80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order and the Members will please be in their seats. The House will be lead in prayer by the Reverend Anthony Tzortzis from St. Anthony Hellenic Orthodox Church."
- Reverend Tzortzis: "In peace, let us pray to the Lord. Glory to Thee, O Lord, our God, glory to Thee. O Heavenly King and Comforter, the spirit of truth who art everywhere present and fillest all things, the treasury of the blessings, and giver of life, come and dwell in the hearts of the Speaker and Members of this House. Purify them from every stain and of Thy goodness save their souls. Amen. Good morning. God bless you."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by our new Member, Representative Olson."
- Olson 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 Daniels: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the Roll, Mr. Clerk. There being 171 Members present and answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. Introduction and First Reading of Bills."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1953, Kornowicz, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to increase the fee for issuing Commissions and...to notary publics, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1954, Vinson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Cigarette Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1955, Levin Cullerton Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1956, Frederick et al, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board and to the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Department of Agriculture, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1957. Schraeder, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Comptroller, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1958, Peters, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the administration of federal block grants and to amend an Act herein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1959, Peters, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1960, Peters, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relationship to state finance, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1961, Peters, a Bill for an Act to appropriate various block grant funds, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1962, Levin - Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1963, Levin - Cullerton, a Bill for an Act creating the Property Tax Multiplier Study Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1964, Steczo, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to township organization, First Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Daniels: "Excused absences. Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may the record indicate that Representative
 Ozella is excused because of official business?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Hearing no objections, the record will so show.

 Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May the record show that
 Representative Betty Lou Reed is excused because of
 legislative business and Representative Stearney is excused
 because of illness in the family?"
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so show. Agreed Resolutions.

 Representative Collins."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 515, Jane Barnes; 516, Pechous; 517, Pechous; 518, Wikoff; 519, Kornowicz; 521, Keane; 522,

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Johnson; 524, Johnson; 525, Currie - et al; 526, Kelly - et al; and 527, Koehler; 528, Bower."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 515, Jane Barnes, congratulates Brother Hennessy of the Congregation of Christian Brothers on his 25th anniversary. Resolution 516, Pechous, congratulates Richard E. Zitner and Deborah A. Pruger on their marriage on October 3. Pechous, congratulates the Second Ward Women's Regular Democratic Organization of Berwyn on their 50th anniversary. 518, Wikoff, congratulates Mr. Erland Kondrup of Arthur, Illinois on his outstanding contributions to his community. House Resolution 519, Kornowicz, congratulates Mr. and Mrs. P. Lawrence Kowalski on their golden wedding anniversary. House Resolution 521, Keane, commends fire protection agencies throughout the state. 522. Representative Johnson congratulates Alison Krauss on winning the Illinois State Fair's iunior fiddling championship. 524, Representative Johnson, congratulates Tom Parkhill for winning the Illinois State Amateur tournament. House Resolution 525, Currie - et al. represents...or congratulates the Daily Calumet on its 100th anniversary. 526, Representative Kelly, congratulates St. Damian Church on their 20th anniversary as a parish. 528, Representative Koehler, congratulates Forrest W. Lemons on his 80th birthday. And Ryan - Oblinger - et al, congratulates Resolution 47, Operation Snowball which is a...thank you, Sparky, organization dealing with high school alcohol and drug abuse. Mr. Speaker, I would move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying

80th Legislative Day

- October 15, 1981
- 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "Death Resolution. House Resolution 528, Bower, in respect to the memory of Robert Heath."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution adopted. Page nine of the Calendar, Order of Amendatory Veto Motions. On the Calendar under amendatory veto appears House Bill 46. On that Motion, the Gentleman, Representative Wikoff."
- Wikoff: "Okay, now we're on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wait till

 I get the page open. You surprised me."
- Speaker Daniels: "Page nine, amendatory veto Motions. House Bill 46, Representative Wikoff."
- Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 46 in the manner and form as follows. And basically this was amended by adding the following line on page two line four of House Bill 46: 'The court may give special consideration to the interest of relatives or other third parties who may have posted a money bond on behalf of the defendant to secure his release.' I think the Governor's veto message in the book is rather self explanatory, if I can find it again, and I would move for acceptance of...of the Governor's amendatory veto."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Wikoff, what is going to be used as the authenticating reason that, or the authentication that it is someone else's money other than the defendant? What are you going to use? What type of system are you going to use to determine that?"

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman indicates he will yield.

Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "The...as it was amended by the Governor, the Bill as it was originally passed doesn't allow the use of the bonds funds posted by defendant's relatives which are found not to belong to the Governor (sic). And the Governor recommended this deposit be available at the discretion of the...at the discretion of the court rather than a complete prohibition. Basically, the reason for doing this is to keep the defendants or those posting the bond as...instead of posting it themselves, having a relative post it so that it would be prohibited. This basically just closes a loophole that was in the law as it came across."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi."

- Giorgi: "Representative Wikoff, the bond form doesn't show where
 the bond money came from. How are you going to
 authenticate where the bond money came from? Is it going
 to take another hearing? Is there going to be another fee
 charged? How are you determining the authentication of
 where the money came from? It doesn't show on the bond
 form, if you've ever seen a bond form."
- Wikoff: "I have never been in a position where I ve had to post a bond. Maybe you have and..."
- Giorgi: "That is no shame nor is that a disgrace, but tell me how you plan to do it."
- Wikoff: "I will leave that to the more learned attorneys who are in here. There was a reason..."
- Giorgi: "That is the trouble with the Bill. Mr. Speaker,..."
- Speaker Daniels: "To the Bill, Sir."
- Giorgi: "You know, I think that was an insult to the people in the State of Illinois that have to use the court system to post a bond that a Representative from Champaign would indicate that a guy should be ashamed or disgraced that he

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

had to use a bond to get out of some problem that was created by some lawyer or some guy like Wikoff. But anyway, the point is there is nothing on the bond form that indicates where the money came from. And the attorney goes in before the judge and says, 'We're going to...the bond is \$200. The fine is \$35. Make the bond out to myself and the defendant.', and there is no indication on there whether the grandfather, the grandmother, the sister, the brother put the bond money up. Now, I think this Bill is very deficient in that regard, and I think you ought to withdraw this until he at least gets a correction notice from the Governor."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, to close."
- Wikoff: "I would only close that the court can take this into consideration. I would ask for an affirmative vote on the Motion to accept."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 46 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 94 'ayes', 39 'no', and 10 voting 'present'. The Motion having received Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 46 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 76, Representative Terzich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 76, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act..."
- Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, am I in...I would like to make a Motion we table Motion #1 to override." -

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Motion #1 is withdrawn."

Terzich: "Alright, and to adopt my Motion #2 which is to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. House Bill 76, which of course is really a great piece of legislation that unanimously passed the House, provides for the Department of Human Rights to bring people under national origin under the...the Code. The Governor vetoed the message since the fact that it was unable to administer the program under the present Bill. And what he has done is he has assigned it to the Department to determine which nationalities have been discriminated against. And even though I am not necessarily happy with the amendatory veto, it is still a foot in the door that the Department will review this, and I would make a Motion that we will accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "As I understand it, you're trying to accept one part of this and reject the other part."

Terzich: "No, what it is is that he amended the Bill and set it
up that the Department would review what nationalities were
discriminated against and take affirmative action after
having it presented to the Board."

Ewell: "Well, you're asking to accept the Bill as amendatorily vetoed."

Terzich: "Yes, I am accepting the Governor's amendatory veto."

Ewell: "Alright."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 76 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 139 'aye', 14 'no', and six voting 'present'.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 76 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 103. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Motion: 'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 103.'

 Representative Abramson."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Yourell, do you wish to handle that, Sir? On the Motion, Representative Yourell."
- Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor relative to House Bill 103 in the manner and form as follows. The Amendment to House Bill 103 amends House Bill 103 on page one line 30 by deleting 18% and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 12% for purchases occurring before the effective date of this amendatory Act of 1981 and 18% for purchases occurring on or after such effective date. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the specific recommendation of the Governor."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 103 by adoption of the Amendment?". All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 156 'aye', four 'nay', and three voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 103 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 129. Read

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Motion: "I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 129 in the manner and the form as follows." Representative Hallstrom."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hallstrom. Ladies and Gentlemen, the TV lights are on. Representative Hallstrom."
- Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ι ф accept nove to the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 129 in the manner and form as follows: Amendment to House Bill 129 amends House Bill 129 on page one and line 31 by changing \$30,000 to \$25,000, and on page two in lines 9, 15, 31, and 33 by changing \$30,000 to \$25,000, and on page three line three by changing \$30,000 to \$25,000. And I would ask that the House please accept the Motion."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 129 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 165 'aye', one 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 129 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 158. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 158 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Giorgi."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation. What it allows is that...it refines the language that allows one or more counties or one or more municipalities to have the same ordinance governing raffles and chances, and it also allows special categories for special instances as exemplified in the letters I showed you from DuPage County. But the Governor did veto out the language allowing the Election Committees to conduct raffles and chances. He vetoed that out, and I move for the adoption of the report."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 158 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. are 163 'aye', none voting 'nay', six voting *present*. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 158 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 239. the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion: "I move that House Bill 239 do pass the

Governor's specific recommendations for change

notwithstanding'. Representative Davis."

Speaker Daniels: "That is Motion #1. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am moving to override the Governor's amendatory veto with the full consent of the Governor. We negotiated some language in addition to what is contained in House Bill 239 on the Child Murder Death Penalty Statute of which we have had debated here at great length over the past 10

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

months and has passed this chamber overwhelmingly and the other chamber equally overwhelmingly. In negotiations, we had decided to incorporate other provisions that are perceived as lacking in the Capital Punishment Statute, but as recently as last week in conversations with the Governor, he agreed that perhaps those conditions are better addressed in another Bill. That Bill is now drafted and will be introduced this afternoon under my Sponsorship along with Representative Kosinski. So with the full permission and full consent of the Governor, I now move to override the amendatory veto language in House Bill 239."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Davis, in our veto analysis, we have
an indication that the Governor was using this Bill as a
vehicle to completely rewrite the Illinois Felony Murder
Statute. And I didn't follow from your explanation as to
whether or not that is going to remain in this Bill or
not."

Davis: "No, all of the language that you have in front of you that is vehicular relating to felony murder, witness murder and inclu...further inclusions in the Death Penalty, are being removed by this override. The Bill will be returned to the provisions of House Bill 239 as it was passed by this House and by the Senate."

Cullerton: "So the Bill will be exactly as it passed both Houses and..."

Davis: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Just as if the Governor had signed it."

Davis: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester? Further discussion? Representative Davis to close."
- Davis: "I simply would ask for a favorable vote, with the Governor's consent to the Republican side. You're not voting against the Governor. You're voting with him."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 239 pass notwith...notwithstanding Governor's the specific recommendations for change? . All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. are 148 'aye', 18 'nay', none voting 'present'. This having received a three-fifths Constitutional Motion Majority prevails, and House Bill 239 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for House Bill change. 239. Motion #2 is withdrawn. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk." Bill 381.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 381. 'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor to House Bill 381 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Rea."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I withdraw Motion #1 and want to move with Motion #2. I move to accept the..."

Speaker Daniels: "Motion #1 is withdrawn. Motion #2."

Rea: "I move to accept the recommendations of the Governor as to
House Bill 381 in manner and form as follows: In line 21
by deleting 'total of the fair cash market value' and
inserting in lieu thereof 'net book value'. And in line 25
by deleting 'fair cash market value' and inserting in lieu
thereof 'book values'. This will make it simpler in terms
of the accounting and will not require the Department of

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Revenue to have to make an appraisal each year. So I move for the acceptance of the recommendation. $^{\rm n}$

Speaker Daniels: "We're on Motion #2. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 381 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nav'. voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 166 'aye', no 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, Governor's and the House accepts the specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 381 by House Bill...Representative adoption of the Amendment. Getty, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Parliamentary Inquiry.

It would appear that House Bill 381 has an immediate effective date. In making its declaration, the Chair has just declared that it received a Constitutional Majority.

I believe in order to have an immediate effective date, assuming the Senate were to concur in our action, that a declaration that it has a Constitutional three-fifths Majority would be in order notwithstanding the fact that the Chair and the record would indicate it had 166 votes. It is only as to a matter of form, but I think to remove any ambiguity, that the Chair should rule on that."

Speaker Daniels: "I am advised by the Parliamentarian that since the Bill has received 166 votes, the record is clear and the question on the three-fifths Majority is moot because the record is clear. Thank you, Representative Getty, for raising the question. House Bill 430, Representative Polk. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 430, 'I move to accept the specific

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 430 in the manner and form as follows. Representative Polk."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to accept the recommendations set forth by the Governor's veto on 430, as it just corrects a technical problem in the Section of the statutes dealing with loans secured by residential real estate. This does not affect, in any way, consumer loans or consumer lending. It affects corporations only. 430 was not touched at all. 438 was the Section that was necessary to change, and we're accepting the Governor's amendatory veto. Appreciate your support."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? On the Motion, Representative

John Dunn, from Macon."

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

Polk: "He will."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Dunn: "My analysis indicates that the effect of this amendatory veto, if approved, would be to allow prepayment charges on consumer installment loans that were not previously authorized. Is that correct?"

Polk: "That's not correct."

Dunn: "It is not? What is the impact of this particular amendatory veto then?"

Polk: "It's commercial and industrial loans. It has nothing to do with the consumer loan."

Dunn: "I seem to recall, during the debate on the House Bill 438, that there was debate about prepayment charges, and I thought that Bill did not provide for them. Are these provided for now elsewhere?"

Polk: "It does... 438 does prohibit it from residential real estate. That's as the law is now and the change in 438

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

was... This is just going to clarify that and bring it back the way it was before. It does not affect residential."

Dunn: "But does it allow the charging of penalties for prepayment? Does it permit that, in any instance, where it was not permitted before?"

Polk: "My analysis says no."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Polk: "You're welcome."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to vote 'no' this morning on this amendatory veto. I'm going to vote for against it because of my belief that the Governor's power to amendatorily veto legislation has some limitations to it. What happened, in this case, is that House Bill 438 passed. There was an error in that Bill, and so what the Governor has done here is to amendatorily veto House Bill 430 with some changes that he might like to have made in What we are doing, therefore, is giving House Bill 438. the Governor broad, broad powers never intended by the Constitution. This amendatory veto is far beyond the scope of the power of the Governor to amendatorily veto a Bill. I think that bond people, people who sell bonds, should be very nervous - very, very nervous as to the validity of those bonds, if they follow this Bill. Accordingly, for consumers and for those nervous bond holders, I certainly don't want to confound their problems, and I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none,...Representative Dunn, Gentleman from Macon."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would take this out of the record for a minute so I can ask him some questions.

