work for their well-being, for the assurance of their freedom, for true justice in their lives. Bless us, Lord, and guide us always, that we may rejoice in You and know that You hear our prayers. In the Name of Jesus, the Lord, Speaker Peters: "We will be led in the Pledge this morning by Representative Fawell."
- Fawell 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 Peters: "Thank you, Father. Roll Call for Attendance.

 Is Representative Olson here? Representative Swanstrom?

 Telcser? Representative Daniels, any excused absences?"
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let the

 Journal show that Jane Barnes is excused due to illness."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty, any excused absences?

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

None. Is Representative Levin here? Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... this is the position that we are Conference Committees on various subjects are presently meeting. It would appear that on the Calendar, the Concurrence Calendar, most, if not all, with a couple of exceptions, of the items on the ... today's Concurrence Calendar, will be concurred in when the principals arrive from the Conference Committees - that is to Representatives Wolf and Matijevich and the Members of the Appropriations Committee who are carrying those Bills. are awaiting further action in Supplemental Calendars from the Senate. Now, the only thing we can end up doing this point, I regret to say, is wait, but once the Conference Committee Membership does arrive, we should move along rather quickly, pending the non-happening unforeseen events. We have a couple of concurrences we can take with Representative Levin, but I don't see him here, and amendatory veto Motions, which he could make, but he's not here, again. So, those of you who may want to get another cup of coffee or answer a letter or two, can do that. We... Do we have any ... Pardon? Yeah. Is there any messages or anything, Tony?"

- Clerk Leone: "All messages were read in last night and appear on the Calendar."
- Speaker Peters: "On... On the Quorum Call, there are 169 answering the call, and a quorum is present. We can end up doing one nonconcurrence, page three of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2206, Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you like, we could also do 2205 after this. 2206 is the Dangerous Drugs Commission Appropriation. There are still some guestions that need to be resolved on that, so I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4."

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

- Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'.

 The House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2206. For purposes of correction of the record, on House Bill 2206, Representative Reilly moved the House not concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4, of House Bill 2206, and that Motion passed. Representative Reilly, House Bill 2205."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The same Motion with regard to Senate Amendments 3 and 4. We have to go to Conference on this to put in the numbers dealing with the agreement with the Child Care Association, so I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2205."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2205. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2205. Representative Pullen, for what purpose do you seek recognition? No. Representative Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Ma'am?"
- Younge: "Mr. Speaker, when the subject matter of concurrence and nonconcurrence is discussed by the Sponsor, would you please ask that everyone generically say what the subject matter is, so we won't have to ask?"
- Speaker Peters: "Your point's well taken, Ma'am. Representative

 Levin, on concurrences? Page four of the Calendar, Senate

 Bill 1180."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that we refuse to recede from
 House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 1180 and ask for a
 Conference... that a Conference Committee Report be
 appointed."
- Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'.

The House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to

Senate Bill 1180. Senate Bill 1186, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I make the same Motion here, that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment \$7, and that we ask for a Conference Committee Re... to be appointed."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #7 to House Bill 1186. The Gentleman requests a Conference Committee on both Senate Bills 1180 and 1186. Representative Meyer, Senate Bill 1193, Conference Committee Report? Mr. Clerk, page four of the Calendar, Conference Committee Reports."

Meyer, Ted: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1193. The Conference Committee Report did two things. It clarified that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Regional Pollution Control Pacilities and Coal Mines are not subject to local zoning. Additionally, it reinstated the felony... felony criminal provisions in the Act."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Will the Gentleman yield for a couple of
questions?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bowman: "First of all, I believe this Conference Committee Report is a major change from the... the Bill. I believe you reported accurately, but I'd like to make sure that we do understand each other on this; that you're saying that the Metropolitan Sanitary District, Fossil Fuel Mining Operations, and let's see... well, just those two, I believe, are exempt from local zoning requirements?"

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Meyer, Ted: "That's the existing statutory law now, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "It looks like we're adding this in. You say this is existing statutory law?"

Meyer, Ted: "Yes, Sir. It's existing law."

Bowman: "Why do we need it, then?"

Meyer, Ted: "It clarifies it."

Bowman: "Wait a minute. It clarifies it? I've heard that one before. What needs clarification? What's the confusion that needs to be cleared up?"

Meyer, Ted: "The Metropolitan Sanitary District came to the Conference Committee and express... expressly wanted statutory language put in that it would be clear, that they are not under the purview of this Act."

Bowman: "Okay. Now, does this include all facilities and buildings owned and operated by the Metropolitan Sanitary District?"

Meyer, Ted: "Yes, Sir."

Bowman: "Including office buildings?"

Meyer, Ted: "I would assume so. Yes, Sir."

Bowman: "Okay. I would like to point out for the benefit of the House that the Metropolitan Sanitary District has just paid four and a half million dollars for a piece of property on North Michigan Avenue, and they're planning to build a twenty—six story office building, and I'm not so sure in my own mind that this is a good idea, to exempt them from local zoning ordinances. You know, North Michigan Avenue is a pretty nice piece of real estate, and it deserves to be protected by setbacks and other protections that are written into local zoning laws, and I don't think that we should be giving the Metropolitan Sanitary District a carte blanche to go and do whatever they want on North Michigan Avenue. I would... Mr. Speaker, I would question the Chair

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

and the Parliamentarian. It seems to me that this pre-empts home rule, and I believe would require 107 votes I would like to ask for a ruling on that, and pass. while you're considering that, I'd like to go back and ask Representative Meyer one other question. Representative Meyer, I notice here that, beginning with line ten, say, undersigned Committee of Conference appointed to consider the differences between the two Houses in relation to House Amendments 3, 4, and 9... Okay. You recommend... Oh, and line fourteen, that the Senate concur in House Amendments 3, 4, and 9. Now, Amendment #9 strikes everything after the enacting clause, so what is the purpose, then, of recommending the Senate concur in House Amendments 3 and 4, which are then nullified by Amendment #9?#

Meyer, Ted: "That... That was done. The Reference Bureau did it that way. I have no idea why they did it. We've raised the question, and they said that that's the way to do it."

Bowman: "Well, does that mean that 3 or 4 are then in or out of the final piece of legislation that goes to the Governor's desk, in your... Well, is it in or out?"

Meyer, Ted: "I would say that they're out."

Bowman: "Okay, they're out. It is not your intention, then, to have us approve language of 3 and 4, or the Senate to approve the language in 3 and 4. You don't want the language of 3 and 4 to go to the Governor."

Meyer, Ted: "Correct. Correct."

Bowman: "Okay. It seems... I'm going to have to ask the Reference Bureau about this one, because it seems to me to be a very unusual way to legislate. I would think that we should just ignore them. But, in any event, I still have a question pending from the Chair. I've concluded my questions on... on the floor, Representative. Thank you."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Peters: "While... While we're looking at that,

Representative - Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to take a very close look at this Bill. House Bill 172, which we passed last year, required that the local government approve siting before they issue a permit for a landfill. Now then, with this concurrence, they can issue a siting for a landfill before the local government has any say in it. It can even be issued before public hearings are held. Now, this is maybe important to you or not important to you, but I... I want you to look at this very closely. If you live in Southern Illinois, this is not a Bill that you want to vote for. Thank you for your consideration."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Fawell."

Fawell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Pawell: "Ted, in my old home town of West Chicago, they have a...

a big problem there with an old Kee-Magerr... McGee plant
that they are knocking down, and they claim that every
brick in that building is radioactive. It's about two
blocks away from the high school and one of the grammar
schools. Are you saying, with this Bill, that the local
authorities would have absolutely no right..."

Meyer, Ted: "Yes."

Meyer, Ted: "No, Ma'am. Radiological... Radioactivity and radio... and nuclear waste, hot waste is covered by an entirely different Act. The Environmental Protection Act does not, N. O. T. have anything to do with radioactive waste."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Fawell: "So, this ... "

Meyer, Ted: "It's covered by a separate Act, and... and that Act is... is, in fact, administered by a different agency — the Department of Nuclear Safety. It doesn't have anything to do with it."

Fawell: "Okay. I just wanted that on the record, that there will... they still will have control of this particular site, because they are very concerned about it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Miller."

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

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative. Representative
Daniels, in the Chair."

Miller: "It's not often that I find myself in agreement with Representative Bowman, but indeed, in this occasion I do, and I think there's some very serious issues that are involved in this Conference Committee Report. We are apparently bringing some clarification to the issue of pre-emption of local zoning in matters such as where strip mines and underground mines will be located. I find it very difficult to believe that the local government has a legitimate interest in determining where filling stations and Laundromats may be located within their communities, but they apparently, for some reason in some people's minds, have no legitimate interest in where coal might be located in their communities, and how they might be positioned, and fitted into the various other uses of property which the community has a legitimate interest in preserving. I think this is very dangerous to local I think that we ought to take a serious look at this. I don't think the present statute or case law is quite as clear as the Sponsor might have us believe, and

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

that we're taking a step away from local control and control by people over the sort of things that can have a very compelling impact upon their destiny and that of their property values, and I would resist the Conference Committee Report."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the the remarks of the last speaker very House. I find interesting, interesting indeed, because the Members of this General Assembly had the opportunity to do exactly what you recommended, Mr. Miller, on Senate Bill 1260, and I'm very sorry that this General Assembly didn't take a posture that was affirmative in that regard. But I'd like to point out that this Conference Committee has presented, Amendment #9 which rewrote the Bill and eliminated everything else before it, did exempt the facilities from the requiring of the securing of all permits necessary for approval. I totally disagree with that Section, but I do agree with the other provision that provides that anyone who knowingly causes or allows the disposal or abandonment of a hazardous waste in Illinois is in violation of the Act and is a Class IV felony. I think that's a good provision. I'm sorry to see that the same language that was in 172 is in this Amendment now. That is the question of site selection and authorization and input by local government. I would hope that the Sponsor of this Conference Committee, even though it was signed by all of the Members on Conference Committee, would take it back and do the State of Illinois a great justice by mandating that any new or expanded facility for hazardous or low level nuclear waste must have the prior approval before authorization by the EPA. I agree in total with Mr. Miller and Mr. Robbins and

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Mr. Bowman on this question, and I would hope that the General Assembly would see fit to make that point very clear, and send it back for the Second Conference Committee to give local governments some control in their destiny for the citizens who live in those areas where there's hazardous waste."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr."
Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I'd like to join with the... my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in opposing this Bill. Representative Robbins, Representative Miller have stated that downstaters should oppose this Bill, and they're right. And everyone in Cook County should oppose this Bill as well, as Representative Bowman has pointed out. This Bill creates a total exemption from zoning laws and zoning requirements for the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. The Sanitary District owns a great deal of land located in many of the communities in our county, and this would exempt those properties from local zoning ordinances, the Sanitary District could build office buildings or sewage treatment plants, or anything in any area, residential or otherwise, violate all the zoning requirements of the municipalities with impunity. This is a terrible Bill. Ι don't know how it got out of Conference Committee. ought to send it right back there and drown it in a sea of red. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Koehler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield to a guestion, please? Representative Meyer, I wondered if this Bill applied only to the zoning ordinances in Cook County. Does it apply to downstate also?"

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Meyer, Ted: "Representative Koehler, this Bill is not effected in Cook County. It applies to... to only downstate counties."

Koehler: "Okay, thank you. Does this Conference Committee Report clarify the original intent of Senate Bill 172, with regard to the Metropolitan Sanitary District?"

Meyer, Ted: "In... In what regard?"

Koehler: "Well, the original..."

Meyer, Ted: "I mean..."

Koehler: "We... 172 did address the problem of the Metropolitan Sanitary District, so why is it necessary to again address it in this Conference Committee Report?"

Meyer, Ted: "Because... Because they felt that existing language in Section J wasn't... wasn't strong enough. They wanted to nail it down and lock it up."

Koehler: "Thank you. One more question. Representative Robbins stated that a landfill can, under this Conference Committee Report that a landfill could be sited before a local hearing. Is that true?"

Meyer, Ted: "Absolutely not. I want to make that... that point clear. You can't site... You can't site a landfill that... that is... meets the definition of a regional pollution control authority without... without prior consent of the local unit of government, be it a county or a municipality."

Koehler: "So, the hearing..."

Heyer, Ted: "I can't make it any more clear, but you have to have
prior authority from the unit of local government."

Koehler: "Thank you. Therefore, the hearing process that is contained in Senate Bill 172 remains intact."

Meyer, Ted: "Correct."

Koehler: "Under this Conference Committee Report."

Meyer, Ted: "Correct."

Koehler: "Thank you very much, Representative."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, something that should be noted here is that the Metropolitan Sanitary District has always been exempt from this legislation. That is not new in this legislation. I might agree with you, as a matter of fact I do agree with you, that there should be more restrictions on MSD, and they should have to come into compliance too, but I think that's an issue that we should fight another day. I have a question of the Sponsor. Question of the Sponsor?"

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

Breslin: "Representative, for purposes of legislative intent,
what is the need for this Bill. For purposes of
legislative intent, what is the need for this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer, Ted: "Well, it, first of all, it... the second part of it, it reinstates the criminal provisions that were inadvertently removed by the passage of Senate Bill 172 last year, and secondly, it clarifies that regional pollution control facilities in the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, and coal mines, are not subject to local zoning."

Breslin: "And you believe that was the intent of 172?"

Meyer, Ted: "Correct."

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

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

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

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 Meyer, to
close."

Meyer, Ted: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a clarification.

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

Regional pollution control facilities are not subject to local zoning, but they are subject to local control of the... of the siting authority. It ... It is not local zoning, I want to make that point clear. It's best described as a process in which there are criteria statute that in siting a... a regional pollution control facility, that there will be uniform criteria for siting these facilities across the State of Illinois. We won't have a situation where one county is saying one... thing and another county or municipality is saying another. It provides uniformity of standards and criteria, so that no local zoning will not apply under this... under the existing Bill. But yes, the ... the petitioner will have to appear in front of the county board or the city council acting as a siting authority with standards that have granted by this Legislature in determining the suitability of this particular site. I urge the adoption of Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman, the Parliamentarian has reviewed the Bill and the Conference Committee Report and advises me that it takes 89 votes to pass. It is not a pre-emption of home rule authority in the sense that it would take more than 89 votes. All right, the question is, 'Shall the Conference Committee Report be adopted?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Meyer, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Meyer, Ted: "No, Mr. Speaker, I'll just... I'll just say that the Municipal League worked on this Bill, the Manufacturers' Association worked on this Bill, the Chamber of Commerce worked on this Bill. It's a re-clarification. If you folks, I mean, you know, let it go down."

136th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1982
- Speaker Daniels: "Your light's not on, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'. I can't vote. My key is temporarily missing, but I'd like to be recorded as 'aye', and..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Ewell as 'aye'. The
 Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain
 his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Robbins: "If this receives 89 votes, I will request a verification."
- Speaker Daniels: "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 83 'aye', 53 'no', and 18 'present'. The Gentleman, Representative Neyer, requests a Poll of the Absentees. 84 'aye'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Barnes. Deuster. Giglio. Hastert. Hoxsey. Karpiel. Dick Kelly. Kosinski. Kucharski. Martire. McBroom. O'Brien. Peters. Margaret Smith. Stanley. Stearney. Stewart. Tuerk. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Younge and Yourell."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."
- Meyer, Ted: "Postponed Consideration. Just hold it."
- Speaker Daniels: "84 'aye', 53 'no', 18 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Senate Bill 1183 under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, page four of your Calendar. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1183. Senate Bill 1183 clarifies the time frame in which the Chicago Board of Education may adopt a supplemental budget based on the increase in the value of taxable property. The time frame

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

for adoption is 60 days from the date of an increase in the equalized assessed valuation becoming publicly known. The Governor's amendatory veto makes two changes in the Bill. First of all, it clarifies that becoming publicly known is when the final multiplier is certified by the Department of Revenue, and secondly, the amendatory veto provides that this is all subject to approval by the School Finance Authority. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer them, otherwise I would move for the acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon,

 Representative Kane."
- Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this has even been printed, much less distributed, and I would suggest that it be taken out of the record."
- Speaker Daniels: "You are correct, Sir. Out of the record.

 Representative Kane.
- Kane: "Yeah, it would make it a lot easier for us if the Clerk and the Speaker or whoever is in the Chair would not bring things to the floor until after they ve been printed, rather than us having to keep making those points."
- Speaker Daniels: "Perhaps you'd like to talk to the Clerk and find out why that wasn't distributed."

Kane: "Yeah, I mean..."

Speaker Daniels: "It would make it a lot easier if the Senate would send us the right messages, too. Thank you, Sir."

Kane: "I've always been for abolishing the Senate."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman, House Bill 1271. Out of the record. The House will stand at ease. The House will come to order. Members please be in the seats. Those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, page four of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1183, Representative Levin."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, let me apologize to the Body. called the Bill before, I assumed that since it was on the Calendar, that copies of the amendatory veto Motion had been passed out. Just to review what I said earlier, the underlying Bill clarifies the time frame in which the Chicago Board of Education may adopt a supplemental budget based on an increase in the value of taxable property. time frame, as set out in the basic Bill, is 60 days from the date of an increase in the EAV becoming publicly known. The Governor's amendatory veto makes two modifications in that underlying Bill. First of all, it defines 'publicly known* to be the time when the final multiplier is certified by the Department of Revenue; and secondly, the Governor's amendatory veto adds language that supplemental levy is subject to approval by the School Finance Authority. I urge adoption ... concurrence in the Governor's specific recommendations for change."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,
 Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the amendatory veto filed by the Governor clarifies an area which those of us who work with it understood. However, by being more specific, rather than just general public by establishing a particular date, I think it does clarify it, at least, for the uninitiated, and I would encourage the adoption of the amendatory veto."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Levin, to close."
- Levin: "I would simply ask for concurrence in the Governor's specific changes."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change by the Governor?". All

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

in favor will signify by voting "aye", opposed by voting "no". The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 151 "aye", none voting "no", 1 voting "present, and the House accepts the specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 1183. Wolf, "aye". 152 "aye". J. J. Wolf. Senate Bill 1184. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1184, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin, on your Motion."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1184 is a companion to 1183. In the process of a supplemental levy, first the Chicago Board comes up with the figure and passes a Resolution, and then it must be concurred in by the Chicago City Council. House... Senate Bill 1184 is part of the same procedure. It simply deals with the City Council portion of that process. The Governor's amendatory veto makes the same two clarifications, as his... as his amendatory veto in 1183."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would say the same thing on 1184 that I said on 1183, and I would ask for your support of this amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change?'. 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? J. J. Wolf, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 162 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House accepts the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Governor's specific recommendation for change to Senate Bill 1184. House Bill 2289, page three of your calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Redu the bill, his clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2289."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I think most of the Members of the General Assembly will remember that House Bill 2289 was one that I had up under consideration and then pulled out of the record on Sunday evening. What we're really talking about, and perhaps we've solved a part of the problem already. with the passage of House Bill 93 yesterday, was first of all, my innocent little Bill that went over to the in regard to overlapping taxing districts, and while it was in the Senate, Amendment #1 was placed on it, calling for the abolition of the Illinois Inheritance Tax, which is exactly the same form as House Bill 93 that passed yesterday. The second part of Amendment #1 eliminates the tax upon tax for utilities, taking that out of their rate base. I understand that is a saving to the rate payer of about eleven to twelve million dollars. Senate Amendment #2 was the one that... perhaps some questionable pertained qermaneness, but to the elected Commerce Commission. Amendment #3 deals with the question associated gas - that gas that is produced in connection with the production of oil. Mr. Speaker, what I want to and I know that I might just as well do it at the outset, because if I don't request it, someone else will, I'm going to ask to divide the question into three separate issues, and the first being Amendment #1, the one that deals with the inheritance tax and the tax on tax for utilities, and at this time, I want to move to concur in Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate Mr. Rigney as Sponsor of the Bill in identifying the problems with the As he indicated, the original Bill as it passed the House. dealt with overlapping taxing districts, particular Section of the Revenue Code of 1939. Senate Amendment #1. as was pointed out, deals with inheritance tax and with the utility tax. Senate Amendment #2 deals with the elected Commerce Commission changing the method in which commerce commissioners are selected. Senate Amendment #3 - it's beyond me to figure out exactly what it does - but somehow, it deals with gas companies. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of 1970 imposed a single subject requirement. It ... Did it ... It weakened the single subject requirement of the 1870 Constitution in only one respect - that one respect being that that single subject of a Bill did not have to be expressed in the title of the Bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Commentator to the Constitution, as you'll note in 'Smith-Heard', indicates that the single subject requirement, absent the requirement of expressing the single subject in the... in the title, was retained by the Constitution of 1970. Now, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would call the Chair's attention to the case of 'The People versus Harran'. In that case, under the 1870 Constitution, not decided on the title requirement for single subject, but decided on the contents of the Bill for single subject, a Bill was before the court which had been passed by the Legislature, which had three separate provisions dealing with trafficking in deadly weapons. A fourth provision, under which a man was prosecuted, dealt with the concealment of deadly weapons. The court held that, because of concealment, that the concealment of

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

weapons was a different subject than trafficking in deadly weapons. For that reason, he held the statute unconstitutional. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the entire contents of the Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 are violative of that single subject rule. And because of that, they're also nongermane to the Bill, and I would ask the Chair to so rule."