I really think there's a misunderstanding about the impact

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

of this amendatory veto at this time."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "I think the staff have agreed now that we're ...at least our staffs agree that what we said is correct. I'd like to go ahead with it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Dunn: "When it is... When House Bill 438 was passed, which removed the interest ceiling on consumer installment loans, my recollection is that there was a clear indication in that Bill that there would be no prepayment charges loans were prepaid. That part of the Bill was amended in to help sell that Bill. It is my understanding that the law provided that there could be prepayment earlier charges, but the prepayment charges in the earlier law were in there because the interest rates were low. To authorize sky high interest rates in House Bill 438, the provision that provided for elimination of prepayment charges was added to help sell the Bill. Now, those who supported House Bill 438 have what they want. That Bill is law. Now they can charge as high an interest rate as they want. The sky is the limit, and they want to come along and tell the consumer, if he prepays his loan, he's got to pay a penalty because he was fortunate enough to have a loan on the books with a low interest rate. This is misleading this General Assembly, and we should reject this veto, this amendatory veto and vote against this."

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

Polk: "Well, it's so typical of what will happen on one Bill that... 430 is not in question. I don't think Representative Dunn or Representative Greiman is making any

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

question in regard to 430 itself, which is the Bill that I sponsored. 438, in itself, does not affect consumer lending. That was a question that I thought we clarified earlier. And in relation to the prepayment of the loan; if a corporation, and again I say to those who are not necessarily always supporting corporations, but if a corporation goes out and borrows a million dollars... wants to borrow a million dollars from a small bank. The bank says, 'I don't have a million dollars, but I can go out and borrow that million so that you can have a loan from your local, home-town bank . He says to them, I am going to charge you 16% because it's costing me 14%'. They have to have the right to cover that 14% in case the corporation determines that they can pay the loan off earlier. That's all this does. From my understanding, that is the current That is the current law, and we're simply bringing that back into effect after 438 was vetoed. And so, clear to me or at least it's clear to me and I'm not a banker, but it seems to me that it has been clarified. Again, it does not affect the consumer. It's corporations only, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 430 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted to explain his vote."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, I think that some of my colleagues were in error when they talked about consumer loans. This does not cover consumer loans. It simply puts the law back into effect the way it was prior to the passage of 438. This affects the sale of

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

bonds. It affects commercial loans in the state, but it has nothing to do with mortgages. It has nothing to do with revolving credit loans. Unless we put it back into the way the law read prior to the enactment of the 438, we are going to cause numerous problems in both the bond market and in the banking industry's loans to industry in the state. And I don't think that's what the General Assembly intends to do. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr."
- Barr: "I'd like the record to show that, although I personally favor this Motion, I am prevented from voting in favor of it because of a conflict of interest, and; therefore, I vote 'present'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 131 'aye', 27 'nay', 9 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 430 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 514. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: ""I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 514 in the manner and form as follows". Representative Greiman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Nr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Governor amendatorily vetoed out a...that part of this Bill that would deal with the treatment of property in a divorce settlement. Under the Internal Revenue Code, there is a question whether a transfer taxed. The Governor believed that there would be a slight impact on the fiscal condition of the state. And on that issue, while I would disagree with them, I am, you know, not going to battle it.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

The other part of the Bill deals with child...with the standards to be used in Section 610 of the Marriage and Dissolution Act, and is recommended by the Bar Association initially. I would ask, therefore, that there be acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "A question of the Sponsor?"

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

Currie: "I am concerned about the part of the Bill that was not subject to the amendatory veto, the Bill that was passed by the House last spring involving the question of standards in change in custody of children - part of the proposal.

Does the new standard proposed by House Bill 514, in deciding when custody cases shall be reopened, apply to matters that are now pending before the courts?"

Greiman: "Well, it would be our...the intention certainly here that House Bill 514 not be intended to imply to pending cases or petitions for change of custody. It would be grossly unfair to change the standard of proof in the middle of a trial or proceeding."

Currie: "Thank you. I see."

Greiman: "Also...yes..."

Currie: "I have a second question which is the evidence standard, the change in effect...could you give us some language to explain for the record and for us exactly what the intention of the change in the evidence standard is? What does 'clear and convincing evidence', for example, mean in the language of that...of that Bill?"

Greiman: "Well, thank you. The first thing is standard of proof necessary for a change of custody under Section 610 will apply only, only by clear and convincing evidence which term, when applied to the best interest of the child, is

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

not the same standard used in originally granting custody under Sections 602. Under Section 610, Ms. Currie, after the effective date of this Act, a person seeking to change custody will continue to carry an extraordinary strict The combination of the term *clear and burden of proof. convincing evidence test with the word 'necessary' ensures that a mere preponderance of evidence will not be enough to judge to change custody. The legislative allow a objective is still to discourage custodial changes and to encourage custodial stability by placing a very difficult evidence burden on anyone seeking to modify an existing custodial order. The standard, therefore, is not the same standard under Section 602. And having explained that, I hope that it will be clear."

Currie: "Thank you very much."

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

Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Representative Greiman, I thought the portion of your Bill that endeavors to help people with the tax consequences of division of property was excellent, and I thought our Legislature made a strong statement in passing that Bill. And I am wondering why you are not seeking to over...or to restore the language or to override the amendatory veto."

Greiman: "Well, I think...I decided...personal, you know, decision certainly, that the fiscal implications that the Governor raised, whether they re valid or not, were probably the kind of thing that in this kind of complex economy and tight revenue-producing situation we probably would not be..we ought be pushing. There are lots of priorities and lots of revenue sources and this is really a small one. I am going to file the Bill again next year so that the Bill will come up just on this issue alone and I

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

didn't want to affect the other parts of the Bill. But I agree with you. I think you're perfectly right."

Deuster: "Thank you.."

Greiman: "Maybe we'll jointly sponsor it."

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

Greiman: "Just a favorable vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 514 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 152 'aye', 7 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails accepts Governor's House the specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 514 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 515. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 515 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Greiman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, House Bill 515."

Greiman: "This was also part of the package submitted by the Bar Association. It makes a number of changes. One of the things the Governor...the only thing that the Governor objected to in this was the question of allowing people to agree on...agree on continuing maintenance after death, and that was covered in another Bill, Senate Bill 267, so that I would just ask that we accept the Governor's recommendation for change."

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

'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 515 by adoption of the Amendment?*. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 158 'aye', 1 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 515 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 542. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 542 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Jacob Wolf."

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

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. The Governor deleted a Section of this Bill which allowed the expenses to be recovered by cities or counties for periodic imprisonment ordered by a court, for example, where a prisoner might serve on a weekend or evenings, for instance. The Governor deleted this Section because if the prisoner isn't ordered by the court to reimburse the local jail, the Department of Corrections would be required to pay. And I think this was not the intent of the original Bill, and I would move to accept the Governor's specific amendatory veto."

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

'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific
recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 542
by adoption of the Amendment?'. All those in favor signify
by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's
open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 158
'ayes', none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 542 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 598. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 598 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Chapman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman, House Bill 598."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which amends the downstate teachers' article of the Pension Code. Deals to provide equity for a very small number of teachers. Will not cost the state any money. What the Governor has done in his amendatory veto is to delete the Section that relates to firemen's pension. The Bill, as the Governor has presented to us, is essentially the Bill as it was introduced in the House. It does the job that needs to be done, and I ask for your vote to accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Sha 11 the House accept the Governor's recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 598 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 159 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, Governor's the House accepts the specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 598 by Bill 623. Read the adoption of the Amendment. House Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 623 do pass the Governor's specific recommendations for change notwithstanding'.

Representative Dwight Friedrich."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Friedrich on the Motion."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the reason I have filed this Motion to override is the fact that the Governor's amendatory veto really made the Bill meaningless and with the Amendment, I would not even vote to concur in because the Bill...it does away with the Bill completely. Number one, I would point out to you that Bill does not apply to either the rural areas or the municipalities in counties over 200,000 or in areas where there is probability of pollution. Ιt does permit municipalities in the rest of the state to burn tree limbs and trees and landscape waste where it does not create a health hazard. Now, I want to point out some of the things it does not do. It does not prevent municipalities or counties from passing ordinances to prevent burning of any kind. It still provides that the EPA can step in there...if any person presents evidence that the burning creates a health hazard. And it does not prevent individuals from bringing suits or injunction where someone is burning and creating a problem for them. Actually, this Bill was introduced in the beginning because in my own town it costs \$30,000 a year to burn...to bury the trees in much needed landfill space and serves no useful purpose. I would tell you that this Bill was sponsored in the House by Representative Winchester, Representative Piel, Representative Polk. Representative Alstat, and Representative Flinn. It passed the House 129 to 4. Ιt passed the Senate 58 to nothing. I think the objections that were raised during the time the Bill was in progress have all been met, and I would certainly appreciate your vote to override this veto of the Governor's."

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

'Shall House Bill 623 pass notwithstanding the Governor's

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

specific recommendations for change?". All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 133 'aye', 25 'nay', one voting 'present'. The Hotion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and House Bill 623 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 663, Representative Christensen. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 663 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Christensen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to accept the specific recommendation of the Governor on House Bill 663. What the Governor did was veto out the part of the Bill that would allow elected or appointed officials to furnish labor or material to a municipality. And the reason he vetoed that out, it is covered in another Bill that he had signed earlier."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 663 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will Vote opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 154 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 663 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 681. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Clerk Leone: "I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 681 in the manner and form as follows. Representative Macdonald."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Macdonald, House Bill 681."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the There is no Motion that you can file to say that you reluctantly accept the Governor's specific recommendations. I have talked with my Senate Sponsor. have talked with my former Sponsor, Cal Skinner, and we have agreed that we will, as a beginning - half a loaf is better than none - so we will accept the Governor's recommendation on the check-off non-game wildlife Bill, Governor has changed the \$10 limit and 681. recommended \$1, \$3, or \$5 for the check-off. deleted the language of the Bill that states that the intent of the General Assembly is to supplement any existing fund and in no way replace existing funding. The change also recommends the fund and requires the Department of Revenue to be paid the cost of administrating the which is \$130,000. Basically, that is what the major changes are, and I would have hoped to have left it at \$10, and I would hope that we would not have had to have that much money estimated at funding this Bill. But it is a beginning, and it is an important environmental Bill, and I would like your support on accepting the recommendations of the Governor."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 681 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 161 'aye', 5

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

'nay', 3 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 681 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 694, Representative Levin. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "*I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 694 in the manner and form as follows. Representative Levin."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin on the Motion."

Levin: "Nr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...House
Bill 694 amends the School Code, the part of the School
Code relating to Special Education due process appeals
procedures by making several changes. The Governor
disagreed with one of those changes which was intended to
clarify the authority of hearing officers based on the
evidence to recommend specific placements of children. We
accept that change although we disagree with it and urge
the adoption of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 694 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 164 'aye', none voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 694 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 787. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion: "I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 787 in the manner and form as follows". Representative Woodyard."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard, House Bill 787."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to accept the specific recommendation on the amendatory veto on 787. The only change in the Bill was that the Governor will receive a report from the Department of Agriculture in addition to the beekeepers. And knowing the Governor's deep concern over the plight of the honeybees, I would move to accept this veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 787 by adoption of the Amendment?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 161 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 787 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 846. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: ""I move to accept the specific recommendation of the Governor as to House Bill 846 in the manner and form as follows". Representative Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to accept the specific recommendation of the Governor on this veto. This concerns public hearings with housing authorities. The Bill was originally drafted that a public hearing must be held before any contract could be entered into. And it was felt that this would be too unwieldy, and thus it was changed to read, 'before any construction actually begins, a public hearing must be held'. And I would move for the acceptance of the veto."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 846 by adoption of the Amendment?". All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 163 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 846 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 858. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion: 'I move that the House Bill 858 do pass the
Governor's specific recommendations for change
notwithstanding'. Representative Jones."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones, Motion #1 for override." Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's specific change in this Bill because this Bill passed both Houses overwhelmingly and I wish to restore it to its original order. The Amendment that I accepted in this Bill which the Governor decided to change through amendatory veto would provide for those school districts who render a health care services for not-for-profit corporations for the children in their school districts, that they can levy a property tax. The area that is affected is one of the poorest school districts in the State of Illinois. That is the Posen - Robbins School District. The Mayor of both towns, the village Board, all want this Amendment, and I recommend that we override the Governor's amendatory change and restore the Bill back to its original notwithstanding the Governor's change for recommendation." Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Knox,

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Representative McMaster."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Emil, in reading the Governor's message in our veto book, I find that the change from a front door referendum to a back door referendum was added in Conference Committee. Is this right, Emil?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "That is correct."

McMaster: "That is correct? In other words, you don't want a front door referendum. You do want the back door."

Jones: "I would yield to Representative Terry Steczo because I accepted the Amendment because it affected a school district in his legislative area. So I would yield to Representative Terry Steczo on that."

McMaster: "Well, just a minute, Emil. I thought your Motion was to override, not to accept."

Jones: "It is to override."

McMaster: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster? Further discussion? Representative Steczo."

Members of the Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House. Representative Jones was correct by saying that this affects one of the poorest school districts in country...or in the state rather. The one thing that you don't read in the Governor's amendatory veto Motion is that this tax increase would be only for a period of four years. This health care service run bу profit...not-for-profit organization is currently funded by foundation funds. The school district came to us and said, *There may be a possibility that some of these funds are lost. We hope that they are not. We hope that we can continue funding these health care services through

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

foundation grants. However, we would like, just in case, to have the opportunity for four years only to levy this by back door referendum. There is a self-destruct provision in it that provides that after four years this tax is deleted from the statutes and the health care service corporation in School District 143 1/2 provides a valuable service to the residents there. And the residents of both Posen and Robbins think it is important and the school district thinks it is important and feel that they would like to have this opportunity, should they need it, to levy for these purposes."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, will the Sponsor of the Motion yield to a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones? Indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Jones, this Bill came down a couple of times in Elementary and Secondary Committee over the past few years. It is my understanding that not only does it only affect one district now, but the language in the Bill as it went to the Governor clearly could only affect that district ever because it relates to the effective date and having the program, in fact, enforced at this time, so that that would be the only district that would ever be affected by the Bill."

Jones: "That is correct."

Stuffle: "Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Hopefully in order to clarify the issue a little further, I would like to point out that this particular school district has been running a health program with a grant from a private foundation for a number of years. It

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

has proved to be a very effective program in that particular school district given the make-up of that particular population. This is a...this is an attempt by the Members of that district to provide a base upon which to maintain the program that they have in effect, which, by the way, Ladies and Gentlemen, is well received by the community. I, for one, am familiar with that program and I, for one, stand in support of the continuation of that program which this override will provide."

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

- Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In order that...in order for that corporation to receive funds under the provisions of this legislation, they would have to be running a deficit. It is not a situation wherein that tax would be levied and the monies be used. Because this corporation is a not-for-profit corporation, they would have to be running in the red. The House passed this legislation last June. The Mayors of both towns, the village Board, they want this legislation. This is the poorest school district in the State of Illinois. And I ask for an 'aye' vote on my Motion."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall the House Bill 858 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?". All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay', and the voting's open.

 Explanation of vote. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."
- Schneider: "Thank you....thank you, Mr. Speaker. Most of the salient points for the debate have been made. That is to say, the language only affects the district of Posen.

 Other points that ought to be raised, however, are that it is only in the event the district wants it that they would

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

go to a back door referendum for the purposes of this tax. By deflection, the Governor seems to think that if you add a tax, it would go into the operating tax rate. That is no longer a problem because of the School Aid Formula changes of the past. So it isn't going to give them any advantage or a leg up over state aid. It is basically for the programs, and as Representative Hoffman points out, it's the kind of program that has been beneficial to this area. It is a local district choice. There is no reason why those of us outside of Posen ought to be against the Bill simply because the Governor thinks it has some relationship to that operating tax base. It does not have that relationship. People have an opportunity to vote on it if they so desire. It seems to me to make emminent good The Legislators out of Posen understand that. I think it is a good Bill, and I would solicit your vote to override the Governor's veto."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I want to say is that since this has got the votes, there is no sense in going into it.

 It is a health care issue, and I am happy to see so many green votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye', 59 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Poll the absentees."
- Speaker Daniels: "Poll of the absentees. Representative
 Leinenweber."
- Leinenweber: "By inadvertence, I don't know how I did this, but I pushed the green. I want to be recorded 'no' on this."
- Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Leinenweber from 'aye' to

80th Legislative Day

- October 15. 1981
- 'no'. Representative Conti."
- Conti: "If this should prevail, I would like to have a verification of the Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir. Representative Cullerton wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Alright, there are 106 'aye'. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Foll of the absentees: Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph

 Dunn. Dwight Friedrich. Karpiel. Macdonald. Ozella.

 Reed. Stearney, and C. M. Stiehl."
- Speaker Daniels: "There are 106 'aye', 60 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion fails. Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You see, I was trying to get your attention because there are some individuals who want to change their vote on your side of the aisle. I wish you would have recognized them."
- Speaker Daniels: "Nobody here that wants to change their vote, Representative Jones. Further Motions on that Bill?"
- Jones: "Mr. Speaker?..."
- Clerk Leone: "Motion #2: 'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 858 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Jones."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jones, Motion #2."
- Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Motion is self-explanatory, and I ask for an 'aye' vote on the Motion."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 858 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 168 'aye', one 'no', none voting 'present'. The Motion having received a

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 858 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 979. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: ""I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 979 in the manner and form as follows". Representative Currie."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie on the Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 979 is a work product of the Sunset Committee. Ιt extends and improves the Structural Pest Control Act. The Governor's amendatory veto did not affect the substantive legislation. It did remove, however, an Amendment that was adopted by the General Assembly that would change the structure of the Sunset Committee itself. While I think the Governor's amendatory veto paid little heed to real problems with the structure and the working of that Committee, it may be that our original recommendation for change was not the best. So I would urge that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto to House Bill 979, and I would appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, accept the Governor's specific House 'Shall the recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 979 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Nr. Clerk. 167 'aye', 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 979 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1049. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1049 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Ewing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's recommended changes in House Bill 1049. Very simply, he took out some language which restated part of the rule of the Administrative Procedure Act requiring when certain rules are promulgated for them to go through that procedure. The Bill, though, only called for one of the criteria. In this regard, the Administrative Procedure Act applies without regard to the language which the Governor removed and his basis for removing that it would be a conflicting definition and could cause litigation. And, I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1049 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 163 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1049 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1127. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Motion #1: 'I move that House Bill 1127 do pass

the Governor's specific recommendations for change
notwithstanding'. Representative Roman."

Speaker Daniels: "On Motion #1, Representative Roman."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

very simple override Motion. I'm sure most of my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to support this. All this does, Motion #1, is to establish the Gang Crime We can fight the battle Study Commission. the appropriation down the road. But as everyone in the General Assembly knows, for the last two years we've worked having a special Committee of the House to look at the problems of gang crimes in the City of Chicago. What this would do would set up the mechanism for a formal Commission to work in the City of Chicago to ... to look at this most serious problem. All you have to do is look at the most recent headlines on the tremendous growth of youth gangs all over the city, especially on the south side and the west side. There's been just an unbelievable growth in the drug traffic and illegal theft of auto parts and things like that. It's a very large money operation. And I think it's important that we address this most serious issue from the legislative perspective. As I said, my major concern right now is to keep this substantive language on the later point we can look at an books, and at a appropriation. So I urge everyone to at least give us the opportunity to keep the substantive language on the books. And I move for an override."

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

Stanley: "Thank you...thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Also contained within the veto is the Suburban Problems Task Force that passed this House in the spring. And I'm asking that this Motion to override...that we pass this Motion to override. Creation of a Suburban Problems Task Porce is unique, but I certainly think it's the right way to go out and hold some public hearings and conduct some kinds of things in the suburban areas that

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

look at the questions of mass transportation and all the other kinds of problems that are confronting us. I think it is not just another Commission. It has a one year life expectancy. The Members are not paid, and I think it's the right thing for the suburban area and suburban Legislators. Please, let's get together, and stand, and vote for this Motion to override. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Ronan to close."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just urge everyone on both sides of the aisle to give us an opportunity to...to get this substantive language put on the books. These are serious issues that the Legislature should be involved with. As I said, we can look at the appropriation Bills later on today or tomorrow. But at least let's have the substantive language on the books so they can review these most serious problems, and I urge everyone to give me a green vote on this very important issue."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall House Bill 1127 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?". All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 95 'aye', 55 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. Representative Koehler, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Koehler: "Mr. Speaker, I think that there was some confusion on this. I would like to ask Representative..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Koehler, we're in the voting process now. You voted 'present'. Do you wish to change your vote?"
- Koehler: "It does...is the Suburban Problems Task Force included in this piece of legislation? I mean in this override?"

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Koehler, the record has been closed. You have to...you wish to vote...Representative Bower. Record Representative Bower as 'aye'. Representative Johnson. Record Representative Johnson as "nay". Okay, if the Members will please be in their seats, we'll make sure we recognize everyone that desires to be Alright, Representative Mautino wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Now, who else? Representative Stuffle wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Greiman. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Bullock. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Alright, further changes, additions, deletions? Representative Vitek. Record the Everybody on? What's the count, Mr. Gentleman as 'aye'. Clerk? 101 'aye', 56 no. 2 voting Representative Chapman, 'aye'. Schneider. Representative Schneider, 'aye'. Representative Ronan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ronan: "I want to poll the absentees since we're so close to 107 and as I said, this doesn't cost any money to ask to have this substantive language on the books."

Speaker Daniels: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Barnes. Currie. Davis.

John Dunn..."

Speaker Daniels: "Currie, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees:

Garmisa. Griffin. Hoffman. Kane. Katz. Kucharski.

Ozella. Pierce. Polk. Reed. Stearney, and Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Further additions, deletions? Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Please change my vote to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Boucek from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Huskey from 'no' to 'aye'. What is the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Smith."

Smith, Irv: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Smith from 'aye' to 'no'.

Representative Griffin."

Griffin: "Absent to "aye"."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Griffin as 'aye'.

Representative Garmisa. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'.

Now, is everyone happy? The way you want to be? Any further changes? Last chance. Alright, what's the count,

Mr. Clerk? There are 107 'aye', 55 'nay', two voting 'present'. This Motion having received a three-fifths

Constitutional Majority prevails, and House Bill 1127 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Representative McBroom in the Chair for the purposes of an introduction."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm delighted to have the opportunity to make a very brief introduction, and I've asked the Gentleman if he wouldn't be so kind as to say a few words. The Gentleman to right is a Member of Parliament from Jamaica. We had a pleasant visit and find that we have several mutual friends. But before presenting Mr. 'Mullings', he is being accompanied by Mr. Clifford Lee who is to my left from the United States State Department. Mr. Lee...Mr. Clifford Lee from our State Department. And from our Illinois Department of Commerce Department...our Industry, Mrs. 'Clacena' Harvey. Ms. Harvey. Mr. 'Mullings' is serving his 12th year in the Jamaican Parliament. His constituency is an area near Kingston. is a licensed land surveyer. I guess we would call it a licensed engineer here in the United States. We're

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

delighted to have you, Mr. 'Mullings'. I told Mr. 'Mullings' that I think he'd really be surprised if he knew how many Members of the Legislature from both sides of the aisle had visited his country from one time or another. Mr. Seymour 'Mullings'."

'Mullings': "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I must confess that I was very surprised that I was given this opportunity to say a few words to...to your august Assembly. visiting your country at the invitation of your government under the international VISTA Program. Members of the government in our Parliament are hardly afforded this opportunity by virtue of the fact that they are On the other hand, Members of the constantly busy. opposition take advantage of this opportunity because they are less busy than Members of the government, and I am here your country, getting a very...a closer understanding of what your country is about and what your wonderful nation is providing for the world at large. Jamaica we have two Houses, an upper House which is the Senate. These Members are nominated. The lower House, the House of Representatives, consisting of 60 Members and these are elected every five years. We had elections our country last year, October. It resulted in a change of government and currently the government has 51 Members, and I happen to be one of nine Members of the opposition at this time. I understand that there are a number of your Members who know Jamaica, have interest in Jamaica, visited Jamaica from time to time. And I would like to take this opportunity of offering a very warm invitation to all of you to find some time to visit our country here in Jamaica. And I am certain you will enjoy it as visitors from Jamaica and other countries do find very, very great pleasure in visiting your wonderful country. I thank you very much."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "That was the Honorable Seymour 'Mullings',
 Member of Parliament. And for all of us who have been in
 Jamaica, we've enjoyed your country a great deal, and we'll
 look forward to returning. Thank you. Representative
 Jones."
- Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I would like to introduce one of the former distinguished Members of the House, a very distinguished Legislator...Legislator in his time. I don't know if he's looking at the map or anything, but former Representative Jesse Madison."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madison, welcome back.

 Representative Madison, you look carefully at the map
 because if you live in Oak Park, you might be able to run
 down in southern Illinois. House Bill 1136. Read the
 Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: ""I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor of House Bill 1136 in the manner and form as follows". Representative Greiman."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman, House Bill 1136."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1136 did three things originally. Two of them the Governor amendatorily vetoed by deleting. One was for...one part was for allowing the commencement of services under professional contracts before they were reduced to writing, and the other takes away the Comptroller's discretion in contracts not filed within 30 days. I would ask that the Department, or I should say the Comptroller agrees at this time not to ask for an override and accepts the amendatory veto of the Governor, and I ask that this House vote "aye" on accepting the amendatory veto of the Governor."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The question is, "Shall the
 House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for
 change with respect to House Bill 1136 by adoption of the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Amendment?. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? It's House Bill 1136. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 161 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1136 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1184. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1184 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Vinson."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson? Representative John
 Dunn. House Bill 1184. Representative Dunn, do you wish
 to proceed with that, Sir?"
- Dunn: "I guess..I'm not the Chief Sponsor. Representative Vinson was. Is he on the floor? If he's not I'll proceed."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

- Dunn: "First, let me get it. These are all technical changes,
 Mr. Speaker, and I would move that the House accept the
 Governor's recommended changes to House Bill 1184 because
 it's my understanding that we just have technical changes.
 This is routine. This is a good Bill. It passed
 overwhelmingly in both chambers and I would urge the
 Hembership to approve the Governor's amendatory veto."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, the Shall House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1184 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The voting's open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 166 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1184 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1288. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1288 in the manner and form as follows'. Representative Donovan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Donovan? House Bill 1288."

Donovan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
do move to accept the specific recommendations for change,
the Governor's amendatory veto, on the House Bill 1288. It
makes change by deleting one comma and adding the word, 'or
by'. It's a technical and clarifying change, one that I
didn't think needed to be in there. I thought it was very
clear. It does go along with the intent of the Bill. We
have...We have concurrence from the Illinois Department of
Law Enforcement, the Paternal Order of Police, certainly
myself and the Senate Sponsor. I would hope that you would
give us an affirmative vote on the move to accept the
Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, House Shall accept the Governor's specific the recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1288 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 162 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1288 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1294. Read the Motion."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1294, 'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1294 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Slape."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Governor's amendatory veto actually cleans the Bill up and puts it in the shape that we requested originally from LRB. It takes out the provision where the Board of Supervisors ...er..the County Supervisor may issue workbooks to township assessors. It now says he has to. He shall issue them. And it takes out the provision that the books would go to the Board. It says instead of giving the workbooks to the Board, they would go to the township assessors now. And I would move for acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto to House Bill 1294."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, accept the Governor's 'Shall the House specific recommendations for changes with respect to House Bill 1294 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 161 'aye' and none voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1294 by adoption of the House Bill 1364. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk." Amendment.

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1364 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Telcser."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House...House Bill 1364 originally deleted the requirement that interest rates in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

bonds and notes issued by the Illinois Housing Development Authority be removed. What the Governor's amendatory veto did was to reimpose the interest ceiling on IDA's notes and bonds to July 1st, 1983, to reimpose a ceiling after that date at a rate of 11% or 70% of the prime commercial rate. The amendatory veto also deals with some cross reference to language and makes clear that the Authority can charge a pre-payment penalty to a mortgagor when the agency itself must prepay ... must make a pre-payment penalty on its own. The Bill additionally deals with a cross reference that refers to commercial loan exemptions which have interpreted as exempting those commercial transactions from pre-payment and variable rate prohibitions. the Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House adopt the Governor's amendatory veto in connection with House Bill 1364."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question Shall House accept the Governor's the recommendations for changes with respect to House Bill 1364 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record. One hundred and fifty-eight who wish? 'aye', none voting 'nay', 6 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1364 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1367. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1367 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Bower."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative
 Bower."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The original Bill has nothing to do with what the Synopsis originally indicated with the Generic Drug It has nothing whatsoever to do with that. The ... It makes several changes in the Act. The one provision the Governor's amendatory veto affects was the relative to an exemption the state facilities had from complying with the Pharmacy Act. The Governor's amendatory veto merely says that any place that the Act might be in conflict with the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act that the Confidentiality Act would prevail and I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1367 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. Voting's open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 168 *aye* and none voting *nay*, none voting *present*. Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails accepts Governor*s and the House the specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1367 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1535. Read Motion, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 1535 do pass, the
 Governor's specific recommendations for change
 notwithstanding', Representative McAuliffe."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe? Withdrawn. Out of the record. House Bill 1536. Read the Motion."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move that the House...House Bill 1536 do pass,
 the Governor's specific recommendations for change

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

notwithstanding, Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the Bill that was probably the best piece of whistle blowers legislation for good government passed out of the Assembly in the past Session. It passed the House 142 to 5 passed the Senate 58 to nothing. And I'm going to move to override the Governor's veto because the Governor says in his message, I think it's sort of interesting, 'I have reached the conclusions that I am in general agreement with the purposes and objectives of this Bill', and then he proceeds to gut most of the Bill. And basically what does is that in the Governor's version of the Bill, the Civil Service Commission, for example, would authority to stay disciplinary action against an employee during the investigation of an allegation made by It really is in the public interest in some cases for the employee not to be removed from the work site pending a full investigation of the allegation. the Governor's veto message, he states that the Bill does not address allegations made to such other organizations such as the BGA, et cetera, et cetera, and that is factually incorrect. The Bill states on page one that 'any case involving any disclosure of information by an employee or applicant, the identity of the employer applicant may not be disclosed without consent of the employee or applicant during any investigation under Subsection 9 of Section 10 or under paragraph 3 of this Section. On page four the Bill says that 'during any investigation initiated under the Section, no disciplinary action shall be taken against the employee for disclosure of any alleged prohibited activity'. Finally, I would like to say the Governor says that the Civil Service Commission has

80th Legislative Day

absentees."