Speaker Daniels: "... Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, as happened last Sunday evening, perhaps Representative Vinson is a little ahead of time in arguing that since there is a certain difference, as far as subject matter is concerned, between the three Amendments, that we, at this juncture, have to throw out the whole thing, and we can't even consider Amendment #1 deals with two subjects of Amendment #1. revenue and, as I stated when this Bill went over to the Senate, it was a revenue Bill. Now, admittedly, perhaps amending a different Section: but nevertheless, on general subject matter, the general subject matter of revenue, and I think clearly, as far as Amendment #1 is concerned, we have no problem with a single subject provision that's found in Section 8 of the legislative Article of our State Constitution. When we get to Amendment #2, of course, I'm also going to at least attempt, at that time, to concur in that Amendment, but I think we've got to take these things one step at a time. We had a favorable ruling from the Parliamentarian the other night, and for that reason, I certainly think that, at least as far as Amendment #1 is concerned, it is confined to a single subject."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, clearly, Amendment #1 violates the single subject rule. It violates the germaneness rule. It deals

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

with two totally unrelated taxes in different Sections of the statute. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House nonconcur in all of the Senate Amendments as a substitute Motion."

- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's substitute Motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3.

 All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3. The House will stand at ease for fifteen minutes. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise for purposes of an introduction. Representative Tim Johnson's mother, Mrs. Margaret Johnson, and his aunt, Anita Campbell, happen to be in the chamber at his desk, and I would like to introduce them as two wonderful ladies, fine Republicans and relatives of a fine human being."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. Members will please be in their seats. All those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the gallery. On the Order of Concurrence, page two of your Calendar, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I rise both as a point of personal privilege and to..."
- Speaker Daniels: "State your point, Sir."
- Matijevich: "...and to enter a dissent on the Journal, and I'm joined by, not only my roommate, Representative Murphy, but many others who deplore the action of the House just before our very quick recess. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have quite a few of us respectfully, but very strongly, and I can't emphasize strongly, object and formally dissent to the action of the Chair and the House on House Bill 2289

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

just before our recess. As you recall, the House Sponsor, Harlan Rigney, when the Bill was called on the Order of Concurrence, explained that the Senate had adopted Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2289. Representative Vins... Representative Rigney asked that the question be The quest... The division of a question is a matter of right. That is a matter of right House Rule #60. At that juncture, as I recall, Representative Vinson posed the question of germaneness, and the Chair ruled the Amendment germane. At that point, I believe, and I don't know; but, there was a lot of commotion, but I thought it was Representative Vinson made a Motion that Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 nonconcurred in. That Motion is out of order, because the division of a question is a matter of right. And main reason for my dissent. Secondly, even after that improper Motion, and the Chair accepting that improper Motion from the Chair, then the Chair asked, for that Motion, how many are in favor of the Motion to nonconcur and had a voice vote. There were at least 15 of us standing demanding a Roll Call vote on that, even knowing and myself hollering for attention, because I wanted to get the attention of the Chair on the question of the division. But, even that, even that, we should have at least been accorded our right, our right under the rules for a Roll Now, with regards to both of those violations, I want to further say that all of us know that the utility lobby has been lobbying like heck, lobbying like heck all over this House floor, because they don't want an elected Commerce Commission."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich, to your..."

Matijevich: "I... This is my right to speak on this issue."

Speaker Daniels: "To your point of order, Sir."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Hatijevich: "And I'm speaking to it and speaking to it more loudly, because that is the point. The point is that they have more power and influence in here than any one, single Member. The House floor belongs to the Members, not to a public utility lobby. They used their lobby influence, and they used the influence of the Chair to ramrod through something when each one of us have a right to vote on that issue. If they have the votes, so be it, but I have a right to vote on it. When that guestion was divided, I had the right to vote on that issue. You didn't give me that right. You took away a right from me, and I've fought for the rights of minority on this floor all the time. And I fight for it now, and I am going to have that dissent recorded. And you made a monkey out of Harlan Rigney in the process."
- Speaker Daniels: "Your dissent will be so recorded, along with your roommate, Representative Murphy. Alright, we're going to go on now. House Bill 2194, Representative Winchester.

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations to the Department of Transportation together with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Department of Transportation's FY '83 reappropriation Bill, and I would move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #2, and if we concur, then that means that the total appropriation for reappropriation will be 1,283,787,000, which is 226 million less than what is was when it was introduced. I now move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2194. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 154 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and 3 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2194. House Bill 2195, Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2195, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation, together with Senate Amendments \$5, 6, 7, 8, and 9."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of Transportation. The Bill now reads 1,118,789,000. It has been reduced 31,788,000. I would now ask that we concur with Senate Amendments \$5,6,7,8, and 9."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "On Amendment #8, what is the total allocation for that project, as compared to all the monies coming out of the Road Fund?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "There are several projects, Dick. Which one, specifically, are you talking about?"

Mautino: "The ones that are on Amendment #8. There's 3.2 million from the Road Pund for widening and resurfacing an intersection channelization."

Winchester: "Okay. The Road Fund is 384 million dollars. Senate

Amendment #8 would use 3,200,000."

Mautino: "What are we doing with the Road Fund? I'm not

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

interested in the 'CB' stuff, but total allocation on the Road Fund. What are we doing with that, in this... in this total 5 through 9. How much are taking out of it for projects?"

- Winchester: "All right. I'm not sure, Dick, I understand your question. You want to say it one more time?"
- Mautino: "Well, you said 325 million totally, is what the Road Pund..."
- Winchester: "Yeah. 300... roughly 325 million is the Road Fund money, and then we're adding 3,200,000 for these various railroad projects in Amendment... Senate Amendment #8."

Mautino: "That's just one percent. Okay, thank you."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Are we concurring in Senate Amend... Amendment #7?"

Winchester: "Yes, we are."

Darrow: "And this is to the House, as I understand it, eliminated
a 38 million dollar diversion for the State Police, and
this takes that out, so that the diversions will continue?"
Winchester: "Yes, that's my understanding."

- Darrow: "And calling your attention to Amendment #9, there's 100,000 dollars for portable toilets? How did we come up with a figure 100,000 dollars? If we're... Are we buying these or are we renting them? It may sound like a small amount, it may sound a little ridiculous, but Senator Grotberg threw out 100,000 dollars. I was just curious about that."
- Winchester: "Well, I'm... I'm glad, Representative Darrow, that
 you said Senator Grotberg did it, because I... I don't want
 to be held responsible for what our Senators do on these
 Bills, but I do feel that throughout the state, we have

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

rest areas that do not have restroom facilities, and we are getting a considerable amount of complaint. I think many Legislators are getting complaints, as well as the Department of Transportation. Why spend a million dollars building a rest area and then not spend the money through the Capital Development Board to build washroom facilities? And I think that's what he's trying to do with these portable toilets. I think it's necessary. Whether the money's correct or not, I don't know. I think it's necessary."

- Darrow: "Well, getting back to Senate Amendment \$7, do you agree with the Amendment that continues the diversion to the State Police? You evidently do, since you're recommending that."
- Winchester: "It's my understanding, Representative Darrow, that
 there is a compromise on Senate Amendment \$7. I personally
 believe that we need to extend one more year, our four year
 diversion plan that we passed four years ago. It's my
 understanding it's an agreed Amendment, and that the
 substantive language will be changed elsewhere."
- Darrow: "When you say it's an agreed Amendment, you mean between the Governor, the Leaders, and the Appropriation Committee Chairman?"
- Winchester: "Yes, I would assume that's... that's the correct people that's involved in the negotiations."

Darrow: "Thank you."

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

Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "To Amendment #9, how many portable toilets will be funded out of that 100,000 dollars? How much are they per..."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Winchester: "The best answer I can give you for that is that it will be quote, 'several', unquote."

Leverenz: "That's not good enough. How much are they per head?" .
Winchester: "We'll get them at the going rate."

Leverenz: "I'm very serious. You know, in the Appropriations Committee at Second Reading on the House floor, I even asked for a tape of the questions that were asked. years ago, maybe three, we went with an Amendment for a four-holer at Funk's Grove on 55, and I asked the Secretary of Transportation if he could kindly tell us how much we have now put in that facility, by itself. A four-holer, we estimated a thousand per hole, would have been four thousand, 225 for the ticket taking system, and \$2.98 the plaque that said 'The Kramer Uleg Memorial Library'. Now, the Secretary has never responded to that answer. Here, we have an appropriation of 100,000 dollars for portable toilets to be scattered through the rest areas in the state, I presume. You do not know, or staff apparently cannot inform you, as I know they should be able to, how many that represents. And you said, 'several'. understand they run about 50 bucks a head. Does anybody have an accurate number? I mean, if that be the case, there was no reason to build that deluxe facility at Punk's Grove that they started building two years ago, that they still have yet to open to the traffic on Route 55. At this point in time, all they're doing up there is taking out whole trees by the roots."

Winchester: "Representative Leverenz..."

Leverenz: "Wouldn't that have been an answer, at Funk's Grove?

We could have got two port-a-potties, up there."

Winchester: "I think you saw me on the telephone."

Leverenz: "Oh, yes."

Winchester: "As I did for you the other day."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Leverenz: "No question."

Winchester: "When I think that you've got serious concerns and serious questions that you're not getting answers for, I take care of it, and I've again scored another point for you today. But I want to say that we feel that these 'portable heads', as you want to call them, are going to cost about \$49.95, somewhere in that neighborhood. But I just talked to a very high placed person, Representative Leverenz, and he assures me that if you're willing to support this Bill, that we will get you a four-holer at Funk's Grove, and we'll even call it 'Leverenz' Grove'."

Leverenz: "I have no interest in changing the name of the Grove itself."

Winchester: "Oh, I want to. I insist on it."

Leverenz: "I understand that we have spent three quarters of a million dollars to put a rest stop there, and I understand this Amendment takes care of the other rest stops that have that infamous sign that says 'no facilities', and I think that's quite admirable, but we don't know, still, how many it... this 100,000 dollars will acquire. I'll let you come back with an answer later. Apparently, I'll just have to vote 'present' or red. To the question of funding state troopers — I'm confused by Amendment 6 and 7. Could you explain what those two Amendments do? Apparently, one puts it in and another takes it out."

Winchester: "Yeah, #6 just breaks out the Road Fund portion by...

by highway districts on a statewide basis. There's no...

no money changes. This breaks it out and makes it easier
to find."

Leverenz: "That's the sunshine..."

Winchester: "If you want to call it that."

Leverenz: "...Philosophy. And then, 7... 7 takes 38... in 6, 38 million is still added."

136th Legislative Day June 30, 1982

Winchester: "Yes, that's true."

Leverenz: "Okay. Then, 7 - does that eliminate it? The 38 million for the state troopers?"

Winchester: "Yes... Yes."

Leverenz: "So then, it's out."

Winchester: "Yes, it's out of DOT's budget."

Leverenz: "And... And from... And would that have been from the 55 million statewide, or would that be a little bit out of each one of the nine districts, or what?"

Winchester: "No, it's 55 million, statewide."

Leverenz: "Out of the statewide, so the statewide would drop from 55 to 17 million?"

Winchester: "Yes. The districts remain intact."

Leverenz: "Well, what is..."

Winchester: "The statewide would be reduced from 55 to roughly 17, 18 million."

Leverenz: "What is the status, then, of the substantive Bill that
would extend the present law that provides for the
elimination of the diversions from the Road Fund?"

Winchester: "I understand that's Senate Bill 423, and it's still in the Conference Committees."

Leverenz: "Wouldn't it be more proper to adopt the substantive,
and then we'd take care of the money, rather than to do the
money first?"

Winchester: "I'm advised that that's not necessary, no."

Leverenz: "Well, then you would not then, by adopting this concurrence Motion with all Amendments — you would not be within the law that provides that the diversions must stop from the Road Fund."

Winchester: "This will pause the diversions for one year. Does that answer your question?"

Leverenz: "That's a substantive Bill, and that is not in this.

That's exactly what it does."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Winchester: "This... This pauses the appropriation for one year."

Leverenz: "But you haven't passed the substantive Bill yet."

Winchester: "It's in Conference Committee. It will be passed."

Leverenz: "In your eloquent words, I'll trust you."

Winchester: "Thank you."

- Leverenz: "And my final request is, where... who do I see to get
 the total breakout of where the 325 million in Road Fund
 money will be going?"
- Winchester: "I've got my staff here, as well as the Department of
 Transportation staff, and I've asked them to immediately,
 after you complete your questioning, to come over and...
 and get your concerns so they can get answers to your
 questions right away. After you vote 'yes' on this Bill."
- Leverenz: "Should I ever be... lose my House seat, I certainly want to move to your district, because you have clout, and you, I understand, are the real committeeman for Southern Illinois."
- Winchester: "Well, we have Erie Jones there. I don't know if we want you down there, too."
- Leverenz: "Well, you could withstand a direct nuclear hit, too."

 Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from... The Gentleman from Stephenson,

 Representative Rigney."
- Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have only one comment. At times we hear folks on the floor say that this is an agreed Amendment. I happen to have been the Sponsor of that Amendment when it was placed on there in the first place, and I think there were about a hundred and thirty some folks around here known as Representatives that, at least, on that particular day, felt differently about the issue. Frankly, I didn't realize that any attempt was going to be made to pull that 38 million out of there until I received the Conference Committee Report. So I don't look upon it as an agreed Amendment, and I feel, to protect my own

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

position in this particular case, that I'm going to have to oppose the First Conference Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester, to close."

Winchester: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate
the... the comments that Representative Rigney said, and I
know how strongly he feels about this issue, and I feel
strong about it too, but I also know that we do have some
very serious financial problems in the General Revenue
Fund, also. And I am, and have agreed, to support what
we're doing now in regards to Senate Amendment \$7 for one
year, and one year only; and if they attempt to do it any
more in the future, then I'm going to be violently opposed
to it, but we do need it now. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this
is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the
Department of Transportation. I ask that we concur with
Senate Amendments \$5, 6, 7, 8, and 9."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 118 'aye', 39 'no', and 9 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments \$5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to House Bill 2195. House Bill 2196, out of the record. House Bill 2197. Excuse me, Representative Bower. House Bill 2196. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2196, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of various state agencies, together with Senate Amendments #4 and 5."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #4,

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

which eliminates 220,000 GRF dollars for grants for care of individuals suffering from chronic renal disease."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman's moved to concur in House... in

Senate Amendment #4. Any discussion? The Gentleman from

Cook, Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "A question of the Sponsor."

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

O'Connell: "Could you repeat your Motion for us, please? Did you... Specifically, did you say you want to delete the 224,000 for renal dialysis?"

Bower: "The Senate did, and I moved to concur."

O'Connell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I would vehemently argue against that concurrence. This is
one measure that addresses itself to human compassion.
We've had very few issues during this Session of the
Legislature where we can go back to our constituents and
said that we did something for people."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman, J. J. Wolf, arise?"

Wolf, J. J.: "I think I might be able to shed some light and end some debate. It's in Public Health Bill. It's removed from the Senate, from Conservation's OCE, and put in Public Health."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I guess Representative Bowman wants to speak. I was going to move the previous guestion, so we can get going along, here. Representative Bowman, do you want to talk?

I wouldn't want to cut him off."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Question of the Sponsor. I just wanted to make sure that we're absolutely clear in what we're doing here. My understanding is that this money was taken out of the Conservation budget and put over into Public Health, where

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

it really belongs. Is it the full 220,000 that was restored to Public Health? Okay, I see the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee nodding 'yes' over there, so I'll.. I'll support the Motion to concur on the basis that we will, then, concur in the Senate Amendment that will put the full amounts in the Public Health Budget where it belongs."

- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

 The voting's open. This is to concur in Senate Amendment #4. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Barkhausen, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Barkhausen: "Mr. Speaker, I don't... I don't want to explain my
 vote. I simply want to request the assistance of our
 electrician. My 'yes' vote seems to going on
 automatically, and it occurs to me there might be a Bill or
 two I might want to vote 'no' on before the end of the
 day."
- Speaker Daniels: "We'll have the electrician check your... Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion, there are 165 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2196. Representative Bower?"
- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may just... for the benefit of Representative Bowman, that is in Amendment #4 to the Public Health budget. Okay. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5, for the reason that it contains substantive language which is not appropriate in an appropriations Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', oops.

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Excuse me, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Just a question of the Sponsor. Is that reference to #4, in that Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Did you say #4?"

Schraeder: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "No, it's #5."

Bower: "No, it's #5. And I would also ask for a Conference Committee..."

Schraeder: "No, no, no, #4 of Amendment #5. Part four."

Bower: "I don't understand your guestion."

Schraeder: "You said it was... Okay, you*re referring to a substantive language in an appropriation Bill, is that correct?"

Bower: "That is correct."

Schraeder: "Okay, thank you."

Bower: "It's not properly in an appropriations Bill, and I would move to nonconcur and request a Conference Committee."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Bradley. Your light's not on, Sir. It is... All right. Now it's on. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I just wanted to make sure what that language was, Mr.

Speaker, that we're talking about. I think I know, but I'd

like for the Sponsor to tell us what... what language that

you're..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "I don't have the precise language, but it pro... it's basically that it prohibits expenditure of operation funds on permanent improvements, developments, or operations of the Rock Island Trail."

Bradley: "Thank you. That's what I thought it was. Thank you."

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

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

Representative Levin."

Levin: "I had my question answered, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Sponsor, will the Sponsor yield, or Mr. Speaker, sorry."

Speaker Daniels: "That's all right. He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, what is your concern about this particular language?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "It's very simple. Substantive language is not appropriately in an appropriations Bill."

Ropp: "I know it, but I ... I think that my ... "

Bower: "I'm not speaking on the merits of the Rock Island Trail one way or another."

Ropp: "No."

Bower: "It's just not properly in an appropriations Bill."

Ropp: "I'm not either making any judgment on that at this point, but it seemed to me that for at least two to three years, I have seen this same language that is now in, in the appropriations Bill in some form or another, and I question why, if it has been in there and we have approved it two or three or four years previous, why now, all of a sudden, it is..."

Bower: "I... I'm not certain that that was in previous appropriations Bills, but I'm the Sponsor this year, and I've been very careful to make certain that the Bill was in proper form."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 2196. 2197, Representative Bower. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

the Environmental Protection Agency together with Senate Amendments \$2 and 3.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with both Senate Amendments #2 and #3. Senate Amendment #2 adds 100,000 dollars U.S. EPA funds for water quality planning studies. Amendment #3 funds adds 3,272,000 anti-pollution bond to. the appropriation for anti-pollution...It's a reappropriation for construction grants, bringing the total ŧο the unexpended balance as of June 1, 1982."