October 15, 1981

neither the manpower nor the expertise to make these professional investigations. This is really a very curious that the Civil Service Commission was statement in officially neutral on the Bill when it was pending before the Legislature and since that time has recommended that it be passed into law. You know, apparently the Civil Service Commission, which is really in the best position to determine whether or not it could carry out the beliefs, that it can effectively do so. I therefore would urge an 'aye' vote on my Motion to override the Governor's veto." Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? There being none, the question *Shall House Bill 1536 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change? .. favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 99 'aye', 59 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The Gentleman, Representative Jaffe, requests a poll of the

- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Barr. Bradley.

 Davis. Ralph Dunn. Dwight Priedrich. Garmisa. Huff.

 McCormick. Ted Meyer. Oblinger. Ozella. Reed.

 C.M.Stiehl. Stuffle. Tuerk. Vitek. Wikoff."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tate, from 'aye' to 'no'.

 Representative Tuerk, 'no'. Representative Vitek, 'aye'.

 Representative Johnson, from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative

 Bradley, 'aye'. Okay. Is that it? What's the count, Mr.

 Clerk? Representative Winchester, 'no'. There are 99

 'aye', 63 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The Motion fails.

 Representative...Representative Jaffe? You have another

 Motion on Supplemental #2. Are there further Motions, Mr.

 Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Governor as to House Bill 1536 in the manner and form as follows, Representative Jaffe.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe on the Motion."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move now to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. It is not as good as the original Bill, but it's better than what we have. And so I would urge an 'aye' vote on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, •Shall the House accept the Governor*s specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1536 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote *aye*, opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. One hundred and seventy 'aye', 1 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1536 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1812. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1812 in the manner and form as follows," Representative Irv Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Smith on the Motion."

Smith, Irv: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'd like to move to accept the Governor's recommended change to veto 1812.

1812 transfers the responsibility of self insurance for worker's compensation from the Industrial Commission back to the Director of Insurance. The original Bill had ..had transferred that to the Industrial Commission, but apparently after looking at it and hearing from people around the state it would work better to keep it with the Industrial Commission. The other parts of the Bill remain intact. I move to accept."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Purther discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1812 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 161 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 1 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1812 by adoption of the Amendment. Supplemental Calendar #1, House Bill 811. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: ""I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 811 in the manner and form as follows, Representative Matijevich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was going to wait. I have a letter from the Department of Public Aid, but I think I can proceed. But before I proceed, I'd like to suspend the appropriate rule. understand there's one of the rules that we have to suspend this bе heard. Is that true, Mr. that can 50 Parliamentarian? Or are we alright now? We're alright now. That's right. You have a Supplemental out. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 811. In addition to his specific recommendations, this is the hospital..the cost containment Bill that we worked in the waning hours of June 30th at our deadline and in addition to the specific recommendations the Department of Public Aid has been working in the last couple of days, working on what amounts to negotiations and they have agreed to a proposed rule that will be put in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

place also so that the cost containment is spread all over the hospitals in the State of Illinois and so that there is proper reconciliation made to hospitals and that there is a monitoring put into place. I believe that now, and I have a letter being sent to me by the Department of Public Aid so that we have it in writing that this is their agreement between the Department of Public Aid and the Association. If this thing doesn't work, I don't want John Matijevich to be blamed. I want those who made the negotiations to be blamed for it. But we think it will work. As I said, it's an agreement between them to achieve budget savings for 1982. There are no assurances against negative consequences among individual hospitals. Services may have to be cut or the rates of other payers may to be adjusted to cover resulting deficits. These effects will require close monitoring and evaluation and I expect that we will be reconsidering this issue in detail next Session, either in FY '83 budget issues or in relation reauthorization of the Illinois Health Finance the Authority Act. But at this time, Mr. Speaker and of the House, I do move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 811."

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

Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative Matijevich, you said something about the
Illinois Health Finance Authority in the process of your
explanation and I wonder if you could repeat and clarify
that for me."

Matijevich: "In the context that that Authority is involved, as you know, in rate setting and I just mentioned it in that context that they are involved with the rate setting, as

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

you know. I know your feelings with regard to that Authority, Sam."

Vinson: "This...This particular amendatory veto in no way affects that agency?"

Matijevich: "The Amendatory veto in no way references the Health
Pinance Authority, Sam."

Vinson: "There is no extension of their sunset date?"

Matijevich: "No."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Levin: "Representative, I'm reading from the Governor's amendatory veto. On page five, part B, where it talks about if the United States Department of Health and Human Services does not approve and it talks about the Department shall implement during fiscal year '82 alternative hospital service coverage and reimbursement limitations approvable and it goes on from there. Are there any standards in the current law or in this Bill as it would be amended as to what that coverage would be? Or are we totally giving the Department the discretion to limit or change coverage to recipients in any way, shape or form that they so choose?"

Matijevich: "In some extent, we are giving them that blanket coverage except that we have the overview process in the rule making authority. That...Otherwise we do give them that blanket authority."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this Bill, I have no objection to the concept. I supported the compromise in the spring. I'm glad to see that there's been further negotiations. But what we have here is a blanket delegation of authority to an agency to do anything it sees fit and we really don't have the safeguards of the Joint

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Committee because the Joint Committee has authority to say
, 'You've gone beyond the law. You've gone beyond what the
Statutes says are limitations.' But what we're doing here
is we're giving what I believe is an unconstitutional
delegation of total discretion to this agency to do
whatever it wants in terms of making payments to welfare
recipients who end up in the hospital. I think this is bad
for the recipients. I think it is bad for the providers
and I think it is something which is clearly subject to a
Constitutional challenge in the court. For that reason, I
intend to oppose the Gentleman's Motion to accept this
amendatory veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think Ellis has made a point, but I think we have a problem and he, himself, would have a problem because if we did not vote for this Motion and these specific recommendations, those hospitals would face more drastic cuts and you'd have a greater problem. So I think the only thing we can do now is vote "aye" on this Motion. We will, I'm sure, as I said, this issue will face us again. This is a one year thing and we will be coming back and there will be further negotiations. But this is the best we've got now, and it's been worked out through the Hospital Association and Department of Public Aid and I think they've done a fairly good job at it. I appreciate your "aye" vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 811 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, explanation of vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Levin, I'd like to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

suggest that there's an old joke that ends with the punch line, 'Consider the alternative'. I think right now we really don't have an alternative except to give the Governor an opportunity to see this plan work. There may be many of us who have some concerns and some questions about it, but it's a complex matter and the best alternative at this point, I believe, is to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin, you want to consider the alternative? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. One hundred and sixty—two 'aye', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 811 by adoption of the Amendment. Representative Collins, the question is which Legislator attained the age of forty today? We'll ask you that after the next Bill. Which Legislator attained the age of forty today? Representative Collins."

Collins: "You're ten years too late for me."

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar \$2, House Bill 288. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 288 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz, House Bill 288."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur and accept the Governor's amendatory veto on 288. 288 was the Bill that would require the Department of Children and Family Services to establish a demonstration center exclusively for the treatment, counseling and rehabilitation services to sexually abused children. It was a recommendation by

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Legislative Investigating Commission. The Governor in turn amendatorily vetoed the Bill to provide for the treatment and counseling of sexually abused children and their families where such sexual abuse or exploitation was inflicted by the child's immediate care giver when wherever possible through community based child abuse programs. I may not totally agree with the concept, but in turn, it's a viable alternative to the recommendation of the Bill. I spoke with Director Coler. He, in turn, believes he can correct this immediate problem that we've overwhelmingly adopted in House Bill 288 and for that reason, I move that the House concur with the Governor's amendatory veto on 288."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the question *Shall the House accept the Governor*s specific recommendations for changes with respect to House Bill by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Take the record. There are 157 'aye', none voting wish? 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts Governor's specific recommendations the for change regarding House Bill 288 by adoption of the Amendment. Representative Collins, which Legislator has reached forty years of age today?"

Collins: "I have the answer."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Representative Collins has the answer."

Collins: "It's Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bluthardt. Wrong. House Bill 483. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Governor as to House Bill 483 in the manner and form as follows, $^{\bullet}$ Representative McClain. n

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain, 483."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to accept the recommendations of the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 483. The subject matter of 483 is that it would require guardian ad litems, that is, a lawyer appointed to represent an abused or neglected child to meet with that child at least once prior to an adjudicatory hearing. When we drafted the legislation we addressed ourselves only to neglected and we failed to also include abused children. So it was a drafting error by me and the Governor caught it and Director Coler caught it and I would move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. It passed the House 150 to nothing. And it passed the Senate 58 to nothing. I'd move for acceptance."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 483 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? wish? Take the record. There are 150 'aye', no voting none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 483 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 781. Read the Motion. Chapman, "aye", to the last Bill. House Bill 781, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "*I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 781 in the manner and form as follows*, Representative Lechowicz."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill 781 amended the Insurance Code to House. House require automobile insurance to rates include appropriate reduction for a three year period for any insured motorist over the age of 55 who's successfully completed a motor vehicle accident prevention course known as the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course, or any equivalent course approved by the Secretary of State. The Governor agreed with the Bill, but at the request of the Department of Insurance, they asked that the effective date be changed to July 1, 1982. That's all the amendatory veto requests. I concur and I move for the adoption and ask that the House concur with the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 781."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 781 by adoption of the Amendment? . All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes? Your light was on, Representative Barnes. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 167 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 781 by adoption of Amendment. House Bill 986. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 986 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Jane Barnes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jane Barnes."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Barnes: "I move to accept the Governor's veto. The amendatory veto just cleared up a little language and changed the word from 'inappropriate' to 'unavailable'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is, the House accept the Governor's recommendations for change with respect to House Bill by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 158 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting *present*. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 986 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1415. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1415 in the manner and form as follows', Representative Bluthardt."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bluthardt on his 40th birthday."

 Bluthardt: "Thank you. It's sixty-five going on twenty-five tonight. I do accept the recommendation of the Governor. House Bill 1415 provided that municipalities may borrow from one fund to another provided that the money borrowed would be paid back from the next tax collections. The Governor feels that the money ought to be paid back during the same fiscal year. It's not what we wanted, but it's better than what we've got. And I move to accept the recommendation."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific
 recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1415
 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor will vote

 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 158 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1415 by adoption of the Amendment. Representative Collins, do you have an answer to the question yet?"

- Collins: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. And, it was a great surprise
 to me because I would have guessed that the Lady was
 considerably younger. But the birthday girl is
 Representative Diana Nelson."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Nelson, I know you have your mic in your hand, but on your 40th birthday, do you really want to speak? Representative Nelson?"
- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't imagine who started this nasty rumor. But I tell you I'm with Satchel Page, who said, 'How old would you be if you didn't know how you was?'. And I'm still 39 by his definition."
- Speaker Daniels: "Is that your District number now?"
- Nelson: "No. I've got to look at the map again. Make some more deals."
- Speaker Daniels: "On the Calendar page three, Total Veto Motions,
 House Bill 22. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: ""I move that the House Bill 22 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding", Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton on the Motion."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 22 passed the House 152 to 3. The purpose of House Bill 22 was to correct a problem that arose as a result of a Supreme Court ruling. The purpose of the Bill was to allow counties to recoup money from criminal defendants who posted bond and yet who were

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

indigent in terms of hiring their own attorney. purpose of the Bill was to allow the counties to recoup money from indigent defendants and have them pay...have them reimburse the county for the free legal services that were being provided. Now, in Committee, in the Judiciary II Committee, we made it clear by adding an Amendment that if someone posted..if a relative posted money for defendant that that money would not be lost to go pay the county for the free legal services. In other words, some aunt of yours posted bond for you that she couldn't be penalized by having the county take that money. And this was put in in the House Judiciary II Committee as a safequard out of basic fairness to relatives who post bond for defendants not knowing that they might lose that money so it could go to pay for legal services. Well, there was another Bill that Representative Wikoff had, House Bill 22. Now, House Bill 22 is ..creates a whole...I'm sorry. House Bill 46. House Bill 46 creates a whole new Act which two pages long which purports to do the same thing as House Bill 22. But what the Governor did on his amendatory veto of House Bill 46 was to say that the counties could take the family's money to pay for legal fees. So, I think that that is some...what the Governor's done is contrary to what the House intended to do when it passed the Bill 152 to 3. It's necessary for us to override his veto to make certain that when defendants have their money posted for bond by someone other than themselves, that that money cannot be used for attorney's fees. And, I'll be happy to answer any questions to explain the Bill if anyone is still confused on it. But, if not, I would ask that we override the Governor's veto of House Bill 22."

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

Representative Vinson."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

- Vinson: "I understand, Representative, that there's some conflict in the provisions of this with 46 which we've already accepted. Is that the case?"
- Cullerton: "When we first passed 46 and 22, they both had the same effect. 46 had a lot of surplus language and created a new Act and it was two pages long. It wasn't necessary. But it had the same effect. But then when the Governor amendatorily vetoed 46 and he changed an important provision of our original Bill, the purpose of which was to make sure that if people. relatives of a defendant posted money that they wouldn't lose that money to pay for the county's public...free public defender. And that's the difference between 46 as we're already passed it and 22 as we consider it right now."
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the point, it would seem to me that Representative Wikoff's 46 as amendatorily vetoed contains all the necessary provisions to deal with this problem. It deals with a particular Statute involved. It solves the problem with that court decision involved. It solves the problem with that court decision. And I don't believe we need to go ahead and duplicate provisions by overriding a veto on this one. I would urge that we vote 'no' on this Motion and that we reject the Gentleman's proposition."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Cullerton to close."
- Cullerton: "Just to make it clear to Representative Vinson. This is not duplicative if we accept this...if we override the Governor's veto. We would be going back to our original position that we, as the House, took 152 to 3 that money

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

that's posted by defendant's relatives should not be used to pay for their free legal services. However, money that the defendant puts up on his own, that can be taken by the county and used to pay for the free public defender that is provided for him. So you do have a choice here. to make a decision as to whether or not you think it's fair that someone who has .. a relative has put up money for bond which is only meant to ensure that that person come back to court, then discovers that that money has been taken from them and used to pay for a lawyer. That's the choice that we have here and I would ask that we override the Governor's veto of House Bill 22 because it is not just It's an entirely different Bill. duplicative. The Governor has changed what we have passed 152 to 3 and I think we should, by that same margin, override his veto." Speaker Daniels: "It takes 107 votes. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 22 pass, the veto of the notwithstanding? . A11 in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Seventy-nine 'aye', 68 The Motion to override fails. none voting 'present'. House Bill 101. Read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 101 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, Representative Abramson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Abramson?"

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that House Bill 101 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The Governor in his veto message stated that the purpose of House Bill 101 was fulfilled by House Bill 145. That's simply not the case. What 101 does is conform two different interest sections, one in Chapter 74 which currently provides for 9% and in Chapter 77 which by

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

this Bill is tied to the 9% rate. Also, what the Bill does is raises the interest rate on redemptions from judicial sales from 6% to 9% to conform it to the interest rate on judgments. These matters are not addressed in 145, which also deals with interest rates but not on these particular Sections. So I ask that the Governor's veto be overridden."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "The Gentleman's absolutely right. The Governor's veto message was inaccurate. House Bill 145, of which I chaired a Subcommittee, was a recodification of all of the rules of civil practice. But it did not make any substantive changes which a change in interest rate obviously would. So, this Bill is needed. It's not taken care of by House Bill 145 as the veto message mistakenly indicated. So I would join with the Gentleman and urge that the veto be overridden."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Abramson to close."
- Abramson: "I move that the veto be overridden. Ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 101 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 116 'aye', 30 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. The Motion prevails and House Bill 101 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 108. Read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 108, 'I move that House Bill 108 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

 Representative Ronan."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 108 is a Bill that most Nembers of the General Assembly are very aware of. This is the Bill that the ... that I carried during the last Session of the General Assembly to help out nurses across the State of Illinois. Most Members of the General Assembly have received both mailings on this piece legislation and I know the Nurses Association has been lobbying very intensely to make Members aware of how important this legislation is. The goal here obviously is to have a scholarship program in order to do something about the critical nurses shortage we've got here in the State of Illinois. It's a problem that has been documented through the Critical Care Commission which held hearings It's been documented by the Medical Society, the Hospital Association and every professional health care group in the state. There's no question about it. got a lack of incentive for people to go into nursing and it's very disheartening for people who've devoted their life to this profession to participate unless there is the opportunity to receive incentives and to work their way up to become graduate nurses and move into supervisory roles. It's a very important piece of legislation. The dollar amount is not significant. What we're trying to do is get this pilot project off the ground so that we can work on it over the next decade and hopefully do something to solve this serious health care issue here in the State of Illinois. I'll be glad to answer any questions and I that everyone really looks at this legislation and votes not on partisan issues or not on partisan principles, but looks and says, 'Hey, we've got a problem in this state.' And this is one small way to do something about health care here in the State of Illinois."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't intend to tell anybody how to vote on an issue, but I would point out a couple of facts that are pertinent to this Bill and its companion Bill. First of all, it's been presented that this is going to cure up a nursing shortage and it's used as a recruiting device which I think is really a little absurd. It is to provide scholarship money for nurses who seek to go on and further their education and receive a baccalaureate degree. And why would one want to receive a baccalaureate degree? Obviously, so they could earn more money. I would like to also point out that this is not a loan. It is really a grant because it has a four year forgiveness provision and if you go on and you work for four years, you are forgiven 25% of that loan over a period of four years. We don't do it for any other profession. I don't know why we should. As I say, I don't tell anybody how to vote, but it's \$300,000 involved here between this and the companion Bill and I think you should be aware of these things before you vote despite the fact that I know you've been heavily lobbied on it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Roman, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Ronan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've been in discussion with some Members from the other side of the aisle. What's the possibility of going to House Bill 109 first and then coming back to House Bill 108?"

Speaker Daniels: "If you'd like to take it out of the record, fine. We don't make guarantees you can get it back though, Sir."

Ronan: "There's no quarantee that we'll get back to it?"

Speaker Daniels: "No, Sir."

Ronan: "Then we'll stick right here. We'll go with it."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf, were you completed?

Further discussion? The Gentleman from...Which county are
you from, Representative Schneider?"

Schneider: "DuPage."

Speaker Daniels: "Will?"

Schneider: "DuPage."

Speaker Daniels: "Oh, from DuPage, Representative Schneider, in that long District.."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Bills before us, 108 and nine (109), I presume are the Bills that deal with the nursing shortage. I was a Member of the Commission which tried to address itself as best we could to resolving a very complicated problem. No one more I perhaps stood in opposition to some of the recommendations. But also, no one more than I perhaps understands that what we are faced with is at least the attempt to make some very early strides towards a complete and total solution of the nursing shortage. And it's more than that. It happens to deal, I think, with the concept of health care and human services. I think unfortunately, perhaps the Thompson administration is being identified as noncaring administration with its budget cuts that we addressed in 588. But let me just clarify for you that this would be a health care measure. One aspect of that health care is nurse services to the needy persons who are need of health care. On the baccalaureate question; Representative Wolf is maybe right. I don't know. I can't understand motivations necessarily, but nurses, like anyone else, are probably interested in money. But the baccalaureate program does more than that. It begins to train people who will be eligible for masters programs in which nurses can be further taught at university level programs. As you know we have more than just

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

baccalaureate programs. There are other programs at lesser levels, junior college programs, other programs operated in hospitals called diploma programs. We need people qualified to teach in a changing technological area of If we deny those people the opportunity to health care. have the expertise of a baccalaureate trained or a trained nurse we are in effect undercutting the possibility that those future nurses which would fill the gaps will not be trained properly and worse yet, they will be absent from A second concern that I have is the loan that career. question. It's not the loans that are forgiven for anyone enters the nurses program. I did have some concerns with this. But the forgiveness addresses directly the That is to say, you're only question of the shortage. forgiven in light of your ability and willingness as a trained nurse to work in the State of Illinois and in a shortage area. So we're not saying that anybody who's trained in that area is forgiven. What we're saying is if you're willing to commit 'X' amount of years to nursing as a career, then we will over a period of time free you from the obligation of that loan. So I think, under those circumstances, faced with the health care need, faced with a part of that health care problem which is in nursing, that this goes somewhat toward alleviating that problem. And I would ask you to support the Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there are several factors that have to be considered with regard to this legislation. First of all, the original proposal called for a loan of \$850,000. What you have before you today is a loan of \$300,000. I don't think there can be any argument on either side as to the need to find a solution to the acute shortage of nurses.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Given that understanding and also given the understanding that we are not talking about flat out expenditures, what the \$300,000 is to be used for is a scholarship to provide for the availability of nurses. I, for one, would consider this to be an investment and not an expenditure. Given these criteria, I think all of us should recognize the compromise that has been made and that given the compromise, a substantial acknowledgement of our financial austerity, that we should concur with the Motion to override and vote 'aye' on the Motion."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this override Motion. One of the previous speakers talked about the motivation that a nurse may have in going back to school to pursue a baccalaureate degree. That's not the overriding concern. The overriding concern is, What notivation in representing our constituents so that when these constituents should find themselves in need of hospitalization will they be getting proper care from the nurses that are on the staff of the hospitals they in?'. I, for one, would like to know that the nurse who is in charge of treating me should I be in a hospital is one who has gone back for additional education, one who gone back for .. to be kept up on new techniques and new procedures, someone who is interested in advancing their education so that they can pursue a baccalaureate degree. I think that's important. That should be our motivation. Do we want to encourage nurses to keep up with their training and their education and to seek higher and higher levels of training and education? I, for one, think that's very essential and it's very essential especially where we have a shortage of nurses and certainly a shortage, if any

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

of you have had the misfortune of recently being in a hospital, you'll find that in many instances you can't even converse in the English language with some of the nurses who are treating you. At least if we have nurses who are encouraged to keep up and advance their training, we can get and hope to get to a point where we are certain of having decent nursing care in our hospitals. So I would absolutely encourage you to vote for this Bill. This encourages education and society has never ever been worse off by encouraging people to pursue higher degrees of education."

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

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Motion to override the Governor's veto on House Bill 108. Within the last couple of weeks I've had scores and scores of nurses coming to my District office begging me to override the Governor's veto. Now, we know what the problem..what the nurse problem is in the State of Illinois. And we know that the sum of \$300,000 is not a big sum. Remember, all these nurses are voters and there's an election year coming up. So I would ask you all to support this override."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Ronan, to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to reiterate one more time.

Let's be really sure we know what we're doing here. This is not a partisan issue. Health care for the citizens of the State of Illinois is our responsibility. It's something that the Legislature constantly reviews through the various Committees and Commissions that we have in this state. I know many Members of the General Assembly are very cognizant when the Illinois State Medical Society or

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Illinois Hospital Association OI the Pharmacists Association comes to them with a concern. Well this is a concern brought to us by the Nurses Association. It's a very important problem. Ιt deals opportunity to improve the nursing profession. The money is going to be equally distributed so that it associate degree nurses, diploma students, baccalaureate students and people going for higher degrees. It's an excellent program. It's not going to break the bank. Let's not get caught up in the rhetoric that this \$300,000 is going to make a big difference. My attitude is the key is that we've got to do something about health care. got to do something to show the nurses of this state that we care about their concern and that this General Assembly wants to be on record supporting decent health care for all the citizens of the State of Illinois. I urge an "aye" vote on this override Motion."

- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 108 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 123 'aye', 33 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Catania, 'aye'. One hundred...Hoffman, 'no'. Catania, 'aye'. Hoffman, 'no'. One hundred and twenty-four 'aye'...Why is Huff snapping his fingers?"
- Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like you to change my 'present' vote to an 'aye' vote please."
- Speaker Daniels: "On the snap of a finger change from 'present'
 to 'aye'. Okay. Representative Hastert, 'no'. Bianco,
 'no'. Okay, what's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative
 Collins."
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan, requests a poll of the absentees. Proceed with a poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Alstat. Bluthardt. Dwight Priedrich. This is a poll of the Ralph Dunn. Karpiel. McCormick. absentees. Laurino. E.G.Steele. C.M.Stiehl. Ozella. Reed. Stearney. Tuerk. Wikoff. Winchester. And, Yourell."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Alright, now we have a number of people seeking recognition. Now, Representative Wikoff wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Dwight Priedrich, Representative Cissy Stiehl. 'no'. Alright. Representative Polk wishes to be changed from 'aye' to Representative Deuster from aye! to Tuerk, 'no'. Representative Bluthardt, Representative Neff 'aye' to Representative from Representative Fawell from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Excuse me. McMaster from 'aye' to 'no'. You weren't recorded. Representative McMaster wishes to be recorded as Representative Virginia Frederick from 'aye' to 'no'. Virginia Frederick 'aye' to 'no'. Okay, any other changes on this side? Excuse me. Representative Ackerman from 'aye' to 'no'. Any other changes on that side? Okay. On this side? There are 118 'ayes', our starting count. Alright, proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll."
- O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. Clerk Barkhausen. Bartulis. Beatty. Bell. Birkinbine. Bowman. Barr_ Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Darrow. Donovan. Doyle. Currie. DiPrima. Domico. Jack Dunn. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Farley. Flinn.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Griffin.
Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff.
Jackson. Jaffe. Johnson. Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane.
Jim Kelley. Dick Kelly...

Speaker Daniels: "Okay, excuse me. Would all those people not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery? The Members please be in their seats. We're in the middle of a verification. All those individuals not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery now. Members please be in their seats. Okay, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Affirmative: Klemm. Kornowicz. Kosinski, Krska, Kulas, Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz-Madigan. Martire. Matijevich. Macdonald. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Miller. Mulcahev. Murphy. Oblinger. R.J.Mever. Pechous. Piel. O'Connell. Olson. O'Brien. Rea_ Redmond. Reilly. Rhem. Preston. Pouncev. Richmond. Robbins. Ronan. Saltsman. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Iry Smith. Stuffle. Margaret Smith. Stanley. Steczo. Stewart. Terzich. Topinka. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. Tate. Watson. White. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Zito. And, Zwick."

Speaker Daniels: "Members please be in their seats.

Representative Laurino? Record the Gentleman as 'aye'.

Representative Collins."

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

Speaker Daniels: "119."

Collins: "Thank you. Representative Barkhausen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barkhausen? The Gentleman in the chambers? He's in his seat."

Collins: "Representative Barr."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Barr? Bob Barr? Gentleman in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Beatty is in his chair.

Representative Garmisa wishes to be verified,

Representative Collins. Is that alright?"

Collins: "Yes, of course. Alright. Representative Bowman.."

Speaker Daniels: "And O'Brien. Garmisa and O'Brien."

Collins: "I don't know about O'Brien."

Speaker Daniels: "Garmisa and O'Brien, alright. Representative Watson? Change Representative Watson from 'aye' to 'no'.

Okay."

Collins: "Did we...Did you answer on Beatty? I didn't... I don't recall."

Speaker Daniels: "Beatty was in his chair."

Collins: "Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman? Gentleman in the chambers? He's up front. You should be in your chair,

Collins: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bullock? Larry Bullock? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Chapman? Lady's in her chair.

Excuse me.."

Collins: "Representative Farley wants to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. There's no camera lights during the verification. I'll have to turn it off now. I'm sorry.

Okay. What was that, Sir?"

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Collins: "Representative Farley asked to be verified. It's okay with me."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Farley may be verified.

Representative Hanahan? Representative Hanahan is verified. Okay, proceed, Sir."

Collins: "Let's see. I believe we were at Representative
Chapman. Did we check her?"

Speaker Daniels: "She's in her chair."

Collins: "Alright. Representative Catania."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Catania is in Speaker Redmond's chair."

Collins: "Representative Christensen."

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

Collins: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Darrow? Representative Darrow is...I can't see him. He's in his chair."

Collins: "General Darrow."

Speaker Daniels: "He's tired. He's campaigning."

Collins: "General Darrow. Representative Donovan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Ewell: "I believe you verified...I mean, I believe you knocked me off the roll."

Collins: "No, you were next on my list, Ray."

Speaker Daniels: "No, Sir."

Ewell: "Oh, oh."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn requests leave to be verified. Leave is granted."

Collins: "I believe I asked for Donovan. Was he verified?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Donovan? In his chair."

Collins: "Representative Hoxsey."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hoxsey? Betty Hoxsey? How's

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove her."

Collins: "Representative Jackson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jackson? Representative

Jackson? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson? Tim Johnson? How's

the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Jim Kelley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jim Kelley? Chairman Kelley?

He's over on the other side of the aisle."

Collins: "Representative Levin."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Levin? How's the Gentleman

recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "You're supposed to be in your chair, Sir. He's

here."

Collins: "Representative..."

Speaker Daniels: "Just a second. Just a second. Representative

Jackson? Representative Jackson? Jackson."

Jackson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman is...has been removed from the

Roll Call."

Jackson: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'."

Collins: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McBroom? How's the Gentleman

recorded? McBroom."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Griffin, for what purpose do you arise, Sir? Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'."

Collins: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Reilly is in his chair. Laurino has been verified."