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Bower, I'm going to support your Motion, but I want to enter into the record, there is language that probably is substantive, and I'm not going to object to it, but I want to at least show legislative intent in the record. In the Bill under the Administration for Contractual Services, we have the language contractual services not including the rental of office space in the building at 840 South Spring in Springfield in the amount of 197,000. It is my understanding that the state has, in fact, violated a contract already on the rental of that office space. I enter into the record that the State of Illinois, by our action today, cannot violate any contract, and this language, unless I pose this matter of legislative intent, would be opening itself to a potential lawsuit. And, I think, in no way do any of us, by our action today, say that we can break a contract. Ιn fact it is a fact really, that this not including the rental of office space is substantive language that we...we don't ordinarily put that type of language when we have a contractual line item. But, I do want to state that in the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

record."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's not often that I agree with Representative Matijevich, but in this particular case, I feel absolutely compelled to do so. For reasons that people who read my biography might understand, I'm particularly attached to the Dartmouth College case, which absolutely is dispositive on the subject of whether states have the authority, Constitution t he of the United States, to violate contractual rights. They do not. There is no way in which a state can do that or a state agency, and there is no way in which this language can be interpreted to do so. The language is an absolute nullity, in my opinion, and I don't believe that anybody who casts a vote on the Bill even containing this language is indicating, in any way through legislative intent, that this should...that the state should violate a contract. And I want that absolutely noted on the record as coming from me as well as Representative Matijevich."

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

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...I'd like to address the same provisions. My question, I guess, is when they get involved in these types of leases for space what...no matter what the department is, my...I guess I'm questioning the evaluation that they do when they sign contractual agreements. It seems to me that, to sign contractual agreement and then decide later that they really didn't want to do it, should have been considered before they took that action involved. It just seems to me that you would not do that in private enterprise or private business, and you'd probably be held responsible for it by

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

virtue of the landlord, in most cases, taking you to court. It just seems to me that the state should not be involved in a lease agreement if, in fact, they didn't intend to make use of it. It does seem to me to be rather ridiculous posture to have before us, and I think that, under the page five on that 2197 for the contractual services, I think it's 300,000 dollars. And it's very interesting to find out how we could make a blunder like that."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Lake,

Representative Barkhausen. Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Levin: "Representative Bower, are you familiar with the lease arrangement, that is referred to on page five lines five through eight, at 840 South Spring?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Only in passing."

Levin: "Do you know whether or not...whether, in fact, a lease arrangement was entered into by EPA with respect to that space?"

Bower: "There was a lease arrangement."

Levin: "And do you know when it was entered into?"

Bower: "I am...do not know the exact date."

Levin: "Approximately."

Bower: "I don't know that either."

Levin: "Do you know who, on the part of EPA, was instrumental in the signing of this lease and negotiated it?"

Bower: "I...I'm unaware of those specifics."

Levin: "Was this individual somebody who was authorized by the EPA to negotiating and signing the lease?"

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, I want to take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

rise?"

- Greiman: "Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a substitute

 Motion for nonconcurring..."
- Speaker Daniels: "You weren't recognized for that purpose. Out of the record. House Bill 2201, Representative Davis. Gentleman on the floor? Representative Davis. House Bill 2201, Representative J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2201, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims, together with Senate Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2201 creates two divisions: Claims Adjudication and Claims Processing. The Claims Adjudication was formerly Operations, and that was increased by 27,200 dollars in personal services and social security. Processing, which is a new unit, is appropriated 276,400 for the standard line items for personal services and the like. This Amendment appropriates the funds necessary to transfer the employees from the Secretary of State's Office as assigned to the Court of Claims. House Bill 2623, which authorized this transfer, passed the Senate on June 24, and the net increase of GRF is 303,600 dollars, and I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2201."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3?". 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 162 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and 3 voting
 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to
 House Bill 2201. 'aye'. Sandquist, 'aye'. That's 164

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- "aye". 2202, Representative J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill."
 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2202, a Bill for an Act making
 appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of
 the Medical Center Commission, together with Senate
 Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 appropriates a million dollars to the University of Illinois for the acquisition or lease of property within the medical center district in Chicago. This Amendment has the approval of the Governor's Office. It was indicated that he will sign it, and I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2202."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 152 'aye', 15 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2202. 2203, Representative J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2203, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue, together with Senate Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment 3 merely makes a technical change in the reappropriation language.

 There are no dollar changes, and I would move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2203."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 166 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2203. 2209, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain agencies, together with Senate Amendments #4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12. These put the Bill at a total of 102,761,500 dollars. In addition to the renal dialysis, or the renal disease grant program that we talked about before, there are really very few substantive changes. There is what amounts to a reappropriation of about a million three in federal block grant money that was appropriated last year and is going to carry over to this year. I would ask for favorable consideration on my Motion to concur in the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 161 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 to House Bill 2209. 2210, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2210, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitation Services, together with Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Bepresentative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Amendment #3 to this Bill. It added 51,000 dollars that we had... I guess, restores this, basically, to the level of last year for the Illinois Veterans Rehab Fund for in-service training. I would ask the House concur.

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 151 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 19 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2210.

 2213, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2213, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections, together with Senate Amendments #3 and 4."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2213 is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Department of Corrections. Amendment #3 is a technical Amendment which merely corrects three typographical errors in House Amendment #16. Senate Amendment 4 adds 2.4 million dollars to provide funding for the operation of the Bowen Pacility as a correctional facility, and I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2213."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 146 'aye', 15 'no', and 8 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 and 4 to House Bill 2213. 2217,

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Representative Vinson. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2217, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Military and Naval Department, together with Senate Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2217 is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Department of the... for the Military and Naval Department. I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #4, which adds 70,000 dollars in Capital Development money to rehabilitate and equip the Effingham Armory kitchen. It makes technical changes requested by the Comptroller. I would simply make note of the fact that the House, on separate legislation, had earlier indicated its intent to do this, and the change is simply being incorporated into the normal appropriation Bill, and I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #4."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 137 'aye', 21 'no', and 11 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2217. 2219, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2219, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Racing Board, together with Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2219 is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Illinois Racing

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

Board. I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to that Bill, which would add 316,300 dollars to the Racing Board for the provisions of House Bill 2508, now on the Governor's desk."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Sam, can you tell me, is the... does this provide the funds for funding at laboratories so that the tests can be made on the winners, relative to certain drugs that may or not... may or may not have been injected into those horses?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir. That's what this is related to. It will provide funds for hiring additional chemists, one to be a Ph.D., three laboratory technicians, and also funds for the purchase of new and the replacement of equipment for the lab."

Ropp: "That's good. That will help save the racing industry in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 141 'aye', 17 'no', 13 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2219. 2222, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly, together with Senate Amendments \$1, 2, and 3."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Senate Bill 2222 adds, in a separate Section, an additional 300,000 dollars in OCE expenses for the Senate, effective January 12, 1983. Senate Amendment #2 makes transfers within the various House lines and adds an additional \$80,000; restores the Leadership Staff and Research Staff lines on the FY '82 level for an increase of 780,000 dollars. It also adds additional money in the House printing line and... and a net increase of 80,000 dollars. It makes, also, 25,000 dollar addition for the House Rape Study Commission. These appropriations include... Okay, it adds the 25,000 dollars for the House Rape Study Commission, and 75,000 dollars for the House Committee on Medical Assistance program. I would now move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 to Senate Bill 2222."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Lady from Champaign,
Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, in Amendment #1, there was an addition of 300,000 for the Senate ordinary and contingent expenses. Can you explain to us what the need for that additional money is?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J. J.: "Senator Rock said he needed it for the orderly operation of the Senate."

Satterthwaite: "Where does that put it in relation to this year's budget for the Senate?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Hold on, we'll try to... I don't know. In the next Amendment we're putting an increase of 780,000 in the House, so I..."

Satterthwaite: "My analysis indicates, however, that the next Amendment only adds 80,000 dollars."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Wolf, J. J.: "There was a four...Now, on your first question, originally was a 4.4 percent increase in the Senate, so this would be up, I'd say about a five percent or so increase total with that change. Now, what was your other question?"
- Satterthwaite: "Well, okay. You were saying that a further Amendment made a substantial increase in the House funding.

 But, I think that was a combination of action by the House and the Senate rather than simply what was going on by Amendment #2 in the Senate."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, I believe you're correct."
- Satterthwaite: "Is...Is the total, then, available to the House a five percent increase also? Is it comparable between the Senate and House?"

Wolf, J. J.: "About 600,000 below."

Satterthwaite: "In the House."

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open.

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Robbins."
- Robbins: "I...I want to vote for this Bill, because I think the

 Senate needs about three or four times as much as the House

 gets for our secretaries and expenses."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye', 25 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2222. House Bill 2283, Representative Yourell. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer together with Senate

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Amendment #2."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Yourell."

- Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment \$2 to House Bill 2283 adds 60,000 dollars for the Illinois Farm Development Authority. This Authority was created this year, and stipulates a start-up cost of the agency provided by the State Treasurer from appropriations made in this Bill. I move to concur in Senate Amendment \$2 to House Bill 22...2283."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 164 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2283. House Bill 2339, Representative Winchester. Bead the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Elections together with Senate Amendment #3."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the State Board of Elections, and I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment...Senate Amendment #1...or Senate Amendment #3.

 I'm sorry."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Madison,
 Representative Sam Wolf."
- Wolf, Sam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."
- Wolf, Sam: "Representative, on Amendment #3, the analysis

136th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1982
- indicates that the Amendment also eliminates 20,000 dollars for grants to election authorities. What is that all about?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "The Bill is...is dead. The substantive Bill is dead, so there's no need for the appropriation Bill."
- Wolf, Sam: "Wasn't that retabulation picked up in the...in another Bill yesterday? 2135, to be specific."
- Winchester: "Yes, it has the election authority supervising instead of a CPA firm, so there's no need to have a special appropriation to pay for the cost of a CPA, because it's going to be done in-house."
- Wolf, Sam: "But, I think 2135 also provides that the State
 Election Board shall reimburse local election authorities
 for additional expenses."
- Winchester: "Okay, I'm being advised that that's a whole different subject, Representative Wolf. That involves the 3,500 dollars that...that we have...that each election authority is appropriated by the State Board of Elections. That portion is still in the Bill. That has not been affected."
- Wolf, Sam: "Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor, please."
- Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."
- Miller: "Representative Winchester, our analysis indicates that
 we're adding 40,000 dollars for expenses of funding the
 East St. Louis November election. Can you explain that a
 bit to me?"
- Winchester: "Well, not really, Steve. I don't know if I can explain it, because it was a Senate Amendment. It was

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

placed on a Bill by Senator Howie Carroll. I've been told that there is some serious problems in the East St. Louis area. They don't have enough money to pay for the cost to make the investigations and make the corrections and all the things that's necessary. I'm not sure who asked Senator Carroll to sponsor the Amendment, but to be quite honest, I'm in a trick bag, and if I don't accept the Amendment, then I...I risk a considerable amount by going back to a Conference Committee. So, that's why I'm accepting the Amendment. We'll let the Governor take it off."

Miller: "Is this the only county that we do this for, as far as you know?"

Winchester: "We don't...We don't do it for any counties. This is
an Amendment that was...that was put on by Senator Carroll.

Like I explained, I'm...I'm asking to concur with it,
because I ca...because I don't want to go to Conference

Committee."

Miller: "I understand. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 124 'aye', 24 'no' and 18 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2339. 2345, Representative Collins. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2345, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Labor Law Revisory Commission together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate (sic - House) Bill 2345 is the companion

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- appropriation for Senate (sic House) Bill 2344, which created the Labor Law Revisory Commission. Senate Amendment #1 reduced the 50,000 dollar appropriation to the sum of one dollar, and I would move that we nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. I move to nonconcur, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? 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 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2345. House Bill 2370, Representative J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies together with Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some technical errors in this Bill. I would move that we nonconcur with the Senate Amendment #2. Nonconcur on Senate Amendment #2 for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? 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 Amendment #2 to House Bill 2370. 2393, Representative Wolf. J. J. Wolf. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General and for the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission together with Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. J. J. Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 adds
 105,560 tho...60 dollars for the Illinois Building
 Authority lease payments. This is to correct an error that
 was made by the IBA in determining their rents for FY '83.

 I would move that the House do now concur in Senate

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Amendment #2 to House Bill 2393."

- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Being none, 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 154 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2393. 2399, Representative Ronan. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2399, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Scholarship Commission together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan."

- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, and I urge everyone to vote for this Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Could you explain them, Sir?"

 Ronan: "Senate Amendments #1 and 2 were added in the Senate.

 This is the nurse scholarship Bill. It changes the program to now come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health as opposed to the State Scholarship Commission. Amendment #2 cuts the dollar amount to 300 and some thousand dollars."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 164 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2399. 2441, out of the record. 2457, Representative Davis. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2457, a Bill for an Act making

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

appropriations to the State Board of Education together with Senate Amendments #2, 4 and 5."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 4 and 5. This Bill is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the State Board of Education's In Senate Amendment #2, the Senate shifted 138,000 between equipment and contractual lines. There Mas some...about half in GRF, half in federal, per request of the Comptroller with some problems that he was having. It. adds Senate Amendment #4 added in 35,000 Common School Funds for payment to the Edinburg School District #4 1,475,000 Common School Funds for payments to the Quincy. O'Fallon and Bell Valley school districts and conforms to the substantive legislation passed by this House in House Bill 1271. Senate Amendment 5 added 100,000 dollars General Revenue Funds for a pilot project for behavior disordered adolescents of the Henry Horner Center. increase to the Bill, at this point in time is about 1,600,000 dollars, for a total of 32...excuse me. 34,886,100 dollars. I would now move, without questions, I'll stand for questions, but move for the concurrence in Senate Amendments 2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2457."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman...you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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. this question there are 160 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 5 voting *present*, and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2457. House Bill 2558, Representative Hoxsey. 2558. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2558, a Bill for an Act making

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

appropriations to the Supreme Court together with Senate

Amendment #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey."

- Hoxsey: "Yes, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 in

 House Bill 2558. This Amendment simply changes the funding

 from GRF to CDB, and I would ask the House to concur."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Lady's Motion. 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 157 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2558. House Bill 2197, Representative Wolf. 2197. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Environmental Protection Agency together with Senate Amendments #2 and 3."

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

Wolf. J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 adds 100,000 dollars of federal EPA funds for water quality reflected This planning studies. some type ο£ in...unexpected increase in planning grants from the EPA. Apparently, they got more money coming than they had anticipated, so we do have a windfall to correct and improve the quality of water in the State of Illinois. Senate Amendment #3 adds 3,272,000 from the Anti-pollution Bond Fund to their FY '83 appropriation for construction grants. This brings the total to the unexpended level, as of June 1st, and I understand that the Governor was pleased to approve of this Amendment: and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2 and 3 to House Bill 2197."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Lady from LaSalle,
Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, a guestion of the Sponsor."

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

Wolf, J. J.: "If I can answer it."

Breslin: "The problem that we had on this side of the aisle, and I think on your side of the aisle, with this Bill, is the fact that the EPA is welching on their contract to rent office space at 840 South Spring Street, and that, in addition to that maneuver, it's trying to be done by putting it in an appropriation Bill. We know that...that our...our Bill of Rights, Section 16 of Article I indicates that we cannot impair contracts. No law can be passed to impair contracts, let alone contracts of the State of Illinois with private individuals. What a...What attempt are you going to do to take this out of this Bill?"

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

Wolf, J. J.: "Representative Breslin, my understanding was that this building was leased for three years while the agency was undergoing an expansion. After one year, they wished to withdraw from the lease and the Department of Administrative Services said the agency must add this particular specific language to the appropriation Bill, and then not to pay the lease. If they were required, I guess, to pay for the FY '83, it would be less than 30,000 dollars for the final year of the lease, and...and on the advice of the Department of Administrative Services, that's why it was put in there."

Breslin: "Well, there is substantial controversy as to whether or not those are the facts; and, in addition to which, we believe that this is substantive language that sh...is not appropriate for appropriations Bills."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 116 'aye', 22 'no', 31 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2197. Page four of your Calendar, Senate Bill 1427. The Members please be in their seats. All those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. All those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. Members please be in their seats. Senate Bill 1427, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Veterans Affairs together with House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly. ... Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to...that the House refuse to recede from any of the House Amendments, and request the appointment of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Senate Amendments...House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8, and a Conference Committee shall be appointed. Representative Keane on the floor? Representative Keane, would you come up here, Sir? Senate Bill 1359. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois...Illinois State Scholarship Commission together with House Amendments #1, 4 and 5."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede from Senate
(sic - House) Amendments #1, 3 and 4...1, 2 and 4 (sic - 1,
4 and 5), and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1359. Conference Committee shall be appointed. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr, arise?"

Barr: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a Motion to reconsider a vote taken earlier today on a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1193."

Speaker Daniels: "By which that..."

"Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side earlier Barr: today, on the vote by which the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1193 failed, I hereby move to reconsider that vote. As I stated in debate earlier, Mr. Speaker, I had serious concerns with the First Conference Committee Report because I was afraid that the language in the Conference Committee Report might be construed as expanding whatever exemption the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Metro... of Greater Chicago might have from local zoning ordinances. After carefully reviewing the language in the Conference Committee Report and consulting with Representatives of interested parties, such as the Illinois Municipal League, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, I am now satisfied that this is not a problem. My concerns have been resolved, and I am convinced that this Bill, as set forth in the First Conference Committee Report, in no way changes or expands whatever exemption the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago may now have from

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

local zoning ordinances of municipalities and counties within the Metropolitan Sanitary District. The exemptions set forth in Senate Bill 1193, as contained in the Conference Committee Report, exist in present law as enacted in Senate Bill 172 and otherwise. Senate Bill 1193 merely clears up language so that a serious... what is really a serious paperwork problem now existing in the Environmental Protection Agency, is resolved. I believe that it is important that this be adopted, and I move for reconsideration."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Barr, having voted 'no' on Conference Committee Report #1, moves to reconsider the vote by which that Conference Committee Report lost. On that Motion, and this is on the Motion, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to suggest to the previous speaker that he was right the first time over this course, and is in error now. And it's not the Sanitary District that he has anything to fear from, but it's the giant polluters around this state who are in back of this ... of this type of legislation. And the very people that he referred to who have backed this legislation are the ones who have carried the water for those who would further pollute areas of our state, and in particular, areas like mine in the Chicago area, where the giants, the giants of the pollution cabal have made our area the garbage dump of the state, and indeed, of the Midwest. And I would... I would say to you, don't listen to Representative Barr this time. He was... He was right the first time, but for the wrong reasons, and now he's wrong, perhaps for the right reasons. I would say, stick with that earlier vote, Representative Barr. You were right the first time. Don't allow these

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

people to continue to defile the air and ground and water of our state, in particular, in our area, which is so close to your own. This Bill has the backing of the people who want carte blanche to dump their garbage and other people's wastes anywhere they wish, without any restrictions. And I say that these fine organizations that you referred to are also in error, because they have been the handmaidens of these polluters, and please, do not reconsider this vote. Have the first one stand. That was the right vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree in total with Representative Collins on this issue, both as it pertains to his statement and Representative Barr's earlier comments. In that regard, I move that his Motion to reconsider lie on the table."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Mautino, has moved that the Motion lie on the table. Any discussion?

 Any discussion? Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Barr's absolutely right, because what the law... what this Bill will simply do is make it very simple for a person to get a sewer permit. That's all it really accomplishes. Right now, in order to get a sewer permit, you've got to get a certificate from the municipality, EPA has to process that certificate. What this will do is allow the problem to be solved by the simple checking of a box on the application. It's ridiculous to try to hold this Bill hostage because other Bills have failed, because it doesn't deal with those, and I would rise to speak against the Motion to table."
- Speaker Daniels: "On the Gentleman's Motion to table, the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. When this vote was taken earlier this morning, there was a sparse crowd of Representatives on the House floor, and I really don't think the... the vote, at that time, was indicative of the feeling of this General Assembly, and I would support Representative Barr. I think he's absolutely right on this... on this Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Zito."