Collins: "Yes, that's what I thought. You checked for Reilly?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes."

Collins: "Representative Redmond."

Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Redmond?"

Collins: "Yes."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Irv Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Irv Smith? Gentleman in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McGrew is right over here on the left. Representative Klemm, for what purpose do you arise,

Klemm: "I had left the floor. How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

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

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

Klemm: "Would you change my vote to 'nay'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change him from "aye" to 'no'."

Collins: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley? Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative White."

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

Collins: "Representative Rhem."

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

Collins: "Representative Abramson?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tate, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Tate: "Switch from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'."

Collins: "Representative Abramson."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard? Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Mulcahey, you're recorded as 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Mulcahey: "Can I be recorded ... verified now, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "You may be, Sir. Leave to verify
Representative Mulcahey. Further questions? What's the
count, Sir?"

Collins: "I believe that's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "One hundred and five 'aye', 37 'no'. And the Motion fails. House Bill 109. Read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 109, 'I move that House Bill 109 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Ronan."

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan, House Bill 109."

Ronan: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. House Bill 120. Read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 120, 'I move that House Bill 120 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Darrow."

Speaker Daniels: "No conflict, right? Proceed, Representative

Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I'd better start by giving you a little origin of this legislation. In May of 1978 the Chicago Tribune did a series of stories on inheritance tax in In that series they pointed out that in four Illinois. counties of the State of Illinois special Attorney Generals are paid directly by the court, that in the remaining counties the Assistant Attorney Generals are on the Attorney General's payroll. In the county of Cook where there are special Attorney Generals paid out of court fees, the fee is \$122.00 per case, average. In the other counties of DuPage, Lake and McHenry, the Chicago Tribune reported that the average fee collected by the Attorney General per case is \$88.00. And in the rest of the state the fee paid the Assistant Attorney Generals who are on salary was only \$26.00. What that would mean would be the State of Illinois would be receiving less inheritance tax and more inheritance tax fees would be diverted to special Assistant Attorney Generals who are paid out of the introduced inheritance tax fees directly. I then legislation in the following Session which unfortuntely did pass and in the following Session after that. This year I introduced similar legislation. I discussed it with the Attorney General's Office. What the legislation did

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

was require that all fees collected by the Attorney General paid into the State Treasury. should be Assistant Attorney Generals in Cook, Lake, DuPage and McHenry counties would be under the salary and would be paid like the Assistant Attorney Generals in the rest This would mean a tax savings, an increase in the inheritance tax of approximately 1.7 million dollars since those attorneys in those four counties are paid an average of two million dollars total. Whereas, the downstate counties totally pay their assistants \$300,000. So what we were looking at was a savings of inheritance tax of 1.7 million dollars. That legislation passed out of the House on a vote of 155 to 2 and out of the Senate by a vote of 44 to 7. The Governor has now vetoed this legislation, indicating that there's no appropriation to assist the Attorney General in hiring these people. However, I have removed the immediate effective date in the Senate so this, if overridden, will not take effect until January 1st, which would mean it would cost approximately \$150,000. will be very happy to sponsor a supplemental Bill to the Attorney General's appropriation if we override this. feel that \$150,000 additional appropriation is much more reasonable than paying 1.7 million dollars to pay these It's for these reasons that I would ask that we override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, "Shall House Bill 120 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?". 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. 81 'aye', 69 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 120, the Motion to override fails. Representative Peters in the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Chair."

Speaker Peters: "House Bill 132. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 132, 'I move that House Bill 132 do

pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Getty."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Nembers of the House, I'd like to preface my saying that this Bill involves no new remarks bу expenditures of any state funds at any time. What this Bill seeks to do is to provide a single remedy for all post conviction types of proceedings. Under our current law there are post convictions, there are habeas corpuses and there are writs in the nature of quorum novice, newly discovered evidence, that sort of thing brought under Section 72. This gives rise to a continual multiplicity in post conviction hearings. What this Bill seeks to do is to have one comprehensive post conviction procedure. convictions are required by the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. They were enforced some 20 years ago upon all of the states that we must provide some form of post conviction remedy. Illinois in the wake of that early case passed a very simplistic Statute saying merely that there would be a post conviction remedy. It does not set down adequate procedures for how that post conviction remedy In accordance with that we find post would be handled. convictions being filed, dismissed. Another one filed, dismissed and in fact, it keeps the jailhouse lawyers in our penitentiary writing and writing and our courts busy disposing of these matters when they could be handling other things at less expense to the taxpayer. What this will do if it is adopted is provide for only the one proceeding. I read the Governor's veto message.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

charity, all I can suggest is that whomever it was on his staff who wrote this for him, and I'm sure he didn't because he's too good of a lawyer, whoever wrote this was not a lawyer and didn't understand what the entire issue about. As a matter of fact, I want the people of this General Assembly to know that I personally spoke with a member of the Governor's staff about a month prior to the time that the Governor's veto message was delivered. That member of the Governor's staff assured me, other than a technical error which I sought to have corrected, that he saw no substantial problem and he promised that if any were to arise, he would contact me. Well I was available at all times between then and the time that the Governor vetoed it. I never was contacted by that staff member and when I later saw him he apologized. But that doesn't cure this, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. That doesn't cure it. His apology didn't pre-cure it. And his failure to call me did not give me the opportunity to explain it to him that he would understand what this Bill will do. The Governor, for example, cites that since the adoption this by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws that the ABA has seriously questioned the entire post convictions. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know what he was talking about, but this is the product of the American Bar Association's questioning. The Task Force to which the Governor refers in his message indeed was an ABA Task Force on post conviction remedies. Indeed the ABA came up with standards and this new law codifies those It is tailored only to the specifics of Illinois law. The Governor them goes on to say that there are several specific objections that he finds. He says it permits convictions to be set aside on grounds which United States Supreme Court has found too insubstantial.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Again, I point out to you whoever it was did not understand this legislation at all. There are no new substantive This is a procedural Act only. given. rights substantive law is what the substantive law is now. It. would not be changed in any way by this Act. All this provides for is Mr. Convict, when you make your conviction appeal, you do it in one Act. You do it in one filing and don't be coming back here running back to the courts every month or every year and doing it over and over This Bill is supported by the National District again. Attorneys* Association. Do you think they frivolously would like to endorse legislation anymore than the American Bar Association that would have multiplicity of things or permit convictions to be set aside on grounds which are insubstantial? It just is not true, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. I will not bore you with going the line of the other objections raised by the Governor. I will tell you they are without substance. They were written by somebody who does not understand the law and I would respectfully ask you in the interest of the efficient administration of justice in this state in trying to strike a blow for de-clogging the court system from multiplicity of filings by convicts that you approve this, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I wish to close if there's any other..."

Speaker Peters: "Does any other Member wish to speak on this subject? If not, Representative Leinenweber to close."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As a joint Cosponsor of House Bill 132, I agree and join with the Gentleman from Cook in moving to override the veto.

Now, if you've read the veto message, the big impression you get from the message is that this Bill would seriously

interrupt the finality of a criminal conviction. Now, as

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Representative Getty points out, we are adding nothing substantive. In fact, Representative Getty and I very clearly read into the record that it was our intention as Sponsors of the Bill and was our legislative intent that it would be merely procedural. So we're giving no additional new substantive grounds to set aside any conviction. only thing we are doing here is providing a uniform procedure that people who do wish to take advantage of their Constitutional post conviction rights to use. Now, I come from a county that has a penitentiary. And they bring these post conviction proceedings under the present Act in by the car load. And they must...a truck load as I've been pointed out. And they must be reviewed and must be passed upon and 99.9% of them are frivolous. Now one of the things about this Act, it provides that they must go ..a post conviction proceeding must go to the court from which the conviction was had, not to the .. not to the court where the convict happens to be residing at that particular moment. It does clarify the law. It establishes procedure ..up to date procedure that the American Bar Association National District Attorneys' Association approves and the So, I join with the Gentleman from Cook in urging that the Governor's total veto of House Bill 132 be overridden." Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 132 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?". A11 in favor signify by voting 'aye' and all opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 voting 'aye', Mr. 22 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The prevails and House Bill 132 is declared passed. Governor of the...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Motion on House Bill 159. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 159 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Ronan."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan on the Motion."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise again to talk about another veto of one of my Bills that the Governor did. House Bill 159 is a noncontroversial All it does is authorize the of legislation. Data Information Systems Commission to review and set up a system to guarantee that there is a security program and plan existing within each state agency to review the that's collected by state agencies and to make sure that there isn't abuses or misuse of this information. everyone's aware, the State of Illinois over the last decade has gone very heavily into the computer area. agencies now gather a tremendous amount of information on the average citizens in this state and what we're asking is that each agency set up a security plan to make sure that all this information that's collected, all this that's collected, cannot be abused or misused or in some way put to a use that is not authorized by the state and is against the .. the .. the proper aspects for the citizens of If anyone has any questions I'd be glad to this state. answer it. But I move for the override of this veto."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Pullen."
Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please?"
Speaker Peters: "He indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "Is this the eternal life Bill for the Data Information Systems Commission?"

Ronan: "Representative Pullen, as long as I'm the Chairman of the

Data Information Systems Commission that Commission will go
on forever, with or without any responsibility. So, don't
worry about it. If you don't override this veto, that's

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

fine. We'll keep going, keep turning out good products for the people of the State of Illinois."

Pullen: "Oh, really, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Roman to close."

Ronan: "I would just move that everyone give a green vote to let the Governor know that occasionally he, too, can make a mistake and veto fine pieces like this one."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 159 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?". All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 82 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the Motion to override House Bill 159 fails. House Bill 284, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 284 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative C.M.Stiehl." Speaker Peters: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's veto of House The Governor has reconsidered his position on Bill 284. this Bill. He feels that it is important that this be in Statutes and now supports the Motion to override. The Motion is also supported by the Illinois Municipal League, the Sheriffs' Association, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police..the Illinois Police Association, the Policeman's Benefit and Protective Association, the Fraternal Order of Police and Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a very important Bill. It will allow local governments to enter into a partnership agreement with the Illinois Local Governmental Law Enforcement

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Officers' Training Board for mobile in-service training of law enforcements in the local area. It will offer a coordinated effort for the courts, the State's Attorney, the local police, the Sheriffs' Department, the PBI and local law enforcement officers to work together to increase their professional skills. It is designed to reduce crime in Illinois. It's an extremely important Bill and I would ask for support on this Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 284 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk? The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 155 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay'. The Motion prevails and House Bill 284 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 318. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 318, 'I move that House Bill 318 do

pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of The people that advised the Governor in the House. the criminal law area I think did not understand what this Bill did and gave the Governor some bad advice. Statute Chapter 38, Section 12-3, which is a battery And that says it's a misdemeanor, Class A Statute. misdemeanor, if you cause bodily harm to an individual or if you make physical contact of an insulting or provoking nature to an individual. That is a battery. That is a Class A misdemeanor and you can go to jail for 365 days in a county jail if you commit that offense. Now, the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

aggravated battery Statute says that if you commit this battery in a certain location or against certain people then that's going to be raised to a Class 3 felony. that, then you can be sent to the overcrowded prison that we have...prisons that we have throughout the state. this Bill that passed 123 to 3, was sponsored by the Illinois State Bar Association, promoted by them and I sponsored it. It came as a result of a court decision that construed this battery Statute to mean that even if someone touched someone in an insulting nature, like if you spit at someone or if you coughed at someone, that this would be a Class 3 felony. And it was our intention to make it clear that that is not what we intended with the aggravated battery Statute as it reads. The Governor's message seems to indicate that we are going to strip away the protection that we are affording all of the police officers, fire fighters, correctional officers, teachers, et cetera. that's not the case at all. We still have a battery Statute and it is still a Class A misdemeanor to merely touch someone in an insulting nature. You can still go to jail for up to a year in a county jail and that is the way it should be. But it was merely to correct a court decision that resulted in an absurd recommendation and that was the purpose of the Bill. It passed overwhelmingly. had the approval of the Illinois State Bar Association and I think that the..in reading the Governor's message, the people that advised him in the criminal law area simply just didnot understand what the Bill did. And I would therefore ask that we override the Governor's veto and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 318 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. All in favor

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 91 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'nay'. The Motion to override House Bill 318 fails. House Bill 349, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "I move that House Bill 349 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm going to make a Motion to override the Governor's veto. I think it's sort of interesting that the Governor vetoes this in the very first sentence of his veto message he after. says that this legislation seeks to achieve a worthy by providing help for those who have been victimized by violent crime and then he turns around and vetoes it and reasons that he vetoes it are actually all in error. For instance, let me just give you an idea of where he's in error. He says that the plan fails to recognize that there is already in place certain things to eight people whose lives are disrupted by violent criminal acts. I would submit to you that he's completely and totally wrong. me just read from the Bill to you and tell you what we create as Victim's Assistance Centers. What we do is we create Victim's Assistance Centers that do the following services: Number one, coordinate volunteers; two, assistance to victims of violent crime; three, provide services to the elderly; four, provide transportation household assistance; five, provide court house reception and quidance; six, provide telephone hotline assistance; provide special in-counseling facilities and seven. rehabilitation service; eight, provide public education on crime; and nine, provide training and sensitization for

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

persons who work with victims. I would submit to you that by and large there are no programs like that in the State of Illinois and, where there are programs, they're now closing down because they do not have any funding. With regards to the funding, let me tell you that we do not go to General Revenue Fund, as you know, what we did, is we created a new fund that assessed the criminal and that the criminal actually pay for these services. The Governor in his veto message refers to another Bill by Representative McAuliffe, which in fact is on the Calendar which Representative McAuliffe has taken out of..off the Calendar and I don't know what he's going to do with it but that certainly has no bearing on this case as long as that..that Bill does not move. In addition, we legislative Commission, quite truthfully because we wanted to save money. We don't want to build a new bureaucracy and our thrust has been to help victims and not build a bureaucracy. The Governor, evidently, thinks that we ought to build a bureaucracy rather than helping victims. problem that we have found is that when we're dealing with agents of government agencies in government, the Legislature really does it better by making their own decisions. I could go on and on about the things that are wrong with the Governor's veto message. I would submit to you that I think that he's been misinformed on his veto message and I would urge a vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Special attention to crime victims and compensating crime victims has been a long time coming.

I'm a Cosponsor of the Bill and everybody makes mistakes, in this case, I believe the Governor has. I believe

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Representative Jaffe is absolutely right and that this veto should be overridden. I intend to support it and I would encourage my colleagues on this side of the aisle to do the same."

- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Jaffe to close. Representative Jaffe to close."
- Jaffe: "I think we've made the arguments, Mr. Speaker. I think
 everybody is aware of what goes on. I would urge an 'aye'
 vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 349 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" All in favor signify by voting "aye", all 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 98 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'nay'. Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "A Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for a Poll of the Absentees,
 Mr. Clerk. Representative Stiehl votes 'no', Cissy Stiehl.
 Proceed with the call of the absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Alstat. Catania. Daniels. Jack Dunn. Garmisa.