Zito: "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 on Representative Mautino's Motion to lie the Motion to reconsider on the table, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I respectfully request a Roll Call on the Motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Mautino, moved that Representative Barr's Motion to reconsider lie on the table. All those in favor of Representative Mautino's Motion to table will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no', and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record. On the Gentleman's Motion, who wish? there are 62 'aye', 101 'no', and the Gentleman's Motion to table fails. On the main Motion, the Motion for Representative Barr to reconsider the vote by which Conference Committee Report #1 failed, all those in of Representative Barr's Motion, when the machine catches up... all those in favor of Representative Barr's Motion to reconsider Conference Committee Report #1 will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no', and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

question, there are 104 'aye', 52 'no', and Representative
Barr's Motion prevails. Senate Bill 1193. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1193, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Environmental Protection Act. First Conference Committee
Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer, Ted: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1193. the initial vote on the Conference Committee Report this morning, the considerable confusion existed. Since the ... Since then, Members have graciously allowed me another opportunity to reconsider this report. I would like to provide you with a little history and background leading up The State Chamber of Commerce, the to this report. Illinois Manufacturer s Association. the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, and mind you. the Municipal League, the Illinois Municipal League approached me with... with the problem that they are now experiencing. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, bу interpretation of House... Senate Bill 172, was requiring local zoning certificates prior to the issuing of any permits, be they land, water, or air. The certification being required by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency did not exist at the local level, and a tremendous paper boondoggle has occurred. The Conference Committee Report is an attempt to solve that problem. It is... It specifically does away with the paperwork, while at the same time assuring that local zoning is protected. The exemption for the MSD and the fossil fuel mining were contained in the original Bill 172. The re... This report continues those exemptions. As regards to the Metropolitan Sanitary District in non-pollution control facilities such as office... office buildings, the exemption applies only

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

to the Environmental Protection Agency Act permits. pollution control facilities. I would like to point out that this exemption also exists in the Act presently. regard to fossil fuel mining, once again the exemptions exist in the existing Act and are for pollution control It does... It does not amend any mining legislation or permits administered by the Department of Mines Minerals. The report does not change any of the local government control this House provided in 172. Its goal is to solve a paperwork and time problem regarding permits, and to insert the felony... felony provision, which was inadvertently removed last year. I thank you for the opportunity for this re... reconsideration and urge your favorable vote."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I mentioned my earlier... in my earlier remarks this morning that I agreed that the Class IV felony provision was a good one. I also agreed that what is included in this Conference Committee is now law in the State of Illinois, because of Senate Bill 140... 172. which exempted those siting criteria. Well, all I'm saying, and most of you realized originally, exemption continuance should not be. I'm not asking to put anything from previous legislation into this Conference Committee. I believe that a mistake was made with 172 when it was originally amendatorily vetoed by the Governor. believe that the exemption should not be there for new or expanded facilities without local input and local control, and specifically, local zoning changes. All I'm saying is that with a Conference Committee #2, if there would be one, those exemptions would be eliminated, and everyone would

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

work under the same set of guidelines and rules, so that if, in fact, a new site selection application is attempted to be put somewhere in the State of Illinois, local governments would have control. I'm not asking for anything else. I do agree that the Class IV felony provision is excellent in it, and it should be, but for that reason that we should go back to local site control and criteria, I'm going to vote 'present' on it, because I think that's the important issue, and I agree with Representative Collins."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I have suggested that a Second Conference Committee appointed because I feel like the rights of the individual, the rights of the local government should be protected, as they will not be if this becomes law. It changes the requirement. You can hold... You... You can start out with good, clean slate by having a local hearing before your area, your local zoning board, and it don't create a lot of paperwork for that local area to say "yes" or 'no' and the state to know about it. It would save the state a lot of money if they know the local area is not going to approve of this zoning before. Some of the other things in this Bill are good, and I support them, but I don't believe in taking the local people's right away from them, which is done in this Bill. It changes it to where the EPA can issue a permit, and then they can comply or not comply, depending on where it is with local zoning. Now, something that the... if you want to believe in local control, you have to vote against this Bill again, you give local control back. If you don't want local control and you want it handled from Springfield, vote in favor of the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Schneider."

- Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ted, would you explain for me, I was off the floor this morning, but I heard some of the discussion in my office, on the Metropolitan Sanitary District, which is exempted, can you tell me where... where some of the Metropolitan Sanitary District property is, and if that property outside of the district is exempt from this provision also."
- Meyer, Ted: "First of all, Representative Schneider, Cook County is exempted from... from the provisions of this Bill, so I... I don't think, other than the sludge disposal site in Fulton County, which has been there since you and I have been around, I don't think that.. that there's any other property other than that this Bill would affect."
- Schneider: "Well, I haven't been around as long as that sludge, I
 don't think, but... are you saying you think other
 properties would or would not be exempt, or do you actually
 know?"
- Meyer, Ted: "The only property I... To the best of my knowledge, the only property that the Metropolitan Sanitary District owns outside of Cook County is the... is the sludge disposal site in Fulton County, and maybe, I understand that they control the locks in... and that may be some property in Will County that... on the Des Plaines River."
- Schneider: "If they acquire property after this Act, outside of the area that you're exempting, then what's the effect of the Bill?"
- Meyer, Ted: "Well, Representative Schneider, as I tried to point out before, they already have this exemption. This... This isn't giving the Metropolitan Sanitary District nothing that wasn't in Senate Bill 172. They already have the power to go and acquire property for... and use it for... for purposes that would require it... the issuance of an

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Environmental Protection Agency Act... permit, rather, and the agency would not require, for the issuance of the EPA permit, local zoning."

Schneider: "All right. I don't want to prolong what looks like a greased Bill through some obvious arrangement that we get down to on June 30, but it seems to me there's enough uncertainty that if I were a non-Cook County resident, I'd have some real concerns about that. My own county's too close to that area not to be perhaps, even cynical about what may happen in the near future. I would encourage those of you in the outlying areas to be very conscious of that, and Fulton County's a good example of the problems we had downstate a number of years ago, and so I would ask that you vote 'no' on the concurrence Motion #... Conference, rather, Committee Report #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Barr: "Yes, Representative Meyer, am I correct that non-pollution control facilities, such as, for example, a regular office building constructed by or for the Metropolitan Sanitary District, are not required to secure any permits from the Environmental Protection Agency?"

Meyer, Ted: "Correct."

Barr: "And, this law doesn't change that, does it?"

Meyer, Ted: "Correct."

Barr: "So that, if we're concerned, as I was this morning, about non-pollution control facilities owned or operated by the Metropolitan Sanitary District, is it your opinion that this Bill has no effect on such facilities, whatsoever?"

Meyer, Ted: "Correct, because they... if you're putting up an office building, you wouldn't get an EPA permit."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Barr: "And, regardless of what the law is, and my study today indicates that it's not really certain, but regardless of what the law is as to the jurisdiction of counties and municipalities to impose their zoning laws on the Metropolitan Sanitary District at the present time, is it your opinion that this Bill does not change that law in any way?"
- Meyer, Ted: "No, Sir, it does not change the law, and it does not inhibit the... the imposition of zoning on... on Metropolitan Sanitary District facilities which do not require an EPA permit."
- Barr: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that we have established now, the necessary legislative history which was not clear this morning, as least insofar as the concerns which... which I, and some others had, as to the effect of the Bill on the... on the... on non-pollution control facilities owned or operated by the Metropolitan Sanitary District, and on the basis of the assurances which Representative Meyer has given us here as to the intent of this Bill and its proper interpretation, I would now urge a 'yes' vote on this Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Vitek."
 Vitek: "Thank you, 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 Meyer, to close."

Meyer, Ted: "I urge adoption of the report."

- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rose

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

this morning in opposition to this Bill because I was under the impression that all the local zoning would be preempted by this legislation. I understand, when talking to the Sponsor and listening to his statement that he read into the record, and talking to the Illinois Municipal League, that indeed, that is not the question or case. pre-empt local zoning with regard to the EPA permit process and will not pre-empt local zoning with regard to the Department of Mines and Minerals permit process. For that reason, I am going to vote in support of this measure. which does contain some other salutory points. I think we have some concerns about some of the existing statutory language which many of us would like to see changed, hnt this Bill apparently does recodify existing law, and that's the explanation for my vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 122 'aye', 19 'no', 28 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1193. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, arise?"

Vinson: "In connection with a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I want first to state that none of my remarks should in any way reflect negatively or critically on Representative Mautino, whom I have the highest degree of respect for, and whom I do not believe to be in any way connected with the... with the issue I'm going to discuss, but Mr. Speaker, there is a lobbyist who has been lobbying, who has been hired to lobby this General Assembly in connection with siting of landfills and the legislation that we have discussed in this General Assembly to date on

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

that, by a county in this state. I am in possession, here at my desk, if anybody cares to look at it afterward, of an article which describes his activity and the amount of money that he's made in connection with that lobbying. just want it stated very clearly on the record that Mr. Yoho, the lobbyist to whom I refer and who has purportedly been lobbying on this material, first contacted Legislators in connection with the Bill in which he was hired to lobby for, on the day after the Bill was defeated. And I think people should understand that, so that in Mr. efforts to go back and try to cast any aspersions on the votes of Members, it is publicly on the record in this chamber that that was the case, and that no Member was contacted by him or, at least, a number of Members were not contacted by him until a day after the Bill that he supposedly lobbying on, was rejected by the chamber."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "In response to the comments by the previous speaker, I don't know what the rationale for the dissertation was, but I would like to make clear to this House and on my own behalf, that the County of Bureau hired Mr. James Yoho as a consultant and a lobbyist on this question. They hired Mr. Yoho after four counties - LaSalle, Bureau, Putnam, and Lee had hired a hazardous waste attorney, namely former Appellate Court Justice James 'Perona', because of large problem that occurs in those four counties. date that I drafted the legislation with input from Mr. Yoho and other members of the ACPE environmental group of Bureau and Henry counties, Mr. Yoho appeared in Mr. Meyer's Committee. The fact of the matter was, he was there to testify, and did testify on Senate Bill 1260, on that given date. I do not understand the rationale for Mr. Vinson's statements concerning the county of which I call home.

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

doing something improper or that specific attorney doing something improper, and that's how I take those remarks. Since Mr. Yoho had been hired by the ACPE group of Sheffield, Illinois on this hazardous and low-level nuclear waste site approximately two years ago, the Bureau County Board re-hired that gentleman because of the interest of the citizens of that county. He is, I believe, the Director of the Illinois Environmental Council, based in, I believe, either Danville or Champaign. The point I'm trying to make is, there's an intense interest and concern at the local government level where these hazardous waste sites are. They not only have hired Mr. Yoho, as I said earlier, but also former Appellate Court Justice 'Perona', because of the intense problem and concern for the health and safety. The gentleman has been discussing with Members, and have contacted Members on this question, as I think was his job, and I respectfully mention that there is nothing improper, illegal, or out of order on getting individuals to notify Legislators of the concern of those 'little people' in the counties who have a great desire to have this question discussed, and there should be no shadows cast on Legislators or the people that work for the environment and the protection of health and safety. you."

Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright. Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to the following Bills: House Bills 403, 1060, 2461, 2504, 2205, 2206 and 394, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Renneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

Representatives that the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee Reports to the following Bills: House Bills 1244, 1271, 2133 and 2359 and Senate Bill 1251, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills 1361, 1392, 1408, 1410, 1412 and 1657, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the following Bill, to wit: Senate Bill 1401, House Amendment #3, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."
Yourell: "Thank...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry of the
Chair. Is it the posture of the Chair that we're going to
call...the Chair's going to call all Bills on Concurrence
before the Motion to adjourn this Session? I'm referring
to, specifically, to House Bill 1992 that's been skipped
over now 21 times."

Speaker Daniels: "We're going to do our best."

Yourell: "What can I construe that to mean exactly? Pardon me?

Obv..."

Speaker Daniels: "The camera T. V. lights are not on, Sir. Okay, thank you, and there will be no filming while the House is not in Session. Agreed Resolutions."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, excuse me. Will all those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

gallery? Mr. Doorkeeper, clear the floor of those not entitled to the floor. The House is still in Session.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1078, Rigney. 1090, Madigan.

1091, Keane. 1092, Greiman — Conti. 1093, Balanoff.

1095, Bower. House Resolution 1078 is out of that record."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Spe...Okay. House Resolution 1090, Madigan and Democratic Leadership. Democrat State Representatives and their Leaders rely heavily upon the House Democratic Staff to supply them with facts, ideas and schemes and general savoir-faire in conduct of representing the people of Illinois: that we extend our sincere thanks and warm personal regards to each member of the House Democratic Staff with appropriate congratulations and wishes for House Resolution 1091, Keane. Where George Peters recently completed ten years of outstanding meritorious service to the Illinois Enforcement Commission, first of...as the Chief of Auditing from 1972 to '79, and later as Chief Piscal Officer from 1979 to 1982. Greiman and Conti, House Resolution 1092. Milton and Gertrude Lambert are being honored at the 25th anniversary celebration of the Chicago Chapter of Magen David Adom. House Resolution 1093, Balanoff. Sam and Edna Anaszewicz of 8342 Kingston will celebrate their 45th wedding anniversary. Resolution 1095. Bower. The Siemer Miller...Milling Company in Teutopolis has benefited the people of Illinois since it was founded 100 years ago this year. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Conti, moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. The

- 136th Legislative Day

 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1094, Levin, in respect to the memory of Dr. Allen Schultz of Chicago."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Levin, moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Death Resolution is adopted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

 Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
 Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the
 House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur
 with the House in adoption of their Amendment #3 to Senate
 Bill 1401, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982.'
 Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Daniels: "The T. V. light is not on, Sir. What purpose does the distinguished Assistant Majority Leader, Elmer Conti, rise?"
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a former colleague come to visit us this afternoon.

 He has distinguished himself as the great Secretary of State. Jim Edgar is with us to see how we're doing."
- Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
 Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the
 House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede
 from their Amendments to the following Bills: House Bill
 1180 and 1186, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982.'
 Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by
 Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to
 inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has
 adopted the First Conference Conference Committee Report to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Senate Bill 1487; action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I merely want to recognize the present...the presence of the President of the Senate, Phil Rock, in the balcony behind us."

Speaker Daniels: "President Rock is here in the gallery watching the proceedings. Thank you for stopping in and saying hello, and who's that other guy up there, Representative Kosinski? Bugh Hill? Representative Swanstrom. if we...Representative Swanstrom is within hearing of this message, could be please come to the podium? The camera light is off. The camera light is off. There's no filming, Sir. T. V. light is off. The House will come to order. Members will please be in their seats. Those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the qallery. House will please come to order. On the Order of the Calendar, regular Calendar, page four, Conference Committee House Bill 1271. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You'll remember House Bill 1271 is a Bill in which we tried to make adjustments for a number of school districts in the state who were caught in the switches on rapid changes in their assessed valuation, which affected their minimum qualifying rate for state aid. House Bill 1271, Conference Committee, provides for the districts that were originally included in the Bill. We also found that another community, Edinburg, had a similar problem, and when we changed the qualifying rate for high school districts from \$1.05 to \$1.10, we found there were two high

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

school districts that would be adversely affected by that this first year. And, since it was not their fault in the sense that they didn't know the qualifying rate was going to be \$1.10; due to the change in the law, we have included them in the Conference Committee Report. One other item included in the Conference Committee Report is to allow those school districts which bond their working cash fund, to use the same...up to the same five cent levy that we allowed school districts that just, in fact, levy the funds; so that it treats all school districts, whether they levy a five cent working cash fund and they're allowed to include that in their operating tax rate for state aid purposes, to also include the ... up to the five cent working cash fund cover the bonding of that working cash fund. Again, that's an equity issue. The Conference Committee Report is signed by all the Conferees, and I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 1271."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Has this Conference been distributed...Report?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. Would somebody please get a copy over to Representative Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Discussion? You heard the Gentleman's Motion.

Representative Mulcahey, a late Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, better late...better late than never. A

question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mulcahey: "Gene, it says here on the...our Report that this

Conference Committee Report #1 further recommends that we

expand the definition of operating tax rates to include the

tax rates for fire prevention, safety, environmental and

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

energy bonds. Would you respond to that?"

Hoffman: "Wo...I'm sorry. Would you repeat that again?"

- Mulcahey: "This Conference Committee Report also indicates that
 we will expand the definition of operating tax rates to
 include the tax rates for fire prevention, safety,
 environmental and energy bonds and also working cash bonds.
 Would you respond to that? Is that..."
- Hoffman: "Yes, those...if you levy those rates now, they are included in the definition of operating tax rates for qualifying for...for state aid. What we've done is that we've taken those districts who, rather than levy the tax have provided for bond and interest against the working cash fund, to count the same amount. So what it means is that those districts that levy as well as those that choose to extend it out on a bond and interest basis rather than levying it, in order to buy it at the present time, to count the same five cent rate. The limit is five cents."

 Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Hoffman to
- close. Representative Hoffman to close."

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

 of the House. I renew my Motion for the adoption of

Conference Committee Report on 1271."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Ebbesen, would you record me as 'aye', please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye', 16 'no' and 2 voting 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1271. On the Order of House Calendar Supplemental #1 appears House Bill 2266, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature, I move to

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

adopt the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Could you explain it briefly for the Members?"
McBroom: "I will yield to Representative Davis on..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis on House Bill 2266.

Conference Committee Report #1."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. having a bite to eat and didn't hear Representative McBroom say that. 2266 has been denuded, and everything's stricken in it. but an Amendment that was in House Bill 1882 that Representative Barkhausen had brought back from the Senate that the Senate amended, and refers to a problem that is currently existent in Will County, relating to a flood control project. That project is currently being negotiated for the benefit of a reduced cost for the State of Illinois and for the County of Will. This particular Amendment would allow that project negotiation to continue and to...until its resolution, hopefully sometime in The...The Amendment to the 2266 actually says that July. the benefit/cost ratio for channelization projects and...and navigable streams in the state need not exceed one, and I would move for the adoption of First Conference Committee Report on...on House Bill 2266."

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

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will. The T. V. light is on."

Leverenz: "I don't care. I wanted to ask the Sp..."

Speaker Daniels: "We turn it on for you, because you always have such interesting things to say."

Leverenz: "But, I still don't care. The Co...The Report provides
that the dredging or channelization would be done, even
though there were no benefits or that the benefits did not
exceed the total cost of the project. Is that correct?"

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Davis: "That it need not exceed one, which is currently in the 1945 Flood Control Act."

Leverenz: "What is that project? Does it have a name?"

Davis: "Just a project in Will County. The Hickory Creek/Spring Creek Flood Control Project."

Leverenz: "Well, we have provided channelization money in the past in the appropriations process. I think the last one was roughly two years ago. Is that correct?"

Davis: "Not for this project, Sir."

Leverenz: "For a different part of it?"

Davis: "No, it ... "

Leverenz: "Hickory Creek."

Davis: "Yeah, but what we've provided in a reappropriation again this year is the beginnings of that portion of a total project that's far in excess, at this point, of what we're trying to do with this Amendment to keep the negotiation alive to reduce the cost to the state and to the county."

Leverenz: "Well, I thought it was part of Water Resources

Department of Transportation..."

Davis: "It is."

Leverenz: "...project list."

Davis: "It is."

Leverenz: "And one of their objectives would be that there would be more in benefit than in expense, and that's how it climbs up the priority list."

Davis: "That's correct."

Leverenz: "But, this would provide just the reverse."

Davis: "Well, it provides it need not be one. Now, as the figures are being adjusted, the benefit is rising in the channelization project only. We're going to continue to that point until we reach an amortization figure that will allow the project to continue with the local match, so that this Bill will not then be necessary. You let...Did I

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

answer your question?"

Leverenz: "You're...You're right...You're right in where you're going and what you're saying. What you're doing is reversing the Department of Water Resources' Declaration of policy in terms of prioritation...prioritizing the project list..."

Davis: "I...I..."

Leverenz: "...therefore allowing your project to jump in front of
everyone elses, and I think that kind of flies in the face
of what good government's all about."

Davis: "But..Well, if I may address... Is that a question,

Representative Leverenz, or a statement?"

Leverenz: "Would you agree?"

Davis: "No, I would not agree, simply because that project has already been approved. It is in the...in the process of being done now at a far greater cost than this Amendment would allow that to proceed. And, should that negotiation proceed to the point where this Bill is not necessary, this provision would be returned to its proper policy position of the Water Resources."

Leverenz: "All right. Well, then ... "

Davis: "You have my commitment on that."

Leverenz: "That's like every other state expenditure. The inflation and everything else is driving the cost up so much..."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Gentlemen. Gentlemen...

Representative Leverenz. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, rise?"

McBroom: "Well, number one, Mr. Speaker, the language that concerned Representative Brummer has been removed; as, I think Representative Davis said, denuded. This has the support and approval of Senator Sangmeister and Representative Davis. But, since we're getting into this

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- kind of thing, I take it out of the record."
- Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 1938,

 Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate did not accept Conference
 Committee Report #1 on House Bill 1938, so I would ask that
 a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and a Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the Secretary. "Mr. House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to the following Bills: House Bills 2370 and 2345, action taken by the Senate June 30, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from their Amendment #5 to House Bill 1301; action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. inform Speaker, I am directed to the House αf Representatives the Senate has adopted the attached First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1256; adopted by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1452, Representative Barr."
- Barr: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, with regard to Senate Bill 1452, I'm informed that the Senate has refused to accept the First Conference Committee Report, and I ask that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and a Second Conference Committee shall be

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

appointed, Senate Bill 1452. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1452, Second Conference Committee shall be appointed. House Bill 2266, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature, I guess
everything has been resolved between Representative
Leverenz and Representative Davis, and I move for the
adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to this. Just so I can put it into the record that there is an ongoing budget for this, and it doesn't really change that; and so that, sometime in the future we will come to some agreement at home between the...between Mr. Vonnahme and all the..all the people involved. And so, I don't think really this is going to jeopardize the project whatsoever, and I..and I join Representative Davis in..in concurrence...or in adoption of the Conference Committee, I should say."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would Mr. Davis yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis indicates he will."

Kane: "Why...Why would the state want to proceed with a project in which the costs exceed the benefits?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Representative Kane, we're reworking the figures now, and we're not sure that that's not true. The problem is the amortization and the problem is, at this point, that we're trying to come up with the local match to absolve the necessity for a 1BC ratio on this particular project. We think we have that worked out. We want to keep the issue in front of...of the...of the issue so that we can continue that negotiation to its successful conclusion."

Kane: "Yeah but, if it gets over one, then you don't need this

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

Bill."

Davis: "That's right."

Kane: "So, why do you have the Bill?"

Davis: "To continue the negotiations, Sir."

Kane: "Well, you can continue the negotiations without the Bill, can't you?"

Davis: "I believe that it's...it's essential that we continue the negotiation with this Bill on the Governor's desk."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Kane: Bill says...what this Conference Committee Report says is that the state is going to go ahead with a project in which the costs of the project exceed any of the benefits. I see absolutely no reason to put that kind of language into law, because it doesn't apply just to this particular program but to all programs that deal only with channelization. think, if we look at the Corp of Engineers, their standards are something like no project goes unless the cost/benefit ratio is in excess of 1.2, and here we're saying is, that any project in which the costs exceed the benefits, so that the ratio is less than one, we can go ahead with. I think that if this project is presently below the ratio of one, then negotiations can continue, and if it gets above one, then it...then it can...then it can be funded or proceeded. But, I think to pass a law which says that a project can continue or be paid for by the state when the costs exceed any of the benefits, I think is absolutely ridiculous, and I think we should vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. Let me rise to speak in favor of the Conference Committee Report 1 to 2266. There are occasions when projects, as I've seen in the appropriations process, they will come in with a...just less than a one-to-one cost/benefit ratio. What this would provide is only in the

136th Legislative Day

Bill

1256,

Senate Bill 1256."

June 30, 1982

areas of a dredging project, channelization or otherwise known as dredging, that they are simply cleaning something out to let the water flow easier. And the projects that the Department of Transportation Water Resources participates in, by and large, they will make sure that they do not just do channelization or dredging, which helps the water flow faster and impacts the next community down. But, in this case of dredging only, it is difficult to determine, in the first place, what the cost/benefit ratios are, and if the Department so sees that the project is worthy, this would allow them to put the money into the And I would stand and ask for your green vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Effingham,
Representative Brummer. No? And Representative McBroom to
close."

McBroom: "Yes, I move for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

On this question there are 154 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2266. Senate Bill 1256, Representative McAuliffe. Supplemental Calendar #2, Senate

McAuliffe." McAuliffe: "I move we accept Conference Committee Report #1 on

McAuliffe.

Representative

Speaker Daniels: "Discussion? Could you offer an explanation, a short explanation for the Membership?"

McAuliffe: "Conference Committee Report #1 removes the House

Amendment #1 which included the...puts six employees that

Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

were fired by Governor Walker back into the pension time, and it restored the time they had spent...that they were off the job. It gave them credit for that. The Senate would not accept that Amendment, so I move to recede and accept Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Lady from Marshall,

Representative Koehler."

Koehler: "Mr. Speaker, has this been printed? I do not have a copy of it."

Speaker Daniels: "It was passed out at 4:15."

Koehler: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Somebody give Representative Koehler a copy of the Conference Committee Report. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "Now that you've told us what it doesn't do, would you mind telling us what it does do?"

McAuliffe: "It does what the original Bill did. It allows veterans, disabled veterans to receive aid from the state to remodel their houses. It's to help them with their disability; if they need a wheelchair ramp built or if they need something like that, I think up to a maximum of 1500 dollars."

Pullen: "In grants?"

McAuliffe: "In grants, yes."

Pullen: "What department administers this?"

McAuliffe: "I...Department of Veterans Affairs administers it, and the money comes from the Pederal Government."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, to close."

McAuliffe: "I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

The voting's open. 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 143 'aye', 18 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1256. Representative Ebbesen, Senate Bill 423."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 423
is...really makes one very basic change. In fact, it only
changes one number. It changes a 'three' to a 'four', and
really that change provides the substantive language for
Amendment #7, DOT appropriation, House Bill 2195, and this
merely brings out the substantive language for that. And
it's on line 11, page four, and really that's about all
that it does. Appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Rigney: "That 'three' to a 'four' that you're speaking of is that...are we providing the substantive language here to delay this Road Fund diversion guestion for another year?

Is that...We're making all of that legal, is that what we're doing under that Amendment?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Rigney: "My, oh my. Very disappointed to hear that."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 91 "aye", 63 "no" and 9 voting "present", and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1. Representative Balanoff, for what purpose do you rise?"

- Balanoff: "Would you vote me 'aye'? My button didn't go down."

 Speaker Daniels: "You'll have to come up here and fill out a slip. I'm sorry, we've announced the Roll already. Senate Bill 1401, Representative Telcser. Supplemental Calendar #1."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do not concur with Senate
 Amendment...do not concur with Co...do not adopt... Are we
 on a Conference Committee Report or a concurrence Motion?
 You've got me confused, guys. Mr. Speaker, Members of the
 House, I move that the House refuse to recede from House
 Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1401 and that a Conference
 Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1401. A Conference Committee shall be appointed. Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry, and then possibly a point of order. About 15 minutes ago Representative Kulas, on 1938, moved that a Second Conference Committee be formed. There was no Motion that the House not adopt the First Conference Committee, and it would be my suggestion to the Chair that that First Conference Committee is, therefore, still before the House, and the formation of a Second Conference Committee would therefore not be in order. And I would ask the Chair to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

rule on that."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, the Chair appreciates your inquiry in pointing out the fact that Representative Kulas did not move to reject Conference Committee Report #1. Your point is well taken, and Conference Committee Report #1 will still be before the House, and a Motion for a Second Conference Committee is not timely at this time. So, the Conference Committee Report #1 is still on the table before the House at the present time. Representative Barr on Senate Bill 1452."
- Barr: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, then, going back to the First Conference Committee Report shown on Supplemental Calendar #1, with regard to Senate Bill 1452, I move that the House refuse to accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1452."
- Speaker Daniels: "And a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Barr: "Yes, and...and that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House rejects the First Conference Committee Report, and a Second Conference Committee shall be appointed. Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification. What's the posture of House Bill 1938 right now?"
- Speaker Daniels: "It's on Conference Committee Reports, First
 Conference Committee."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "On the Order of the Calendar. Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bullock: "Inquiry of the Chair."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

- Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, as we proceed to adopt Conference
 Committee Reports or to reject them and request a Second,
 is it appropriate that the Sponsors of these...or the
 makers of these Motion or the movements would explain to
 the Body why we are rejecting the report; as is customary
 to explain why we should adopt the report?"
- Speaker Daniels: "It would be a good idea, and your point is well taken. We'd ask all Sponsors to explain the purpose of their Motion when they present it. Thank you, Representative Bullock. Representative Meyer. What purpose does Representative Hoffman rise?"
- Hoffman: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest that we wait until the 59 Members of the House leave before we start remodeling it. It's a little noisy up there."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The House will please come to order. Members please be in their seats.

 Those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. What purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Irv Smith, arise?"
- Smith, Irv: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to introduce one of the stalwart Precinct Committeemen from Sangamon County and an auditor in Woodside Township of Sangamon County, Mr. Hadley Pfeiffer, up in the balcony."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will please come to order. Members be in their seats. All those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery. Members please be in their seats. Senate Bill 1180, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House adopt Conference Committee (Report) #1 for Senate Bill 1180. Senate Bill 1180 allowed the Chicago Board of Education to amend its budget upward. Right now, according to law, they can only

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

amend their budget downward. Our purpose in...What the Bill intends to do with Senate Bill 1180 is to allow the Chicago Board of Education to do the same as the rest the state, and of course they need the approval of the Pinance Authority to do so. So, in the event that there money available they could amend their budget upward. That's what Senate Bill 1180 did. The Conference Committee Report adds new legislation to allow the Chicago Board of Education through the utilization of the pension contribution liability tax to incur an obligation to make employee pension contributions on behalf of all Board both teachers and municipal employees. members, The Chicago Board of Education make these employee pension contributions by a reduction in the employee's salary or by an offset against future salary increases. It restricts the Board's ability to make such employee contributions to an amount not to exceed the present statutory employee contribution, which is 8% for Chicago teachers. And this Conference Committee Report has an immediate effect. If there are any questions, I'11 happy to try to answer them. The hyphenated Sponsor of this legislation is Representative Schneider who will also be available for any questions."

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

Ebbesen: "Well, the Sponsor said he'd yield, and I'd like to..."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Thank you. On page six it says something there about the employer may pay these employee contributions, and it talks something about ...I beg your pardon. It's not on page six. It's something about a point four eight percent (0.48%)...wait. It's on page nine, about 0.48% of the value is assessed, equalized or assessed, Department of

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Revenue? Are we talking about a property tax increase for this purpose in Chicago?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "It authorizes the Board, if they wish, to incur..."

Ebbesen: "..In other words, it just provides that opportunity if they so desire?"

Cullerton: "Right. And it's anticipated that the Board would not have to make it 0.4..0.48. It's anticipated they would need an increase of 0.43."

Ebbesen: "Yes. On page ten, Representative Cullèrton, the last three or four lines there, it talks about the obligation incurred by the Board to make contributions on behalf of its employees to the municipal employees, officers and officials, the Annuity Benefit Fund and the Public School Teachers Pension and Retirement Fund. Would you explain what that really means?"

Cullerton: "There is a difference between the Chicago teachers and the Chicago Board of Education municipal employees.

And that's designed to cover both of those types of employees."

Ebbesen: "Well, it talks about officers and officials. Are these elected officials?"

Cullerton: "No."

Ebbesen: "In no way. Appointed, elected?"

Cullerton: "We're talking about custodians."

Ebbesen: "I beg your pardon?"

Cullerton: "Are you referring to what...what line are you referring to?"

Ebbesen: "On page ten, the last..the last..the last four or five lines there."

Cullerton: "It refers to Board employees who are not teachers, noncertified teachers as well."

Ebbesen: "But it's just strictly confined. You're not talking

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

about municipal officers, aldermen, mayor or anything like this? You're talking strictly about the school system?" Cullerton: "Right."

Ebbesen: "Okay, fine. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Would the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Yes. Does this legislation cover just Cook County,
Chicago school, Cook County, downstate?"

Cullerton: "Just the City of Chicago."

Ewing: "Is there a provision for a transfer of funds in here that's different? Between funds?"

Cullerton: "No."

Ewing: "No? No transfer of funds?"

Cullerton: "No. ...tax that's increased, if they chose to do so, would only be allowed to go into the Pension Fund."

Ewing: "Well, I was...If you look at your Bill at the bottom of page seven..."

Cullerton: "All right. That refers to the original Bill that I explained concerning the...being able to amend your budget upward just like you have down in your district."

Ewing: "That..that refers to the original Bill?"

Cullerton: "Right. Senate Bill 1180. Senate Bill 1180 was designed to bring the Chicago Board of Education in line with the rest of the state in that, if more money was available they can revise their budget upward. Under current law they cannot revise their budget upwards; they can only revise it downwards."

Ewing: "Is there...Is this, in any way, going to increase the property tax?"

Cullerton: "It's entirely up to the Board of Education and the City Council."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Ewing: "They can levy the...it's additional authority then, to levy?"

Cullerton: "Absolutely correct."

Ewing: "Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Bowman: "Representative Cullerton, my..my concern is..over this is that the monies might be collected for pension payments and then, because of an especially tight cash situation, perhaps payments into the Pension Fund might be suspended and we would face a situation where the Board would be collecting monies for one purpose but actually using them for another purpose. I would like to ask if this legislation would permit that sort of thing to happen."

Cullerton: "No. Thank you, Representative, for that question.

We did talk about this earlier. I talked to staff as well
as Representative Schneider. It's our understanding for
the purpose of legislation intent, any monies collected by
the Pension Contribution Liability Tax would have to go
into the Pension Fund. It could not be suspended."

Bowman: "Okay. Well, thank you very much. Then, Mr. Speaker, to the..to the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Bowman: "I rise in support of this legislation. I believe that this is a way of dealing with probably the most acute civic problem facing the City of Chicago today. My only concern was that the ...that we might have created a loophole in the law inadvertently. I'm reassured by Representative Cullerton's response. I believe that these..these monies will go to the proper ..to pay the proper liabilities of the Board, and that being the case, that this is a..a very

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

responsible piece of legislation. I think that we must pass this so that the Chicago schools will open in the fall. And I'm happy to support it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "If we pass this legislation and it becomes law, when will ...when will the first opportunity arise to levy the tax, and when will the first tax be collected?"

Cullerton: "The first time it could be collected...collected would be in August of '83, the '82 tax year second installment."

Hoffman: "All right. So this is ..will soon be July...will soon be July of '82..."

Cullerton: "A couple of hours..."

Hoffman: "So this money...these monies could not be collected until August of *83?"

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "What ...How does this fit into dealing with ...with the apparent 82 million dollar shortfall that the Chicago Board is facing this coming fiscal year?"

Cullerton: "This would not provide any immediate new cash for them in September. And it would only provide the money in August of '83. They still have a projected deficit and they still have to deal with it."

Hoffman: "Is there any provision in this legislation which would allow them to take the taxes collected in August of '83 and pay already incurred obligations?"

Cullerton: "Could you...Could you ask that again, please?"

Hoffman: "Is there anything in this legislation which would make it possible for them to take money collected in August of '83 to pay previously incurred obligations?"

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Cullerton: "Such as salary?"

Hoffman: "Such as pensions."

Cullerton: "Yes."

Hoffman: "In other words, we could..we could agree that the pension contribution would be made retroactive..."

Cullerton: "Right.."

- Hoffman: "..As I think there's an August '82 cutoff where you can't go back. You can only go forward from that point, but we could collect the tax in August, incur that commitment and pay it out of that."
- Cullerton: "Right. And to that extent that would..that would aid the situation in..."
- Hoffman: "That would then address that...that number. Now, what is the maximum that could be levied ...could be collected under this tax?"
- Cullerton: "The maximum is 63.4 million. The anticipation is that it would not be that high. It would be 43¢ per \$100.00 of assessed valuation, which would raise 57 million."
- Hoffman: "Will you explain the Section in the legislation then which provides for levying tax to cover a loss in collection and whatever that particular language is that would make it appear that we're..as we levy a tax we're collecting 98, 95, 94%? This would provide that the following year they could levy enough to make up that shortfall. Is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "They can...If I understand your question, they can collect for and pick up for the cost of the collection of the taxes. Is that what your question was?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. There's a Section which provides for the levying
 ...include the amount to cover it's on the top of page ten
 include the pension contribution and liability tax to
 include an amount to cover loss in collection and cost of

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

collection of the tax and also deferred collections."

Cullerton: "That's..that's right. I mean, that's..."

Hoffman: "That provides then that they could...they could, in the future, levy a tax more than would be needed to cover the 8% incurred to cover what wasn't covered the previous year."

Cullerton: "No, I don't believe so. I think it makes it clear in other Sections, perhaps on page nine, that the maximum that can be collected is the 48¢ per..."

Hoffman: "..Yes..I..I.."

Cullerton: "..It cannot exceed. It cannot exceed..."

Hoffman: "..Can..But..I understand that. But you said that if
they levied the 48% that they would collect 63 million
dollars, and my assumption is that the 8% incursion or
this..for this particular year would not..would only
require 43%. If the same were true next year they could
levy 45% to cover what they didn't collect the year...the
2% additional they didn't collect the year before. Is that
correct?"

Cullerton: "Well, the..the key here is found on page nine. It's

not to exceed the amount of contributions which the board

has determined to make or incur in obligation to make on

behalf of its employees to the city, municipal employees

officers. That's the 8% that I referred to for..."

Hoffman: "...Correct.."

Cullerton: "...The ...eight and a half percent for the..the other employees."

Hoffman: "All right. Thank you very much. Let me ask you one additional question, if I may. And that is, if I owned ...if I owned a \$50,000 home in your community - and I know you don't have any of that.er..that small - .."

Cullerton: "No, make it 100,000."

Hoffman: ".. Where you live.. "

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Cullerton: "It makes it easier to explain."

Hoffman: "..All right, make it easier to explain. I want to simplify this for all of us. If I owned a \$100,000 home in your community or a condo in your community, and you levied — I'm sorry — and the School Board levied the maximum tax they could..permissible under this legislation, what ..how much would that increase my tax bill?"

Cullerton: "If you'd allow me to answer that based on what we anticipate the levy will be, I can answer that very quickly. Based on the 43¢ per hundred thousand for a \$100,000 home, it would be \$101.48. Now, if you want...I am an attorney and if you have a problem with your assessed valuation, you want to appeal it, we can help you out later on. But, with respect to...43¢, which is what they anticipate, that's the figure. About one hundred dollars."

Hoffman: "So, what we're proposing to do here, and that is assuming that I don't go to someone with your expertise to reduce my assessed valuation..."

Cullerton: "Most..most of the homes are underassessed, practically speaking."

Hoffman: "I'm sure some of them are."

Cullerton: "Sixteen percent..."

Hoffman: "...I'm sure some of them are.."

Cullerton: "...Fair market value. Assessed valuation is sixteen percent of fair market value."

Hoffman: "All right. But you're going to increase for someone...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're going to increase at the 43¢ level, you're going to increase the taxes or the taxes of a homeowner in Chicago on a \$100,000 home, would be increased approximately \$101. Thank you..."

Cullerton: "..Can I answer.."