 Hoffman. Jackson. Klemm. Leverenz. Margalus. Martire.

 McBroom. McClain. Ozella. Reed. Irv Smith. Stanley.

 Stearney. E.G. Steele. Stewart. Tate. Turner. Wikoff.

 Winchester. Sam Wolf. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk, record Representative Catania as voting 'aye'. Change Representative Leinenweber from 'aye' Mr...Representative Klemm 'no'. to 'nay'. Vote Representative Dunn votes 'no', Jack Dunn 'no'. Do you Representative Margalus votes 'aye'. have that, Tony? Representative Wolf votes 'aye'. Representative Meyer from *aye* to *no*. Hang on, hang OD. Roland Meyer. Representative Tate votes 'no'. Representative Neff from

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

'aye' to 'no'. Do you have that, Tony? Representative Margalus from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative McClain wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Irv Smith 'no'. Representative Vinson 'aye'. Representative Barnes from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Fawell from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Wolf?"

Wolf J.J.: "Yes, did I hear you record me as 'aye' or was that..?

Speaker Peters: "No, you're not recorded, Sir."

Wolf J.J.: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further changes? Representative Stanley votes 'aye'. Any further changes? Any further changes? Representative Bianco from 'aye' to 'no'. Any changes or additions? What is the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 101 voting 'aye', 58 voting 'no'. The Motion to override House Bill 349 fails. House Bill 441, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk. Representative McGrew, out of the record, Mr...out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 496, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 496 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Glenn Schneider."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider. Gentleman on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 581. Is Representative Leverenz on the floor? Representative Mautino, I'm sorry. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'House Bill 581, I move that House Bill 581 do pass

 the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative

 Mautino."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do move that we override the Governor's veto on House Bill 581 because I believe that the message that was presented is certainly in error. I think that we are living in the twentieth century and I'd

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

like to give you a little analysis of how this legislation came about. A young man was elected to the city council in Peru, Illinois and one was elected in Ottawa, Illinois...in Utica. Illinois. In both instances they were indirectly involved in the distribution of alcoholic products by virtue of the fact that one gentleman drove a semi-truck for a distributor from Peru, Illinois to Peoria, Illinois and when he filed for a petition to run for the city council, this particular issue was brought up that he was not eligible to serve on the city council because he was indirectly involved in the distribution of an alcoholic I think we have come further than that in the twentieth century and I believe that those people discriminated against who work for and do...although they do not own any stock. They work for a company that has some involvement with alcoholic beverages. If in fact, the Governor's opinion in this case were correct that would mean that every employee of, for example, the Pabst Brewing Company in Peoria would not be eligible to ever public or village office because of this statute. therefore, I introduced this legislation that allowed a person in this particular situation to hold a public office as long as he did not have any direct interest in that alcoholic beverage industry and I'd be happy to answer But I do move that we pass House Bill 581, the Governor's veto notwithstanding."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Before I was fortunate enough to come to the General Assembly I spent the previous two to three years prosecuting liquor license revocations for the City of Chicago and among the...among the laws that didn't seem to make any sense whatsoever to me are laws that forbad public officials from

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

having this direct or indirect interest in the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors, like there's some magic attached to alcoholic liquors. You. as а Representative can be involved in the sale of new or used You can be a pharmacist, you can be any one of a million things which all of us are but you're not supposed to own a tavern. Well, that's ridiculous on its face. throwback to the 1920s when we had prohibition and we associated all sorts of evils with alcohol. Alcohol is or is not good..something that I would recommend to you. That somebodys individual interest but to bar a public official from having a direct or indirect interest in the sale or manufacture of alcoholic beverages is ridiculous. It's nonsensical, it should no longer be in the law and this Bill is a step in the right direction and I would ask you to override the Governor's veto. It makes no sense. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino to close."
- Mautino: "I would just ask for an affirmative vote on my Motion to pass House Bill 581, the Governor's veto notwithstanding."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 581 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present' and the Motion to override House Bill 581 fails. House Bill 732. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 732, 'I move that House Bill 732 do

 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Representative Robbins."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I...with leave of the House, could we consider 732 and 733 on one vote?"

Speaker Peters: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider 732 and 733 on one vote? Leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."

Robbins: "House Bill 732 assigns to the Department of Agriculture the control program for starlings and House Bill 733 is an enormous appropriation of 50 thousand dollars for them Now, in the Governor's veto he use in this endeavor. states that this is a local problem. I realize it is. It's in the locality of Tuscola. It's in the locality of Mount Carmel. It's in the locality of Enfield. received information from the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home at Quincy, people in Springfield, people in Joliet and people in Galesburg asking for me to continue this program. If this was a bad Bill the bird watchers would not be in support of this Bill. Now, California had to wait on Jerry Brown to move to control the med flies until it had almost totally destroyed their fruit crop. The starlings go even further, they not only destroy crops, they destroy and carry disease to animals. They carry disease to humans and one of the reasons that the Department of Agriculture is reluctant to accept this program is because they know they*re going to have to find some advanced technology other than just say the only way you can get rid of the starlings is to cut the tops out of the trees. Farmers, left to their own, will not only get rid of some of the starlings but they will also have to take care of some of the other birds that they don't want to destroy with it. Any area that is populated with these birds, you lose the meadowlarks, the blue birds and the quail. So, if in any way you can see fit to support me in this override, I think

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

that you..whenever you leave in a jet airplane from some of the airports will feel a little more relieved to know that as happened in Kentucky and has happened in Illinois, these birds won't be sucked into the motors of the plane which could cause..of your airplane..to come down. This is a very serious pest control measure that is needed for southern Illinois. I have not sent you letters. I have not talked to you personally. I just plead with you now for your support in this Bill. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Irv Smith? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 732 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All 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? Yes, this is on House Bill 732 and 733, two Bills. Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich to explain his vote."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge your affirmative vote on this Motion of Representative Robbins. I can tell you if you've never been in an area that was infested by these birds, you really don't realize what the problem is and I can assure you this is money well spent and would have a long range impact for the betterment of the state."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 76 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. The Motion to override House Bills 732 and 733 fail. House Bill 760. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 760, 'I move that House Bill 760 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

 Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would move to override the veto of the Governor on House Bill 760. The Bill provides two things, in provides that governmental entities may receive and use nonpublic funds only as provided by law or as provided ordinance in the case of units of local government or by resolution in the case of school districts. It really defines what public funds are and further, defines this in a way that is consistent with Supreme Court the pronouncements and definition for public funds. The Governor's veto explains it in a different manner. subject that has come up time and time..on Bills that have passed in the House and been on the Governor's desk but he's vetoed those and that is with regard to appropriating all funds that come into the State of Illinois. not the case with this Bill but that is the explanation for Therefore, the explanation is simply correct. The Governor believes that it would require of various funds that not appropriation appropriated, totally incorrect. I would ask for your affirmative vote and move that House Bill 760 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Peters: "Is there any discussion? Representative Priedrich? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 760 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All 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 Priedrich to explain your vote?"

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a Bill that came out of a lot of hard work on the part of the Legislative Audit Commission. When we found that, among

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

others, some of the universities and the Judicial System was having a little trouble distinguishing what is public funds and what isn't and as a result of that it created some problems for the Auditor General in auditing those accounts and determining exactly what he should report to us. The Auditor General, as you know, is...is responsible directly to this Body and I think it's very important that we have once and for all a definition of public funds and nonpublic funds and I think that you would be well advised to yote for this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. The Motion to override House Bill 760 fails. House Bill 847. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "'House Bill 847, I move that House Bill 847 do

pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Klemm."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not a spending Bill. In fact, rather it's going to help, I believe, the State by allowing the cities and counties to work to help the state alleviate some of their problems. Basically, this Bill says that it would allow counties and municipalities to adopt and enforce pollution control ordinances which are no more stringent than the terms and provisions of the Environmental Basically, what we have is that the Protection Act. Environmental Protection Act has been adopted for statewide unified program. But our problem is that the local municipalities that are under 25 thousand are unable to enforce or do anything about pollution. They have to call the EPA and obviously with the restricted budget that

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

they have in the state today, I think it makes good common sense that we allow local governments, local cities and counties to try to help the state enforce pollution control. It's no different than cities now enforcing speed limits on state highways, really. They're helping the state work together. I think the Governor's veto was..had indicated that certainly there should be no fragmented Bills and legislation but I'd like to call the attention, which I think the Governor's staff had overlooked, that there are 95 home rule cities that can do this now already. The..city..the county of Cook County can do it. So, what we're just basically saying is that if you believe cities of 20 and 15 and 10 thousand people are no more concerned ... or are as concerned as your larger cities for pollution, you would certainly adopt this. It cannot be any more stringent than, therefore we won't have local cities and counties adopting and in forcing ordinances that are more stringent enforcing businesses to flee. It's to work with them, to help them. It received only 11 negative votes in the House, unanimously in the Senate and certainly, I think, it's a Bill that should be supported by all. The cities and counties are supporting it. It was a provision in Senate Bill 172 that contained it. It was eliminated and the counties thought it was still there and that's the reason they are now supporting this Bill and I ask for your support on overriding the Governor's veto, notwithstanding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Neyer, Ted Neyer."

Ted Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. This would create confusing and fragmented regulatory requirements for Illinois industry to meet throughout the State. The Illinois Constitution and the Environmental Protection Act, both clearly intend that

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

we should establish a unified statewide program of environmental protection. This goal is being met by a strong state program of pollution control regulation. It should not be frustrated by duplication of effort and lack of uniform standards of enforcement that would result from this Bill. For these reasons, the Gentleman's Motion should be defeated."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion to override. We had a particular problem down in the northern part of Peoria County which finally got resolved to where the people who filed for the permit to put in land pollution facilities was finally overridden. But in the meantime, there was a lot of hue and cry, there was no county input at all into the matter and as a result it caused a lot of consternation, a lot of confusion and a lot of real ill feeling among the constituents of that area. I think the Bill, itself, was well founded when it was introduced and debated. I think the Governor's veto was misguided, I would urge you to support the override."

Speaker Peters: "Cartographer McClain."

McClain: "I might be in trouble now, thanks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Mr. Meyer's position. What Mr. Klemm's Bill would do is provide in the State of Illinois a patchwork of rules and regulations throughout the entire State of Illinois so business and industry would have a difficult time knowing exactly what the environmental rules and regulations are per county and per city. You think of the awful problems that businesses would have. Secondly, I would suggest to you that what the Bill says is that the rules and regulations can be no more stringent than what

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the state and federal regulations are. What that means is that in a lot of communities throughout the State of Illinois those communities can have rules and regulations that are more stringent, can cause a great deal of Ιf you just take an example of like emission controls in a community, let's say granite-steel, where Mr. Wolf and Mr. Steele and Mr. McPike аге rules granite-steel community could have that are more stringent than the Environmental Protection Agency, can cause a great deal of problems for the steel industry in that area, cause a great deal of employees going out of work and in likewise an industrial development throughout the entire State. This kind of piece of legislation would cause some severe problems. So, although Mr. Klemm has his heart in the right spot, I stand in support of the Governor's veto and ask for you to reject his Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Any other discussion? There being none, Representative Klemm, to close."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it's really unusual that in 1979 really the courts had determined that non-home rule entities didn't have that authority and it's of course a little bit confusing because the speakers who are opposed to this legislation have home rule, come from home areas that have that authority. So, it's kind of interesting that they support home rule authority control pollution for their areas but they don't want us in smaller communities who are concerned and are working to try to help the state in a unified program. I think, course, they misunderstand that home rule, and I'm talking about almost approximately 95 cities in Illinois, anybody with 25 thousand people or more can do this. Now, why not make a unified program for the state as the Governor asked for, and I ask for your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 847 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor 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? Last call, have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 74 voting 'aye' 66 voting 'nay' and 6 voting 'present'. The Motion to override House Bill 847 fails. House Bill 996. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "'House Bill 996, I move that House Bill 996 do

pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Alexander."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Members of General Assembly. I rise asking your support in overriding the Governor's veto with regards to House Bill 996. statement of the Governor that the quilty or the person accused would never by prosecuted if he or she did not have a..or receive a preliminary hearing is totally with...in error. Because prosecutors have and will continue to have the right to go before a grand jury in a direct or indirect procedure to secure a true bill for the prosecution of anyone accused. I'd like to further state before this Body, that this is not an issue that appropriates money which would affect the Governor's budget in any shape, form or fashion, neither does it increase taxes but it does address a constitutional quarantee of these United States and the State of Illinois. My point I'd like to raise here is that our Governor is considered the highest constitutional officer of this state and this General Assembly, as has prior General Assemblys been requested to implement the laws of this state with regards to enacting this constitutional right. In each instance this issue has

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

failed, and I will say to you here and now that we may look forward for this issue to keep raising its head before future General Assemblys if my Motion to override does not prevail. Many of you may wonder why the issue has arisen. I say to you that the guarantees guaranteed us by this state should prevail and as constitutional quasi-officers of a General Assembly, you have the right to prevail and ask that this constitutional guarantee prevail for the citizens of these...of this State of Illinois. I ask your 'aye' vote in the override."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber." Leinenweber: "Yes, I would speak in behalf of the Governor's veto and against the Lady's Motion. The requirement that a person have a preliminary hearing is a valued requirement and one that we should not abridge. However, the contents of House Bill 996 as the Governor points out would require that no matter how heinous the crime, no matter person is charged with, and for what...no matter what reason, with the exception of two or three ones, the person if not granted a preliminary hearing within 30 days, if in jail, and in 45 days if free on bail or on recognizance, that person goes free. This is not a question requiring them to start over again or requiring them to be released from jail. They go free of the charge. This is...this is such an overwhelming penalty for the people of the State of Illinois, not just a prosecutor who might miscount by a day and have a preliminary hearing on Tuesday instead of Monday or for some reason or other, say it's a drug related charge, the tests are not back from the crime lab in order prove that a person had a particular controlled substance or not. For whatever reason other than those specifically mentioned in the Bill which is being brought before a grand J. occasioned by a competency examination,

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

determination of incompetency or the delay is occasioned by the defendant. There are many other valid, legitimate reasons why a preliminary hearing might under certain circumstances have to be delayed. This would, in effect, cause virtually every drug offender to be set free because of an inability to comply or to require that the person be brought before a grand jury. Some people have suggested that we use grand juries too much, well this is going to force virtually every criminal defendant to be brought before a grand jury. So, I urge that we vote against the Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen Just in a form of rebuttal of the previous the House. speaker. The courts right now can set people free as Representative Leinenweber referred to if they feel that that particular individual has not had a prompt preliminary hearing. What we're doing with this Bill is setting a statutory time so that the state is on notice that that's when they have to have given that preliminary hearing. they don't, an appellate court might say, 'well, I think 45 days is too long to keep somebody locked up. And they can set them free and dismiss the case. And all the state has to do if it gets close to this time period is take them a very perfunctory fashion, take that issue before a grand jury. You can get an indictment in about two minutes on any crime that's imaginable without any problem. It's totally hearsay evidence which is admissible at the grand There's no defense attorneys there and it's easy to indict somebody. This Bill is in direct response to a report, a request from the Supreme Court that every year points out that we have just..that there's a void in law with..in this particular area. The comments of the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

previous speaker are just not accurate and they were misleading and it's something which should be addressed and the Bill passed, I believe without any problem. And I think it's again an example of the people who are advising the Governor with respect to the criminal laws are more of his, perhaps, his political advisors rather than his criminal law advisors and they're totally misleading in their veto message and in the veto of this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jones, Emil Jones."