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

Cullerton: "..Representative Hoffman? Mr. Hoffman? Just to..to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

put the final touches on that point. The last time this was done was back in 1972. So that has been eleven years since...since the tax, the property tax would have been increased. I live in a three flat. Let's say it's worth...it's assessed as if it's worth \$100,000. My rent right now is \$545 a month. Now, if that landlord of mine who lives in the building had to pay an extra hundred dollars — okay? — That would mean about \$10.00 a month, and if you divide that among the two other tenants who are paying \$545 a month, it would be about \$3.00 a month. Okay? And I fully accept that as a reasonable increase in my...in my rent.."

Hoffman: "..Sure.."

Cullerton: ".. To bail out, if you will.."

Hoffman: "...Sure. Sure.."

Cullerton: "...Situation.."

Hoffman: "..It's only ten cents a day, you know, if you work it down the right way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that as the previous..er..the Sponsor of this Conference Committee Report indicated that it is about time that the taxpayers in the City of Chicago had their taxes increased. only..It's been eleven years. And, those of us who live in other communities know that our tax rates have increased over that period of time for schools, and I think it's time now to give the taxpayers in the City of Chicago an opportunity to increase their..their efforts and their support of the Chicago school system. And if you have a home that's valued at \$100,000, it will only increase your taxes, or at least the rate on your taxes, which will fractionalize out into the tax bill as an additional \$100.00. And so for that reason, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we all ought to give very

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

serious consideration to this Bill, recognizing that it's only going to affect the taxpayers of the City of Chicago, and I think that, you know, as we watch those Chicago Legislators put their votes up on the Board, I think those of us from the suburban and the downstate areas should follow suit. It's only fair. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vitek."

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. Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the of the Co-Chairmen of the House Resolution 73 a number of years ago, one of the final conclusions that we drew was that the Chicago tax base needed to be upgraded so that they could provide for adequate public education in the City of Chicago. of you may recall after having been here, or may have read about, we did take 50¢ away for the bonds that we borrowed in order to provide for the Chicago school bail-out crisis of *79. I, like Representative Hoffman, have felt for some time that a number of taxes that we levy downstate and in the suburban areas are not levied in Chicago - for example, transportation, special ed and a number of others. it is reasonable to expect that local effort is a valid way to measure the way schools can contribute to their schools as a result this..this approach of the 48¢ maximum for pensions only comes as a kind of, I think, a temporary relief to the City of Chicago. Keep in mind that it is permissive, that is, it will be negotiable between the schools and the unions, that we can look at it as a..as an effort to make sure that schools do open and that there will be an opportunity for us to continue to evaluate the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

programs as they progress. One final observation is that Chicago really has had over the last ten years, based on our research for HJR 73, when you combine the suburban Cook, make that all the Cook County districts, units, or if you combine high school and elementary, that Chicago really is not a heavily taxed school district. They rank among the lower ones if we look at the last decade. i n reality Chicago has not been onerous and burdensome in the sense of its school taxes because they have been, in truth, been one of the lower taxing units of government. I'm not talking about the municipal tax rate when you combine it with schools, but I am saying for the purposes of schools Chicago, when you make a comparison to other metropolitan Cook County schools, has been among the lowest. So it comes timely. I think it's one of the solutions to a very critical problem. There are other ways that we can with it and I hope, in the future, we can confront those as So I would ask that you put an "aye" vote on the well. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1180?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Telcser to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as a resident of the city I, of course, rise to support this legislation because I happen to think it's the right thing to do. One of the most critical problems facing a city like ours is that of our educational system and our ability to retain people to live in the city and to continue to send their children to our school system. In my view, this piece of legislation represents a method by which we can continue to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

maintain, supporting and keeping good qualified teachers. And our City Council, as I understand this legislation, would be necessary if it ...would need a vote in our City Council should it become necessary to raise a real estate tax. So, Mr. Speaker, I see we have enough votes now. I simply rise to support this legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Birkinbine to explain his vote.

The timer's on."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would hope that all of those people who are House. either guests in our audience or who are freshmen on the floor of the House who have not yet seen something like this are paying close attention to what's happening. Because what we're seeing is something that's heavily greased sliding down the skids. It's an interesting thing. Frankly, if anything, this is something of a victory for the media. I am yet to read a newspaper in this state that has not advocated a tax increase for one thing or another. I'm yet to meet a constituent or taxpayer who's in favor of one. Well, here we have one and it's without referendum. In other words, we're not asking the taxpayer whether they want to pay this or not. We're just pushing it through. So that if anybody should applaude, it's those people who have cut deals on one side or the other and the media who say, 'Like it or not, taxpayer, you should pay more'. Well, here you see it and the taxpayers don't have a thing to say about it, and it's a lesson in government ..."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been one for many years certainly interested in the schools. My concern is the principle here and the fact is, I certainly agree with Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Birkinbine. I don't vote for tax increases without referendum. I think it's only fair to let the people in the City of Chicago, if they feel they want a tax increase, let them vote it. I don't think we should be sitting here in Springfield and making decisions for them."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion there are 93 'ayes', 70 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report \$1 to Senate Bill 1180. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee to House Bill 2285. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused adopt the First Conference Committee, request a Second Conference Committee to House Bill 1938. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded the request for a First Conference Committee to Senate Bill 1427 and 1359. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1193, adopted by the Senate June 30, 19821. Kenneth Wright. Secretary."
- Speaker Daniels: "We're waiting for the Supplemental Calendar #3.

 We're going to go to Agreed Resolutions. Agreed

 Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 111, DiPrima and 112,
 DiPrima. House Resolution 1096, Ryan, 1097, Katz et al,
 1098, Bower, 1099, Younge et al, 1100 Hallock, 1101,

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Kulas - et al and 1102, Rigney - Olson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution, DiPrima - et al, 111, the Illinois Department of AMVETS met in their 37th annual convention at Ramada Inn in Champaign, Illinois during the period of June 18th and 20th and whereas, Frank Gudgeon of Berwyn, Illinois was unanimously elected Illinois Department Commander for the term of 82 and 83. DiPrima - et al, House Joint Resolution 112, the Korean and Viet Nam AMVETS held their annual convention at the Ramada Inn, Champaign, Illinois, whereas, Phyllis Dever of Bloomington, Illinois was unanimously elected Illinois Department President for the term of 82 and 83. House Resolution 1096 by Speaker Ryan, that we do hereby commend and honor Charles Huber for his devoted and distinguished work, that we congratulate him for being selected as receiving the Distinguished Citizen Award. House Resolution 1097, Katz, on July 24th, 1982 will mark the 65th birthday of Morrie Brickman of Evanston, Illinois, creator of the world's famous cartoon strip 'The Small Society'. House Resolution 1098, Bower, that we congratulate the Texaco refinery in Lawrenceville for its many years of reliable, faithful employment and service to the people of Lawrence County in the State of Illinois. House Resolution 1099, Younge - et al, whereas, it has come to the attention of Members of this chamber that Alvin L. Roundtree, Senior Archivist II, is retiring from the Office of Secretary of State on June 30th, 1982. House Resolution 1100, Hallock, Diane Goldsworthy, a June graduate of Guilford High School, Rockford, Illinois recently won the 1st place in the 1982 Illinois High School Diving Championship and the Big Nine Conference Diving Championships. House Resolution 1101, et

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

al..by Kulas, it has come to the attention of the House of Representatives that Julian E. Kulas and his lovely wife, Elizabeth, residents of River Porest, Illinois, will celebrate their silver wedding anniversary on September 28th. House Resolution 1102, Rigney — Olson, whereas, Sublette Township in Lee County, Illinois, is celebrating the 125th anniversary of its founding. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the 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. Further Resolutions? General Resolutions."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Committee on Assignments. Kulas? Will the House please come to order? Will the Members please be in their seats? Will all those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery? House Bill 1607, Representative Keane? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1607, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There may be some confusion on House Bill 1607 and I would like to clarify it. There were two Committee Reports. Only one has been filed. And it is the one..the one that has been filed and the one I will describe is the one that does not have..it does not have anything to do with the Caterpillar Amendment. House Bill...The Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1607 includes three provisions. The first one indicates ...we took the Bill and we deleted Amendment #4 from the Bill. The Bill, as it now reads, has the provision for taxing fuel of interstate drivers who do not buy within the state

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

and giving a..giving a..providing relief, a sales rebate, for those who..who do. Amendment #2 forbids the application of the combined apportionment income tax for utilities. It deals only with the invested capital portion of the personal property replacement tax and capital..er.. #3 revises the Board of Review work schedule to June 1. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Representative Keane, was...would..would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Winchester: "Representative Keane, is this the House Bill that had the Amendment in it that would hold harmless certain taxing bodies, specifically certain school districts from losing dollars?"

Keane: "Yes it was. We discussed that Amendment. The..It was decided and I talked with a number of Members who ..on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses who supported that, and it was generally agreed that we can handle that. Wе may be able to handle that in a better manner when we get a better analysis. The Department of Revenue told us in the Conference Committee today that they would be happy even though it costs substantial sums, they would be very happy to run a fairly expensive computer study to find out exactly who has been hurt and we're hopeful - and I think I speak for all the Members of the Conference Committee we're hopeful that something can be done to alleviate the impact in the fall or in...in next spring because that's when it will hit them."

Winchester: "Well, I think, Representative Keane, that we have
...we already have that computer print out and it shows

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

that some 3700 taxing bodies are going to gain money, roughly 2.4%, and I think some 2700 taxing bodies are going to lose between 1% up to 39% with about 370 losing as much as 60%. But, I understand the situation. I understand the predicament that many of our schools are in and many Legislators because some of their schools are gaining money other schools are losing money and a simple hold and harmless provision would really help probably everyone in the State of Illinois fairly. But are you saying that you're willing to work with those of us who have schools and other taxing bodies that will be losing considerable amount of dollars, that you, and you feel that others on the Conference Committee in the Senate, will work with us to try to do something maybe in November if we can work out a solution?"

- Keane: "Yes, yes. That...that's exactly..exactly what I meant.

 What we're going to try to do is..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me, Representative Keane. Could the Gentlemen please have your attention? Mr. Doorkeeper, I'm going to ask you to please clear the floor of all those people not entitled to the floor. And will those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery?

 Members please be in their seats. Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Yes. That specific point was made at the Conference
 Committee that we would look to the districts that had..are
 severely impacted by the fall off of the hold harmless and
 personally I would be very...I will work and support such
 legislation that would reduce the..the impact on..on those
 districts."
- Winchester: "Well, Representative Keane, I think speaking on behalf - and maybe they might want to speak for themselves - but, speaking on behalf of Representative Rea and Representative McCormick, we appreciate all the courtesy

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

that you've extended us in trying to help us resolve the problem. We don't want to cause any problems for you on your Bill. We accept your word that you will work with us to try to resolve this problem in November. Thank you."

Keane: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Keane, I didn't hear the explanation and in this clutter of paper I don't have the Conference Committee. Could you, one more time, for me, run through what 1607 does?"

Keane: "Alright. As it came out of the Conference Committee,
what it does now is it forbids the application of the
combined apportionment income return for utilities. But it
only deals with the invested capital apportionment of the
personal property replacement tax. The second Amendment
which is Amendment \$3 revises the Board of Review work
schedule at a time when assessors go to the books. And the
final Amendment adds a motor fuel tax surcharge on
interstate motor carriers who do not purchase fuel within
the state, who purchase their fuel without.outside the
state and drive through the state without purchase. And
that's what the Bill does."

Schneider: "The..I have a reference to Senate Amendment #5? You have that same analysis, I think, right? Add the motor fuel tax surcharge?"

Keane: "That's right."

Schneider: "Alright. Thanks a lot."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Having served as Chairman of that Conference Committee, I do want to say that everything that Representative Keane has said is true. We will cooperate

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

units of government that Representative with those Winchester was talking about. We do want to reiterate that there is nothing in here in regard to the so-called Caterpillar Amendment. the unitary taxing. That Conference Committee Report was never introduced. This is the only Conference Committee Report that has introduced. It contains nothing about the unitary taxing and the Conference Committee Report has been signed by every Nember of the Conference Committee, both Senate and House. It is a good Conference Committee Report, good legislation, and I would join Representative Keane in urging a 'yes' vote and final action on this legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Miller: "Representative Keane, did I understand that we're changing the time when the Board of Review will go into Session?"

Keane: "It's June 1."

Miller: "So that is remaining the same and not changing?"

Keane: "Right."

Miller: "You said right?"

Keane: "Right."

Miller: "Thank you."

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

Ropp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "Can you give me kind of a rough estimate as to the amount of motor carrier special tax that this might total? Is there an estimate of this surcharge, how much it's going to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

generate?"

Keane: "The..It's five million is what the estimate is on the
...on the motor fuel income. It will generate five million
new revenue."

Ropp: "Okay. Is this a new provision or is this just a continuation or kind of a refresher of what is already is in existence?"

Keane: "No. No. it's a new provision..new provision."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Yes, Senate Amendment #2, which has to do with the combined apportionment of income tax return for utilities, would you explain that to us and who it affects and by how much?"

Keane: "Yes. The..the amount of revenue involved is..estimated from 25 million to 50 million. What happens ...it would go to local school districts and local units of government. What happened is is that when the Caterpillar..when the Caterpillar lawsuit occurred there were three..there were the corporate personal three Sections in property replacement tax. Two of them were income tax and the third was the .. the tax on corporate investment. The tax...the formula for computing the tax on form...on corporate investment tax included the income tax. Because the court decision changed that income tax, it changed the formula and computation of the corporate investment tax and the ...a major utilities paid in protest. couple of would...this would take away that protest payment and the monies would come in as they had before. So it should free up about .. presently about 25 million dollars for local

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

government."

- Kane: "Do I understand that this 25 to 50 million dollars is taxes paid by the utilities that have been paid under protest and held in escrow?"
- Keane: "There are taxes being held in escrow. I'm not sure of the exact amount. It ... over a period of years it's been estimated that this would increase revenues by 25 to 50 million. I don't know how much is exactly in there right now."
- Kane: "Okay. Over a period..what..what effect would it have on an annual basis?"
- Keane: "Somewhere between 25 and 50. Closer to 50 than 25."
- Kane: "Does this mean that the tax that we will save a reduction or there will be an actual increase over the level of taxation that has been.."
- What they're doing is that because of the Caterpillar decision and its impact on the formulation of the corporate investment tax, which is sort of a side effect that no one envisioned, what happened was ...is that they paid the amount of tax that they should have paid all along, but they paid a part of it under protest, which is the part that we're trying to free up so that in the future, you know, we get the same...local government gets the same amount as they've always felt they should get. It's not an increase."
- Kane: "It is not an increase and it is not a decrease also, either?"
- Keane: "Right. What it does is it just clarifies...just returns the..the..that one fund, the Corporate Investment Fund, to the way it was before the Caterpillar decision."

Kane: "If..Okay."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

136th Legislative Day

Ā

June 30, 1982

- Piel: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."
- 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 Keane, to close."
- Keane: "I think we've thoroughly discussed the Bill and the Conference Committee Report, and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

 The voting's open. Representative Mautino to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."
- Mautino: "I had..Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on to ask a question. I'd just like maybe Representative Keane could respond if he would explain his vote if I would give him a situation where I would be a broker, trucker hired out to an out-of-state company. How would I get back the tax credit since I am not listed as a commercial carrier but a brokered independent owner?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane to explain his vote. The timer's on."
- Keane: "Yes, it's my understanding that there is a provision for this already. There is a regular reimbursement. What you would do would be to save your ...your purchase slips within the State of Illinois. And there is a process by which you would submit them and be reimbursed or get a credit."
- Speaker Daniels: "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 159 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 5 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1607. On the regular Calendar, page four, House Bill 2133, Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Steczo."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that the
 House disapprove Conference Committee Report #1 to House
 Bill 2133, and would like to ask for a second Conference
 Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 Representative Steczo, could you explain why?"
- Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. There's portions of the Conference
 Report on House Bill 2133 that deal with annexation, and
 there was some language that was inadvertently left out so
 we'd like to correct that."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House rejects Conference Committee Report #1 and a second Conference Committee shall be appointed. Supplemental Calendar #3, Senate Bill 1285, Representative J. J. Wolf? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1374, Representative Leverenz? Representative Leverenz, 1374."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask that the House would support the Conference Committee Report \$1 to Senate Bill 1374. It specifically has the Senate receding from their action on the Amendments that we put on in the House. The funding level would be as the Bill left the House for the funding of the Office of Auditor General of \$2,500,000.00 and the balance for the operation's nine million two would be the total appropriation. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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? Take the record. On this

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

question there are 157 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1374. The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Those not entitled to the floor will please retire to the gallery. Doorkeeper, please clear the floor of those not entitled to the floor. Supplemental Calendar #3, Senate Bill 1285. Representative Davis? Representative Winchester, can you handle that or should we take it out of the record? Out of the record. 1397, Representative Reilly? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1397, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Aging. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just...Just a second here while

I get the numbers. Take this out of the record please.

And would the staff get up here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. 1399, Representative Vinson? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Conference Committee Report on the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Commission on Banks and Trusts. The conferees recommend that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2, and that the Bill be further amended as detailed in the Conference Report to increase the number of examiners to five and make the appropriate line item changes in response

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- to that. And I move that the House do adopt Conference
 Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1399."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting '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 145 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1399. Senate Bill 1397, Representative Reilly?"
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1397 recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment #1. The Bill, as it stands, then would be 60..this is the Department on Aging. The Bill, as it stands, would then be \$67,465,500.00. I'd be glad to answer questions. Otherwise I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1.

 Representative Van Duyne, late again."
- Van Duyne: "Yes. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. But really, why don't you just go through that again, Jim, slowly and more loudly so everybody knows at least what you're talking about?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish to ask the Gentleman a guestion?"

 Van Duyne: "That's what I'm asking him. Why don't he speak..."

 Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."
- Van Duyne: "Why doesn't he reiterate what he said and speak it more loudly?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Department on Aging's budget. The Conference Committee recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment #1. This will put the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Bill at a total of \$600...\$67,465,500.00."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor indicate...signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 158 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1397. Senate Bill 1402, Representative Winchester."
- Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that we concur with the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1402.

 It's basically coming...It is coming out exactly as it was introduced except for one area where the Senate and the House concurred in the adjustment of the 70% solution situation. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's...Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 139 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 15 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1402. 1403, Representative Davis?"
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Senate Bill 1403, we're recommending to you...the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1403, that the Senate concurred in House Amendments 1 and 2. The dollar figures now in this appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, \$310,700.00 introduced. With the House action and the Senate action it is now at \$305,500.00. And I move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1403."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, on 1402, I notice the retirement amount was increased to 70%. Is there a retirement amount in this 1403?"

Davis: "Same figure...Same figure, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Same figure?"

Davis: "Seventy percent."

Bradley: "Is that going to be the...oh, you might not know. Is that the same figure we're going to do for everybody?"

Davis: "It will be the pattern, yes, Sir."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #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 160 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1403. Representative Davis on Senate Bill 1285."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Senate Bill 1285, we're recommending that the ...the Senate concur in House Amendment #1. The Bill is introduced for the Judicial Inquiry Board, was \$283,100.00. It is now \$281,200.00. So, Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1285."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 149 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 16 voting 'present'. The

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1285. Senate Bill 1405. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, would you have the Clerk read the Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1405, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Conference Committee recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. The resultant action would have 2.1 million dollars in General Revenue, 14.6 million in other, which is primarily federal money, for a total of 16.7 million dollars for the agency. And I do move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1405."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that we've spent considerable time on this Bill already, and I'm sure it'll all come back to ..to your recollection when I tell you that this is the Bill that has the state radiological defense officer. So those of you who are interested in preparing for nuclear war and who think nuclear war is a winnable feasible strategy should be voting for this. Those of you who think that it is not a..a..nuclear war is not winnable. It is not a feasible strategy. And who think that it's a nutty idea, should be voting 'no' on this. I plan to cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.

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

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

this question there are 111 'ayes', 43 'no', 14 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1405. 1407, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Financial Institutions. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, this happens to be a Conference Committee
Report on the Department of Pinancial Institutions. The
report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment
#1, that Senate Bill 1407 be further amended to increase
the budget by a total of 12 thousand dollars, 8 thousand in
General Revenue, 4 thousand in Pension Fund to provide for
70% pay out level for retirement. I would move that the
House do concur and do adopt Conference Committee Report #1
to Senate Bill 1407."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 136 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 25 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1407. Representative Peters in the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "Senate Bill 1409, Representative Wolf? Reilly?"
Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for acceptance of
the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1409.
This is the budget for the Guardianship and Advocacy
Commission. The report basically recommends that the
Senate concur in House Amendment #1 and #2, and that we
reduce some nonpersonal services lines by \$35,000.00,

- 136th Legislative Day

 June 30, 1982

 making a total budget of 3 million, 199 thousand, 600

 dollars. I would ask a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly, it's my understanding, before the Roll Call we'll need a Motion to amend on the face? Is that right, Mr. Clerk?"
- Reilly: "I'll be glad to make the Motion. I don't know as to what..."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly, at the top of the report the typing is incorrect. It says, 'House Bill 1409'. It should read, 'Senate Bill'."
- Reilly: "I ask leave to amend the Conference Committee Report on its face to read, "Senate Bill 1409"."
- Speaker Peters: "Does the Gentleman have leave? There objection?

 Being none, the report is amended and so ordered. Proceed

 now, Sir."
- Reilly: "I would be glad to answer questions. Otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Lechowicz."
- Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, will the Sponsor yield to one question? The restoration of \$168,000.00 in General Revenue Funds, is that for the Advocacy Commission?"
- Reilly: "Yes. The Senate made some....This whole budget is for them. The Senate made some personal service cuts and we restored that in the House. And the Conference Committee recommends that both Houses adopt the House's policy."
- Lechowicz: "In what area is this restoration being made?"
- Reilly: "What..What the Senate did...this is the 8% business.

 The Senate cut it 2%."
- Lechowicz: "Alright. Thank you."
- Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry. Representative Reilly?"
- Reilly: "Yes, I believe we're ready to vote now, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1409?'.

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Van Duyne, to explain his vote for one minute."

- Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I'm correct or not, but there was a correction made on the face of the..of the Conference Committee, and I think the Conference Committee is probably correct. It just says, "Senate Bill, already with House Amendments"...okay. I stand corrected."
- Speaker Peters: "Yes, Representative. The Chair thanks you for calling attention. But we did correct that by a proper Motion. Have all voted who wish? Representative Van Duyne, did you wish to vote? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 157 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 11 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1409. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1411, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1411, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Historical Library. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the OCE for the Historical Library and the Conference Committee Report #1 recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 as introduced, 1 million, 760 thousand, 200. The Conference Committee now reflects 1 million, 735 thousand dollars. It is the House's version of this Bill, and I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1411."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative...Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1411? .. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by Mr. Clerk. The voting is open. Have all voting 'nay'. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 163 voting 'aye', 3 5 voting 'present'. This Bill. voting 'nav'. received the Constitutional Majority, the House having conferred...having adopted Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1411, this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1413. Representative Winchester. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1113 ...1413, a Bill for an Act
making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent
expenses of the Department of Labor. First Conference
Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of Labor.

The...the Bill was originally introduced at 162 million, 314. It's now, as a result of the Conference Committee, at 157 million, 763. And I now move that we do adopt the Committee Report on Senate Bill 1413."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a guestion?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Bullock: "Representative Winchester, is it my understanding that
this Conference Committee Report relates to the Bureau of
Employment's security?"

Winchester: "Yes, it does. Yes."

Bullock: "Is it my understanding that you're proposing that we reduce from 164 to 157 million dollars for that Department

136th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1982
- to fulfill its obligation and operate in Fiscal Year *83?"
- Winchester: "Yes, the Bureau asked this House, this General Assembly, to reduce them by four million, five hundred and thirty-nine thousand. That's federal funds."
- Bullock: "Let's back up a little bit..."
- Winchester: "That's federal funds that won't be available. I'm sorry, Larry."
- Bullock: "Could you clarify that? I missed the end of what you said now."
- Winchester: "Okay. The Bureau asked this General Assembly to reduce their appropriation by four million, five hundred and thirty-nine thousand, that is, federal monies that will not be..will not..will not be made available to the Bureau."
- Bullock: "Okay, so none of this is General Revenue money? This is federal money?"
- Winchester: "The General Revenue is... Yes. General Revenue is reduced by 11 thousand dollars. The rest of it is the... is the Bureau's part, the federal money."
- Bullock: "So these 4.6 million dollars are federal dollars that are just not being allocated?"
- Winchester: "The Federal Government is not allocating it to the Bureau."
- Bullock: "And so consequently..."
- Winchester: "...And the Bureau has asked that we correct that in their budget."
- Bullock: "Okay, so the net reduction them is what? \$12,000 to the Bureau from General Revenue?"
- Winchester: "Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Bullock. The 11,900 is little labor, excluding the Bureau of Employment. They are being reduced 11,900. There is no General Revenue in the Bureau. The Bureau is being reduced 4,539,000.00 which is federal monies. That's not being allocated."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Bullock: "Okay. Mr. Speaker? Briefly to the ... "

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Bullock: "...Conference Committee Report. I think those of you who have been following very carefully the recent accounts in the media, particularly in the Chicago Tribune, relative to the problem with our Unemployment Insurance Trust Pund, might want to make a particular note of this Conference Ιt is not beyond the realm of Committee Report. comprehension that the Bureau of Employment security indeed do an effective job in the next fiscal year. But I think all of us know that the unemployment rate in our state is not going to decrease. I think all of us know that we are in excess of 2 billion dollars in debt to What I can't quite fathom out of all Federal Government. of this is why we should be asked to do the Federal Government's work for them and reduce any amount for the Bureau of Employment security? I certainly think that what we should be doing is trying to find additional funds to make the Bureau more efficient because there are - and I think we all know - as of today, there are in excess of 500,000 people in our state that are unemployed who have not been able to draw the necessary compensation and who, through no fault of their own, are being subjected to perhaps the most crass form of economic discrimination history of our time. So, I think the record should just show that this administration is not seeking to make Bureau more efficient, but in fact is crippling it by reducing its appropriation."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur..adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1413?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Mr. Clerk? Take the record. On this question there are

108 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay', 39 voting 'present'.

And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on

Senate Bill 1413. This Bill, having received the

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

Bill 1415, Representative Vinson? Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and the various state agencies. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 4, 5 and 6, that Senate Bill 1415 be amended further...so that to transfer an additional \$27,000 from local grants to the Section to refund Federal Government for unmatched costs. This Amendment also deletes the word, "discretionary", from the Section. And I would move that this House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1415."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Representative Vinson, would you hold it just for a second? We think it's alright, but there's..they're concerned that there may be some technical problem. Could you hold it and we can get back to it right away."

Vinson: "Absolutely."

Matijevich: "If my staff will...Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall..'..What? Representative? Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1416, Representative Vinson. Mr. Clerk?"

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1416, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers' Training Board. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1416, the Conference Committee recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4, for a result of 322,000 in GRF, 3 million 820 thousand in other funding, a total of 4.1 million dollars. And I would move that this House do adopt Conference Committee Report \$1 on Senate Bill 1416."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There...There being none, the question is, Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1416? . Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 153 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 12 voting 'present'. And the House does concur ...does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1416. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1418, Representative Bower? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Mines and Minerals. First Conference Committee Report." Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expense

appropriation for the Department of Mines and Minerals.

The Conference Committee Report ..the Senate concurs in all

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

of the House Amendments. There is no dollar change as it left the House. I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur...adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1418?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 148 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay', 17 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1418. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1419, Representative Vinson. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act making ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Nuclear Safety. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1419 is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Department on Nuclear Safety. The conferees recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9. It's a classic case of the Senate having round heels, and I do move that the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1419."
- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1419?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', 4

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

voting 'nay', 17 voting 'present'. The House does concur..does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1419. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1421, Representative Bower? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act making the ordinary and contingent expense of the Pollution Control Board. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Pollution Control Board. The Conference Committee concurs in...The Senate concurs in House Amendment #1. No dollar change as it left the House. I move for the adoption of the Conference Committee."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Mr. Clerk, clear the discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1421?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question there are 135 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'nay', 17 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1421. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1415, Representative Vinson. Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Representative. Phil Gonet?

Alright. Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act making the ordinary and contingent expense for the Illinois Law

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Enforcement Commission and various state agencies. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1415 is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. conferees recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 4, 5 and 6 and that the Bill be further The effect of the further amended. Amendment is to transfer an additional \$27,000.00 in General Revenue funding from local grants to the Section to refund the Pederal Government for unmatched costs. This Amendment also deletes the word, 'discretionary', from the Section. And I would move that this House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1415."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1415? . Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Clerk. On this question there are 147 voting 'aye', 6 And the House does voting 'nay', 18 voting 'present'. adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1415. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1422, Representative Reilly? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Aid. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly."

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

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

House. I move adoption of the First Conference Committee The Conference Committee recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10. The effect of the Amendments is basically...obviously as we did it in the House, puts the personal services back at the level of the 8% increase. It puts the hospital funds in the shape that we agreed and have passed the substantive legislation out of the House. It puts the domestic violence shelters money in, and makes the changes that we had already made in the House and the recommendation that the Senate concur in the House Amendments. I. therefore... I would move that the House concur..that the House accept the Conference Committee Report. It results in a bottom line of \$3,036,451,200.00."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I would point out that the

Conference Committee Report has not been printed and
distributed. But second, I would point out that a few
minutes ago, less than a half..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. It has been..Hr. Clerk, has it been printed and distributed? It has been. Point two, Representative Braun."

Braun: "The second point is, less than a half hour ago, every single Black Member of the Illinois General Assembly from the House and the Senate met with the Governor of the State to discuss the issue of the omission in this Conference Committee Report of certain essential hospital and health services, such as dental, optometric, hospital out-patient and clinics. The Governor gave us his word that he would get back to us this evening and we presume that that would mean that this Amendment..this Conference Committee Report would therefore be held until such time as the Governor had had a chance to report to the Members of the Senate as well

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

as the Members of the House, who I believe constituted 20 in number in his office, that he would get back to us before this is called. I would suggest and ask the Gentleman if he would have the courtesy to withdraw this Conference Committee Report until such time as we have had an opportunity to hear back from the Governor regarding the very essential concerns that were raised in his office less than a half hour ago."

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan. No? Representative Reilly?"
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the basis of the Lady's representations, I will until the Governor has had the courtesy to tell me, as the Sponsor of the Bill, what negotiations he may have conducted, I will take this out of the record."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly, you are correct.

 Last...I'll get out of here. Senate Bill 1425,

 Representative Vinson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank I • m you, Mr. Speaker. glad to have noncontroversial measures. The conferees on Senate Bill 1425, which happens to be the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Department of Registration and Education, recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 and that the House recede from House Amendment #2. I will explain House Amendment #2. House Amendment #2 which we would recede from in this report would have appropriated \$150,000.00 in a lump sum from the Dental..Disciplinary Fund to the Dangerous Drugs Commission

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

for seed money to permit the Dangerous Drugs Commission to establish a system to facilitate the transfer of the official prescription blank system from Registration and Education to the Dangerous Drugs Commission. The understanding is that that is unnecessary and that it would have been illegal to have appropriated the money from that fund, and for that purpose, the conferees recommended that the House recede from House Amendment \$2, and that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 3 and 4 and for those reasons, I do move that the House concur and adopt Conference Committee Report \$1 on Senate Bill 1425."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report (#1) to Senate Bill 1425? . Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 128 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'nav', 26 voting 'present'. And the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1425. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair welcomes to the chamber the Secretary of State, Jim Edgar. Representative Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1426, Representative Davis?
Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the fact that 11:00
o'clock in the Midwest is 12:00 o'clock Eastern Standard
Time which marks the dead on arrival date of the Equal
Rights Amendment, and I would also make known to you, Mr.
Speaker and the Members of the House, that in concurring on
the nuclear...on the radiological defense officer, I
believe the..this House has handled..handed Ms. Schlafly

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- her first victory in the anti-nuclear freeze movement."
- Speaker Daniels: "Senate Bill 1426, Representative Davis. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Employee Retirement System. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the OCE for the employees" Retirement System Fund. The Conference Committee Report recommends that the Senate concur in the House Amendment #1. This Amendment restores the 8% salary cut and restores the 70% pension program that's going on here tonight. And I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1426."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 161 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1426.

 1427, Representative Reilly? Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly?"
- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption of the First Conference Committee Report. The report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and that the Senate nonconcur, and obviously, the House recede from House Amendment #8. House Amendment #8 added four million dollars for veterans' scholarships. This

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

makes the bottom line for the Bill appropriation of \$19,665,100.00."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, just to point out that Amendment #8 that's being taken off the Bill is the Amendment that added the full funding provision, the additional four million dollars to fund the Illinois veterans' scholarship that we put on in the House by an overwhelming vote, and I think if you were committed to that particular issue, you ought to be up on this particular Bill and indicate your opposition or at least your 'present' vote if you believe that the military scholarships ought to be fully funded. It won't be under this particular Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Reilly, do I also understand that

Amendment #2 significantly reduces the funding for the

veterans' scholarships for Piscal Year 1983?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "It's the exactly the same question for '83 as for '82."
Satterthwaite: "Pardon me?"

Reilly: "It's the exactly the same question for '83, with the Amendment you're referring to, #2, as Amendment #8 is with this year's appropriation."

Satterthwaite: "Well...But, are you saying that Amendment #2, with the reduction down to 44,600,000 and some, gives an equal funding for '83 as in '82?"

Reilly: "What? I'm sorry. Would you repeat your question again?"

Satterthwaite: "I was asking whether the result after Amendment

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

#2, which reduces the funding level for the scholarships to
4.6 million, how that 4.6 million for Fiscal '83 compares
to the '82 funding level?"

Reilly: "It's a slight reduction."

Satterthwaite: "So we're saying that, knowing that we did not fund a sufficient amount this year, we are putting in even less money in next year's budget? What is..what is the rationale for that?"

Reilly: "There are fewer...will be fewer veterans in the system."

Satterthwaite: "But not fewer than needed the money this year,

apparently."

Reilly: "That I do not know. The veterans don't receive the money. The colleges do."

Satterthwaite: "Well, but funding for their education. If we were four million dollars short this year, what makes you think that we will be ...we will need less money next year than we needed this year?"

Reilly: "The Members of the Conference Committee from both parties, both sides of the aisle, both Houses, came to the conclusion that this was a reasonable action to take. I agree with them."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, then
I suggest that this is a second year that we would be
underfunding this scholarship line item and I would suggest
a 'no' vote on the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative DiPrima?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Mr. Speaker, listen, I put in an Amendment to add an additional four million dollars for the veterans' scholarships and the whole Committee saw fit to vote and remove it. Now, I would advise Mr. Reilly to take this Bill out of the record at the present time and let's

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

discuss this a little further or else I would recommend that everybody vote red on this..on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly to close."

- Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The
 Leadership on both sides of the aisle in both the House and
 the Senate have agreed that this is the responsible step to
 take. We can take the step tonight. We can take it at
 3:00 o'clock in the morning. We can take it on Friday. I
 would predict that it's going to be taken. I would hope
 that, in the interests of getting done, and fiscal sanity,
 that we would adopt this Conference Committee Report to
 Senate Bill 1427."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we did fight the battle in the Conference Committee and discussed this, and we felt that at this time there's nothing else we can do. Conference Committee Report would not have come out. Ι think most of you want to show your support for veterans by passing on a 'no' or a 'present' vote. I'm afraid that it won't be done, as Representative Reilly has said. wish that it could. So much of what we did was negotiating what we could come up with in this very tight year. would urge the Members to vote 'aye' at this time. assure you the second report will come out the same and we'll just stay here much longer than all of us want to. So, I know how many of you feel. We all support veterans, but I.. I think we must vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bullock."
- Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want the record to show, should this Bill, unfortunately, get the requisite number

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

of votes, I'll request a verification of the Affirmative."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not any happier than some of you are about the reduction of scholarship money for veterans. But I would remind you in this same Bill there's a lot of other things for veterans and if you keep on voting 'no' there won't be any tomorrow. Now you can make up your mind whether you want to leave out veterans completely, or whether you want to go along with this. I don't like it. But I'll tell you what. I'd like it a lot better than if you cut the veterans off completely, and that's what you're doing."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Representative DiPrima."
- DiPrima: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Representative
 Dwight Friedrich. He backed me up all the way with this
 legislation, and I'm happy all of you have gone along with
 me. But this is bigger than all of us. We've got
 all...the Department of Veterans Affairs will take care of
 them. No use prolonging this thing. We're going to keep
 fooling around and I appreciate the support you've given
 me. But I think we ought to vote for it. Come on, let's
 get them a green light."
- 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 'ayes', 26 'no', 10 voting 'present'. And the House con..adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1427. Thank you, Representative DiPrima. Senate Bill 1428, Representative Wikoff. Representative Wikoff."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for

136th Legislative Day June 30, 1982 the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. First

Conference Committee Report."

- Wikoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The..this Conference

 Committee Report recommends that the Senate concur in House

 Amendment #1.."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 may we please have your attention? Will the Members please
 be in their seats, and will the doorkeepers please remove
 from the floor all those persons not entitled to the floor?
 Representative Wikoff."
- Wikoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Conference Committee
 Report on the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board OCE is
 that the Senate concur in House Amendments #1, 2 and 3.
 House Amendment #1 restores \$5,400 in personnel services,
 half of that's GRF and half of it is in federal funds.
 Senate (sic, House) Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment
 which corrects a word that's missing. House Amendment #3
 restores the \$1,000 to the Retirement Fund to the pay out
 level of 70%. That's 500 GRF and 500 federal. I would
 move for adoption of the Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 124 'aye', 14 'no', 17 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill (sic, Senate Bill) 1428. 1445, Representative Winchester? Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act making reappropriation to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State and Southern Illinois University. First Conference Committee Report."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Conference Committee Report #1. It is the reappropriation Bill for the Capital Development Board. As originally introduced it was \$451,406,000.00. As it goes out of this House it*11 be \$403,391,000.00, a reduction of 48 million. The..the Conference Committee Let them qo. recommended that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2. 3 and 4. And I would ask that we now do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1445."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "In the original Senate Bill 1445, there was an for appropriation Jubilee College State Park for construction improvement of the rehabilitation of the college building. still in the appropriation Is that Bill?"

Winchester: "Yes. Representative Tuerk, none of the projects
that were originally in the Bill have been taken out. Only
four Amendments have been added and they were House
Amendments, no Senate Amendments, and we are concurring
with the House Amendments."

Tuerk: "So your answer is, it's still there?"

Winchester: "Yes, absolutely, Sir. I.. I went to bat for you on that one and made absolutely sure that that stayed in because I knew that was a special project for you and your district."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry. Representative Henry?"

Henry: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Henry: "Bob, could you explain to me an Act making

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

reappropriations to the Capital Development Board? What was the first appropriation?"

Winchester: "Well. over..over the last several years, this General Assembly has appropriated funds for various capital projects and for one reason or another the..the money was not appropriated or spent because it might have been a project that would require three or four years to actually So we would appropriate or spend so much as complete. necessary the first year, reappropriate the balance spend it..that portion the second year and so forth. We've got various...many projects in here that are two, three years old and some that expect to go on for another three four years in the future. We just continue to reappropriate that money to make it available each fiscal year so that CDB can pay the construction costs, the contractors, so forth, so they can pay their bills."

Henry: "Bob, how much money are we talking about..are we speaking of for the Capital Development Board this fiscal year?"

Winchester: "Alright. Now, there's..there's three Bills. There's the ordinary and contingent appropriation which we passed out. There is the capital improvements which is the new projects that we hope to complete this year, and this is the reappropriation. Now, are you addressing your ... your question to projects in the past or projects in the future?"

Henry: "How much money are we talking about for projects in the future?"

Winchester: "Roughly \$151,000,000.00, Representative Henry."

Henry: "One hundred and fifty-eight million dollars?"

Winchester: "One hundred and fifty-one million dollars for this fiscal year for new capital improvements."

Henry: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Piel."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

- Piel: "I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."
- 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 Winchester to close.

 Winchester to close."
- Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again, this is the ..this is the reappropriation Bill for the Capital Development Board. I would move that we..we concur with the Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Representative? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 12 'nos', 23 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1445. Braun, 'aye', 131 'aye'. Senate Bill 1514, Representative Matijevich? Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1514, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1514, the Conference Committee Report, Senate concurs in all House Amendments. Amendment...House Amendment #1 cut 500,000 phasing in new positions Associate Judges and shorthand reporters. Amendment #2 brings us at the 8% pay raise level for the Amendment #4 puts us at the 70% retirement pay out..for the retirement system. The next Amendment is the big one, the Judges' pay raise of 6,843,100. Floor Amendment 6 transferred three thousand and added two thousand to contractual line item for the 3rd Appellate District. The

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Bill in the Conference Committee, the total GRF Fund is \$90,687,466.00. I move to adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1514."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I heard the Gentleman say the appropriation for the Judges' pay raise is in this Conference Committee Report. Is that right? Question of the.."

Matijevich: "There was nowhere else to put it."

Bradley: "But it's in here."

Matijevich: "That's correct."

Bradley: "How much?"

Matijevich: "And it's \$6,843,100.00."

Bradley: "For half a year?"

Matijevich: "Pull year."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. 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 103 'aye', 56 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1514. Senate Bill 1406, Representative Bower? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Conference Committee concurs with House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4...I'm sorry. We concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 6 and recede from House Amendments 3, 5

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

and 7. Amendments 5 and 7 relate to the funding of public museums and that is replaced by an addition to the Conference Committee that funds it not at a million and a half, but at one million dollars. So I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Barkhausen. You've heard the Gentleman's
Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
On this question there are 127 'aye', 13 'no', 15 voting
'present'. And the House adopts Conference Committee
Report #1 to Senate Bill 1406. Senate Bill 1422.
Representative Reilly. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Aid. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were on this Bill before.

There were some indications as to negotiations with the Governor's Office. The Governor has indicated that he simply cannot come up with the additional funds, so we are back on the Bill. Again, the bottom line is essentially where it was at the House level. In fact, it is where it was at the House level, if I recall. The Conference Report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10. I will be glad to answer questions. Otherwise, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I rise in opposition to this Bill, and ask for a
resounding rejection of this Conference Report by the

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Without going into all of the issues in this Bill. some of which have been debated throughout this Session, including the issue of the underpayment for general assistance recipients. There's another issue that I'd like to bring to the Membership's attention that, in my opinion, is a defect in this appropriation and may be a fatal Under the decisions of the Department, payments infirmity. will be cut off, altogether, for general assistance recipients and well as aid to the medically indigent, well as the AFDC MANG population which ... who are the working poor, for any payments for hospital out-patient services, clinics, dentists and optometrists. In other words, the working poor and the handicapped will not able to buy services for their dental needs, their Their optometric needs. optometric needs.... Sorry. Τ I was waiting for you to restore order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. For hospital out-patient services Please realize, and I think many of you do, and clinics. that in many areas of the state, where there are hospitals, the clinics and out-patient facilities are the only place where people can get health care. Secondly, absence of ... in light of other changes in the Public Aid budget, it may well be that we'll find ourselves with huge populations that will have no access to health care at We attempted to amend the Conference Committee Report or put in this Conference Committee Report a minimal level of funding for these functions out of the lines that already in the budget without changing the bottom line on the budget. That effort was unsuccessful. The issue is presently being debated over in the Senate, understand, in a Conference; and, in the House, very much like to have this issue go back to a Conference Committee so that some further discussion in the waning

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

hours of the Session can be made about this critical area of concern for the poor, and the working poor and the handicapped in Illinois. And I encourage your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In support of what Representative Braun has said regarding this appropriation, it is inconceivable in this day and time that we have a budget for the State of Illinois in excess of 15 billion dollars, and those persons who need our attention, those persons who need health care, we cannot provide it for ... provide for them in this particular budget. And I will request the Members on this side of the aisle, concerned and have expressed themselves in the past as to the health care for the needy, the health care for poor, I'll request that the Members on this side of the aisle either vote 'no' or 'present' on this Conference Committee Report, until such time that this Body addresses itself to the needs of the poor in the State of Illinois. So, I request you vote 'no' or 'present' on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you try and get a semblance of order in the House? I'm certain that you can hear me. Others Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the issue before us in Senate Bill 1422 is whether or not we'll state, as a matter of policy in this state, people who seek out-patient care, that dental care. optometric care, as to whether or not they have a right to health care. I think the issue that we are asked to consider in this Amendment is whether or not we afford two percent of a state budget for those areas. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the issue is

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

quite simple. Are we going to engage in a game of Russian roulette? Are we going to have our hands stained with the blood of the elderly and the poor who will be dumped on the streets if we don't fund this particular category? the question that is put before us. I, for one, am willing to play a game of Russian roulette. I, for one, am willing Senate Bill 1422 which is a Public appropriation, because I don't think the citizens of this state are going to expect this Legislature and this Governor; and, as I indicated to the Governor a short while ago, I hasten not to be partisan, but this is a partisan matter because he, in fact, is responsible for fashioning of a budget in the area of social service as the other parts of our appropriation. think anyone who is a progressive and anyone who believes in the human dignity of every American and every Illinoisan and every citizen to have a basic right to health care ought to vote for this budget. This budget is inhumane. It's cruel. It's insane. It's a joke. It's a joke, because we know the people of our state deserve better. know they deserve better, and we're being challenged this issue to say, 'Yes, we agree with you. You deserve better. But, if we wote out tonight without sending back to the Second Conference Committee Senate Bill 1422, every one of you leave with a stained, a blood-stained hand you leave this chamber with tonight, because you're going the citizens of Illinois at the alter. You will have sacrificed the poor for some expedient end to adjourn some mythical, magical number, and you will have derelict... been derelict in your duties. I think it's a serious matter. It is a matter of life and death, and I would respectfully urge a resounding *no* vote to Conference Committee Report #1 for Senate Bill 1422."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'.

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption of the Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference

Committee Report #1?'. All those in favor signify by

voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open.

Representative Henry, to explain his vote. The timer's

on."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I believe this Amendment is wrong. I concur with Representative Braun and Representative Bullock. I also believe that the Executive Branch of government is wrong, where the Executive Branch of government can overlook the sick, the ill and the aged, and they are not only Black people. They are White, Hispanics, Europeans, Southerners and all types of people across the State of Illinois. T * m speaking for the people that need the help. We should send this... We should send this Amendment back to the Second Conference Report and ask them for money for the poor and people that need it all across the State of Illinois. And I suggest a red vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Margaret Smith, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Smith, Margaret: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I stand in support of the request of my colleague, Carol Mosely Braun, who has asked that we look at this Amendment from the Conference Report. We're not asking that you make other monies. The only thing that we are requesting at this time is that you would transfer funds so that these people, who are in dire need across

136th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1982
- this State of Illinois, will have an opportunity of receiving the need that they are entitled to. We are about to approach the 4th of July..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Alexander, to explain her vote.

 Timer's on."
- Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From those... for those of you who may have a dire concern of what this will do to the budget, it will not affect the bottom line of the budget. It is merely a lateral change of an over-budget budget in the Public Aid budget that came out for us to consider. It will not change the dollars at all. We're merely asking for a line item change. Please, do not vote green. Help us and vote 'present' or 'no' on this particular Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pechous, to explain his vote.

 Timer's on."
- Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would merely remind all within listening of my voice that our state employees do not receive optometric nor dental care; and, until such time as those who are producing receive it, I will be voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Christensen, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question there are 61 'aye', 67 'no' and 44 voting 'present'. Gentleman's Notion fails. Representative Reilly."
- Reilly: "I want a congratulate all those so-called conservatives
 who just added ten million dollars to the budget. I ask
 to... that the House now not adopt the Conference Committee
 Report and ask for a Second Conference Committee to be
 appointed."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1452, Representative Barr."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Illinois Pension Code. Second Conference Committee

Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, to avoid any possible conclu... confusion by the Members, we are dealing with the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1452, the one on your desk with the word 'corrected' typed at the top. corrected, and I might add correct Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1452. Senate Bill 1452, as amended by the Con... Second Conference Committee Report, concurs in House Amendments 3 and 5, recedes from House Amendment 1, the language from House Amendment 1 being incorporated in other language contained in the Conference Committee Report. The language dealing with investment powers contained in the Conference Committee Report has been requested by both the Office of the Governor and the Office of the Treasurer and the Attorney General. corrects certain language presently found in the statutes that authorizes the Treasurer, does not require him to, but authorizes him, with the consent of the Governor, to invest state monies in certain investment certificates and other forms of investment securities issued by state or national banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It makes it clear that it is the banks that must be insured and not the securities issued. It incorporates the present so-called legal-list language presently found in Section 112. It gives it a new Section number as 113. So, all of the language beginning on page four which is underlined

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

is... is presently in the statute with the following exceptions: Section 5.1 which authorizes investment by pension funds in bonds issued by the State of Israel. That's presently in the law. Is... Includes common stocks issued by banks. It authorizes investment and money market funds and mortgage pools."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "As I take it, this Bill provides that certain sums of the General Assembly Retirement System can be invented...invested in certain programs. Am I right?"

Barr: "That's correct. It applies to all pension funds."

Stearney: "And am I also right that it provides that, before it can...that funds can be invested in a U. S. corporation, that that corporation had to have earnings in the five preceding years?"

Barr: "I'm sorry, Representative Stearney. Could you repeat your question?"

Stearney: "Does the Bill also provide in the Second Conference

Committee Report that, before General Assembly pension

funds can be invested, that that corporation had to have

earnings in the five preceding years?"

Barr: "No, Representative. I'm sorry. I... I misspoke. It does not apply to the General Assembly Pension Fund."

Stearney: "This Bill... Are you saying now that Senate ..."

Barr: "The General... Representative Stearney, I'm sorry. The
General Assembly Pension Fund investments are still
governed by the so-called Prudent Man Rule and not by the
language contained in this Bill."

Stearney: "Well, then what is the purpose of the language of the
Bill if we have the Prudent Man Rule that overrules the
language of this Bill?"

136th Legislative Day

- June 30. 1982
- Barr: "This Bill applies to certain other pension funds,

 Representative, but not the General Assembly Fund."
- Stearney: "Okay. Are you saying now that no... no funds of the General Assembly Pension Plan can be invested in these certain groups... classifications that are itemized in this Bill?"
- Barr: "As currently written, the answer is yes."
- Stearney: "Well, what does it mean as to pension funds being invested in corporations that have earnings in the five preceding years?"
- Barr: "Well, Representative Stearney, that's already the law."
- Stearney: "Well, if it was in the law, why is this language underlined? At least, it was in the First Conference Report."
- Barr: "No, because we're changing the Section number,

 Representative Stearney. That's the only reason."
- Stearney: "As a matter of fact, it's... it's underlined in the Second Committee... Conference Committee Report..."
- Barr: "It's underlined, Representative Stearney, because it is presently in the law in Section 112. Under the amended statute here it's ... the Section is changed. It's now Section 113. So, all of the language has to be underlined, but that is in the present law."
- Stearney: "So, is it the present law that the pension funds can be invested, not only in American corporations, but in foreign corporations?"
- Barr: "Yes."
- Stearney: "And, is it the present law that pension funds can be invested in American-owned banks and foreign-owned banks?"

 Barr: "Yes."
- Stearney: "Well, then what does the Bill do?"
- Barr: "Well, Representative Stearney, I did explain what it does.

 It makes a number of technical changes and corrections in

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

the investment authority of the State Treasurer and in the investment authority of the trustees of certain of the pension funds. Now, I'm not sure we have time for me to repeat everything that I said before."

Stearney: "Okay. I don't... I don't want to take up your time,
Mr. Barr, and the time of the House. So, I'll relinguish
any further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Piel: "Representative Barr, you stated that these funds had to be insured by either FSLIC or the FDIC. Is that correct?"

Barr: "No, the bank that issues them must be insured by the F...

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Piel: "Okay. What I'm doing is comparing page two, the part that's underlined. It says the FDIC. Then, page three, it's going back to the two previous paragraphs, and then it goes PSLIC. Shouldn't we have FSLIC in the second paragra... the second underlined paragraph, too?"

Barr: "No. Banks... this... The paragraph on page two refers only to banks. Banks are insured. It doesn't refer to savings and loans."

Piel: "But it's saying the last... On page three, Bob, that it does not have... these funds do not have to be insured?"

Barr: "No. The... It says that the certificates or securities described are not insured, and that corrects..."

Piel: "Bight."

Barr: "All that does, Representative Piel, is correct, in a drafting error in the present law which referred to the power to invest in securities which are insured when, in fact, it isn't the securities which are insured, it's the institution issuing the securities that are secured. This does not authorize investment and savings in loan

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

associations."

Piel: "Well, what I'm getting at is, why do we have the FSLIC in there? That shouldn't be in there, should it?"

Barr: "It says... it's to correct a mistake in the present law which referred to securities insured by the F... the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and there is no such thing. And so it just is taking... Really what's it's doing is taking that out."

Piel: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tuerk. Representative Karpiel."
Karpiel: "... previous question."

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

Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I've answered the questions, and I would urge a favorable Roll Call on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote. Timer's on,
Sir."

Lechowicz: ".. can't answer a question? Forget about it."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 57 'aye', 86 'no', 13 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion fails. House Bill 1060. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1060..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "... a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois
Housing Development Act."

136th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1982
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill has not been on the desks for an hour. I believe that's our rule."
- Speaker Daniels: "Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 2370, Representative J. J. Wolf. Representative Wolf, 2370."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various state agencies. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This is the omnibus appropriation Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Representative Piel. Representative Findley."
- Findley: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I've had this Bill on my desk for 33 minutes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf, J. J.: "It's been here, Mr. Speaker. I've had mine."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Piel.

 Representative Piel. Representative McAuliffe.

 Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Move the previous question."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Wolf, to close."
- Wolf, J. J.: "No further."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

 The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 46 'no', 12 voting 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

House Bill 2370. Senate Bill 740, Representative Terzich.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 740..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On 2370, I couldn't find it on any one of the Calendars. Could you show me where... Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we just received Supplemental #5 now, where 2370 appeared."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Senate Bill 740 is the Bill that covers the Chicago Police
and Fire Pension System. What is does, it provides the
Chicago firemen a post-retirement benefit of three percent
for those people who retire... who were born prior to
June... or January 1, 1930. It also provides a 50 dollar
increase in the minimum annuity for survivors. This has
been agreed by the City of Chicago, and it only pertains to
the Chicago Police and Pire Fund. It also has a state
mandate exclusion, and I'd appreciate your favorable
support."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'.

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

The 'ayes' have it. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Again, Mr. Speaker, this is still... it's an ad hoc.

It's been approved by the Pension Laws Commission and also
the City of Chicago. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this guestion there are 98 'aye', 49 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the

136th Legislative Day

June 30. 1982

House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 740. Senate (sic — House) Bill 2504. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the House to adopt the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2504. This does a couple of things. Creates the Inner-Agency Services Fund for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs which is what it originally did. It does several things in terms of clarifying the purchasing power. I think the only controversial part is the...that remains is the wording when it says, 'for the use of an agency'. That was the present law. Now there's a longer phrase inserted in there. Frankly, I'm not sure one or the other is that much more crucial. I would move adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Olson."

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

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there's some questions that the Membership would like to raise."

Speaker Daniels: "Your light was on, Sir. Proceed."

Lechowicz: "Well, first of all, let me just point out to this Membership, when I raised a question on 2370, that was an agency in Committee budget that was really a Christmas tree, and I don't believe we had fair debate on that one. And I believe that we should just slow down the process a little bit. These Conference Committee Reports that are being given to the Membership, and the Calendars, do not even correspond; and, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should just re—evaluate how we're operating at this time of the evening."

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Did you have any questions on this Bill, Sir?

Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker ... "

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

Reilly: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1060. House
Bill 1060. Representative Levin. Page four of the Cal...
Supplemental Calendar. Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, since I'm going to be opposing this

Conference Committee Report, I would yield to

Representative Getty."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would you take this out of the record for a minute, Mr.

Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Bouse Bill 1060, Representative Bonan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we accept the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate (sic - House) Bill 1060."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion?"

Ronan: "House Bill 1060."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it would very appropriate at this time to sing 'God Bless America'. God bless America..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. ... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that...that we accept the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1060. It's a very simple Conference Committee. All it does is..."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

no . "

Ronan: "... expand the..."

Speaker Daniels: "Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'aye', 36 'no', 18 'present', and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1060. ...three-fifths Majority, this Bill... House passes House Bill 1060 by a three-fifths Majority. House will stand at ease until 12:30. TV light is off. The House will come to order. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, can we have Introduction and First
Readings? Mr. Speaker, I now move the House stand
adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Daniels: "Five minutes for the Clerk."

Telcser: "With five or ten minutes for the Clerk."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning or this morning until 10:00 o'clock."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the
House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede
from their Amendment #5 to House Bill 2196. I am further
directed to inform the House that the Senate requests a
First Conference Committee, action taken by the Senate June
30, 1982', Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the
Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I am
directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate
has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their
Amendments to Senate Bill 1599, action taken by the Senate

136th Legislative Day

June 30, 1982

June 30, 1982', Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: *Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee to Senate Bill 1398 and requests a Second Conference Committee, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee and requests a Second Conference Committee to Senate Bill 1452, action taken June 30, 1982', Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate had adopted First Conference Committee of the following Bills: Senate Bill 423, 1386 and 1416, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1982', Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee to the following Bills: House Bill 2266 and Senate Bill 740, 1285, 1402, 1445, 1514, 1374, 1399 and 1397, adopted by the Senate June 30, 1982', Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."

09/30/82 09:37

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

JUNE 30, 1982

PAGE

1

HB-1060	CONFERENCE		PAGE	153
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	72
HB-1271	CONFERENCE		PAGE	74
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	101
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	78
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	108
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	23
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	24
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	31
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	35
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	53
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	39
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	40
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	40
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	3
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	2
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	41
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	41
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	42
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	43
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	43
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	44
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	74
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	46
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	18
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	47
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	49
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	50
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	150
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	50
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	51
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	51
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	152
	CONCURRENCE		PAGE	52
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	83
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	151
	NON-CONCURRENCE		PAGE	3
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	86
SB-1183			PAGE	14
SB-1184			PAGE	17
	NON-CONCURRENCE		PAGE	4
	CONFERENCE	9	PAGE	4
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	60
SB-1193			PAGE	56
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	81
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	113
	NON-CONCURRENCE		PAGE	55
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	109
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	111
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	110
	NON-CONCURRENCE		PAGE	84
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	112
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	112
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	114
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	138
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	115
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	115
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	117
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	118
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	121
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	124
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	122
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	122
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	123
	CONFERENCE		PAGE	124

09/30/82 09:37

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

PAGE

JUNE 30, 1982

SB-1422	CONFERENCE	PAGE	125	
SB-1422	CONFERENCE	PAGE	139	
SB-1425	CONFERENCE	PAGE	127	
SB-1426	CONFERENCE	PAGE	129	
SB-1427	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55	
SB-1427	CONFERENCE	PAGE	129	
SB-1428	CONFERENCE	PAGE	133	
SB-1445	CONFERENCE	PAGE	134	
SB-1452	CONFERENCE	PAGE	78	
SB-1452	CONFERENCE	PAGE	85	
SB-1452	CONFERENCE	PAGE	145	
SB-1514	CONFERENCE	PAGE	137	

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER PETERS	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER BEVERIDGE	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	8
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	68
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	69
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	71
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	71
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	78
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	99
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	99
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	101
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	115
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	128
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	154
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	154