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

Representative Alexander, what is the statutory limit a

person now can be...languish... incarcerated in jail or

out on bond before a preliminary hearing is held?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Oh, thank you. To my best knowledge, and I hope some of the criminal lawyers or those who are a little more in-depth into the theory of this procedure will advise me, but there is presently on the statute books a statute which relates that in 120 days from the date of arrest or incarceration, a person must have a speedy trial. I.. this has been misnamed because this is not really a speedy trial, this is an Act that says that if I am arrested I must at least have a preliminary hearing. Further on the books there is a law that says that if I am on bail, I must proceed within 160 days with a speedy trial. Other than that I will have to make a motion to dismiss before the court and the court will have the option to grant my motion or not grant my motion. What we're merely doing is bringing into...for a time element with regards to how soon an individual if the state is going to proceed by an information in lieu of an indictment that the time element would be the 30 day period if you are incarcerated in jail, 45 days if you are out on bail. It

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

does not preclude any state's attorney in any county if he elects not to proceed with a preliminary hearing to go before the grand jury to hold the person on a true Bill-I'd like to say further..."

- Emil Jones: "One other question, isn't it a fact that the Supreme

 Court recommended this type of legislation?"
- Alexander: "This is the...with my request, this is the fourth
 request by our Supreme Court that this General Assembly do
 its work by implementing this constitutional guarantee for
 the people of this State of Illinois."
- Emil Jones: "Yes, thank you. Mr. (Ms.) Sponsor, in addressing the
 Bill, I rise in support of the Representative's Motion to
 override the Governor's veto. The highest court in this
 state has indicated on numerous occasions that this Bill,
 this language is needed in the Criminal Code. The..one of
 the speakers previous spoke about individual being set
 free. What this Bill would do, will force the State's
 Attorney's Office to do the job that they are supposed to
 do. It would...it will bring justice as far as society is
 concerned and I ask for an override on House Bill 996 and
 give justice not only to the person that is guilty but also
 to the person that is innocent."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask all of the Members of the House to take a good look at this Bill. It is not a partisan issue. It is a matter of fundamental justice. It is a recommendation, a response to a recommendation that has been made by the courts for some time. Justice delayed is justice denied and this Bill will only go to make Illinois better able to deal with the whole issue of speedy trial by giving us a definition that our law presently does not have. I would suggest to you all that you take a look at

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

this Bill. It's a good Bill and I would hope that both sides of the aisle would respond in an affirmative way and put the votes up there to override this veto. I strongly suspect, looking at the veto message on this Bill, that this was yet another instance of someone who really was not conversant with the criminal law deciding that this was just not going to be the way that they were going to go. The veto message really did not make a whole lot of sense in my opinion. Particularly given the recommendations of the Supreme Court, and particularly given the demands of our criminal justice system. If we're going to make the system work, we have to begin to be responsive to the concerns, and this is a very important area and I would encourage your 'aye' vote for House Bill 996 override."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise to ask you to sustain the Governor's veto of this Bill. The amount of crime that is being committed in Cook County very easily could overwhelm the State's Attorney's Office. They wouldn't have time to have a preliminary hearing in 30 days and what this Bill says is, if you commit murder and you're not charged within the first 30 days, that you can go out and commit another murder. I don't think this is very conducive to making the streets of Chicago or streets of Illinois safe and I would urge all the people who are interested in law and order to vote to sustain the Governor on this."

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

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I disagree with the previous speaker. If I am charged with murder and the evidence warps...the matter being heard and the state elects not to proceed on an information, the state's attorney has an

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

option to take the matter before a grand jury and secure a true bill or an indictment as we currently know it to be. The state's attorney is in no way boxed. But let me you one more bit of information, our Honorable Governor, James Thompson, on April 23rd of this year, came before General Assembly in message concerning a technicalities in the general processes which loopholes in the law and in his statement to us he recites that any doctrine that frees criminals should be suspected. I agree with him wholeheartedly but I question the doctrine that causes their early release of convicted felons and murder out of the penitentiary back into our society before they have completed their term of sentence. He further states that any rule that interjects an element of hap stance into our system should be scrutinized. I agree with him 100% but I also question why should a person not be entitled to a quaranteed right that is projected and the history of our state since the forming of our Constitution and the forming of our United States Constitution. This is а constitutional question, constitutional awareness, Legislators. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 996 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. 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 73 voting 'aye', 80 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and the Motion to override House Bill 996 fails. House Bill 1007. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "'House Bill 1007, I move that House Bill 1007 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Representative Hallstrom."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House. House Bill 1007 amends the Illinois Human Rights Act to exempt from violations any college, private college compelling the retirement of a faculty member who has reached 65 years of age but not age This legislation was introduced to conform with federal legislation which did provide that the colleges universities would have until 1982 before..July, before they would have to conform with the Federal Discriminatory Act. To give you, quickly, just a little of history because I did not want to do anything against our Illinois Human Rights Act. I did go to Representative the Sponsor of this Act in the House, and he saw Reilly. nothing wrong with this legislation. I Representative Larry Bullock because I trust his expertise in this area of Human Rights. He saw nothing wrong with In the Senate, I went to the Senate Sponsor of this Bill. the Human Rights Act and asked him to be the Sponsor of this legislation, which he was. Ladies and Gentlemen, there was not one single Legislator in the House or the Senate who voted against this legislation. Furthermore, there was not one person from the Department of Rights, from the Governor's office, from anywhere who came to me and said they had any kind of problem with this Bill. I would ask, please, for your support in overriding the Governor's veto. I do feel the Governor was ill-advised on the veto of this Bill. I would appreciate your support on the override. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Lady's request for

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

overriding the veto. She stated correctly that this is good Bill and as so many speakers have said earlier today, sometimes in the Governor's office, in haste, some of the learned counsel make mistakes and there again we find that haste makes waste and in this particular case, they were mistaken. I think we can rectify that mistake by joining the Lady with an affirmative vote in an override Motion on House Bill 1007. I certainly solicit your 'aye' vote in that regard."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative John

John Dunn: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "She indicates she'll yield."

John Dunn: "Does this piece of legislation prohibit retirement if the employee is willing to retire?"

Hallstrom: "No, Sir, it does not."

John Dunn: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative
Hallstrom to close."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask, please, that you would support the override of the Motion of 1007.

Thank you."

Speaker Peter: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1007 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 121 voting 'aye', 24 voting...yes, Representative Braun, 'aye', on this question there are 122 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay', none voting 'present' and the Motion prevails and House Bill 1007 is declared passed, the Governor...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 1051, Representative

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Kulas. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1051, 'I move that House Bill 1051 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1051 provided that any student upon a successful completion of a language proficiency test may receive up to years high school credit for that language. In his veto message, the Governor states that House Bill 1051 places a curriculum mandate on local school districts and that it infringes on a school board's authority to establish graduation and course requirements. suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the Governor's staff maybe should take a language proficiency test in English because this is not what the Bill does. not what the Bill says. The Bill does not infringe on a school board's authority to establish graduation or course requirements. It does not change graduation requirements or course requirements. The Governor also states message that many local school districts already allow language proficiency testing and that he is all for it. This is true, but not all school districts provide this So, what happens, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are discriminating against certain students on the basis of where they live. For example, you have two students attending a Saturday Ethnic School or a Hebrew School, one them, because he lives in Chicago, can take a language proficiency test and get high school credits. The other one because he lives across the street in Oak Park can't get those credits. So, what do we have, Ladies and Gentlemen? We have two students who at their own expense, at their own time, study a foreign language. One of is rewarded by getting high school credits and the other

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

one doesn't get spit. Now, I ask you, is this justice? Is this fairness? House Bill 1051, Ladies and Gentlemen, would make language proficiency tests uniform throughout the state and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this...on House Bill 1051, notwithstanding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative James Reilly decides not to speak. Any further discussion? There 'ain't' any. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1051 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All 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? Representative Terzich to explain his vote for one minute."

Terzich: "....I would urge support of House Bill 1051. This one of the better Bills that was introduced in the General Assembly this Session. There's no money involved here, simply a principle on learning a foreign language. Now all of us have our own ethnic background and certainly if a person is fluent in any type of foreign language, whether it be Spanish, Latin, French, Polish, Ukranian, they should be entitled to the same credits and the same privileges that anyone else who is going to school taking up a language. If you happen to be growing up in a neighborhood or a family that is fluent in that language and you can pass an equivalency test. All this Bill does is say that if you are fluent in a particular foreign language that you should be given the same credit as anyone else who is learning this type of a language. This is pood legislation. I have not had one person who could possibly speak against such good legislation such as this. no money involved and I would appreciate any support that you can give in overriding the veto on House Bill 1051."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just make one observation and that is my 'no' vote is based on the fact that this is another mandate that the state would place on local school districts. Right now they have the right to do as they wish. I think it should remain that way."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Van Duyne to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Yes, I'm a little bit confused as to Representative Hoffman's remark. Just how does this place a mandate on a local school district? As I read our analysis, it person can go out and gain this...take these courses on his I also, and that's a own private time, pay for them. question, but a comment along with that, I disagree that there is no money involved. There is money involved, in fact, it's a saving to the school system. Ιt doesn't mandate that the school system provide the services to these pupils. The pupils are going out and taking these courses on their own private time. They re paying for them with private money and I would see ... I would think that that would provide for a saving to the school board. The only mandate that it provides to the school system is that they make the students come and take a proficiency test in order to prove that they are actually proficient in that foreign language before they will give them the credit that they deserve. Now, I'd like to ask Representative Hoffman, how does that, I realize that in the Governor's statement he said it's a mandate and he favors local control and I see where this Bill gives the local school body or school board the control over the student. They can either ... they can give him the test, they can either give him the credit or they can deny him the credit. Now, but I'd like to ask

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

you and my first question is, where is the mandate to the school system? And where is it costing the school system any money?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."

I honestly cannot understand Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. a single red vote on that board. All this is doing giving, really encouraging students to seek knowledge of a foreign language. This is encouraging them at their own expense to go out and seek knowledge of a foreign language. Boy, I wish I had this kind of knowledge. I wish I had the kind of knowledge Myron Kulas has. I'd love to be able to speak another language. Now, schools offer some languages and that's wonderful. If the student wants to learn some other languages at his own expense, why should he not be given an opportunity to take a proficiency examine? I can't understand for the life of me how one person could be against that. I wish someone actually who's a red vote up there would explain why they re a red because it really does mystify me."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'nay'. The Motion to override House Bill 1051 fails. House Bill 1139. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1139, 'I move that House Bill 1139 do

pass veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative

Deuster."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Amendment to the Juvenile Crime Act that we sailed out of here about 157 to 1 last spring, the Senate passed unanimously. And what the Bill does is, I believe it really strengthens the capacity of our local government and our local police departments to cope with the problem of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

invenile crime in a very constructive manner. Bill provides is that the juvenile officer after a minor is taken into custody may elect not to refer that child to the court system but to release the child upon his written agreement, with the consent of a parent or guardian to make restitution for damages to the injured victim or to perform some public service work in the community where the offense took place. Now the beauty of this law that we passed first of all, it doesn't cost any money. But i t facilitates compensating the victims of crime on а local level. Secondly, it 11 keep some youthful offenders out of Third, it will promote public service the court system. work which benefits all of our communities and fourth, is optional for everybody involved. It's optional for the police, it's optional for the juvenile offender and the of whom need agree to this form of parents, none disposition. And lastly, I know from experience and think you do to, that when young people make restitution or perform public service work they see how justice really works and after it's over they feel better. And I know that their attitudes are changed and they're less inclined to follow a consistent recurring pattern of crime. The Governor vetoed this Bill for two reasons; one reason, he said the Senate Judiciary Committee was studying subject and we ought to let them study it some more. The answer to that concern on the part of the Governor is, that the Senate Judiciary Committee approved this unanimously, 6 to nothing and the Senate, itself, passed it 57 to nothing. The second concern of the Governor is, that this might invest in local police officers a discretionary authority that would be too broad and the Governor's staff cited a court decision that, I'm regret to say, had nothing to do with the subject. I think the Governor was misadvised.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

think the General Assembly was right and I would appreciate your affirmative vote and I hope that we'll pass this with more votes than we did last spring. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1139 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Nelson, to explain her vote?"
- Nelson: "Yes, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is an excellent Bill. I've spoken to police chiefs in my district about it and they concur. As it is, juvenile officers only have two alternatives, presently. As it is they either have to release a juvenile or detain that juvenile. I believe that that would give juvenile officers a third option which would be to make restitution. It used to be years ago that this other alternative was available and I think it worked then, I think it can work again now. That's why I support this piece of legislation."

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

Pawell: "I, too, rise in support of this Bill. We had a similar situation in DuPage County a few years ago where the juveniles were allowed to work out their fine and everyone agreed that is was an excellent system. Hinsdale Hospital got a lot of free work in the process and a lot of our parks and what have you were cleaned up and a lot of the juveniles learned that maybe next time they better think twice before they did some of the vandalism around the towns. Unfortunately, a very smart lawyer came in and got the system knocked out and I would suggest very strongly that you do take a good look at this Bill and vote 'yes'."

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Olson: "Mr. Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Judge Thomassey Hornsby of Lee County, 15th Circuit is the principle judge in the Juvenile Court Association this year. He called me and strongly urged me to support this Bill and may I urge the support of everyone in the House."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ralph Dunn to explain his vote."

Ralph Dunn: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I also urge an 'aye' vote on this for perhaps what may be another reason, a little different. They're closing the Juvenile Detention Center in Maryville and our people in Southern Illinois are going to be taking their juveniles, if they're necessary to be detained, to a detention home in St. Charles. Think of the cost that's going to entail to the local sheriffs who'll have to pay that expense or the local counties. And maybe that this is an idea that the time has come. It would help relieve the number of children referred to the detention homes. So, I too, would urge an 'aye' vote. I think it's maybe an idea that would serve its time because of the budgetary constraints on the Department of Corrections."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Monroe Flinn to explain his vote."

Flinn: "No, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote. I want to be voted as 'aye'. I didn't punch my button, I'd like to be voted as 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Vote Monroe Flinn 'aye'. Representative Karpiel votes 'aye'. Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

O'Connell: "Would you make that 'aye' please?"

Speaker Peters: "Change Representative O'Connell from 'no' to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

"aye". Representative Redmond from "no" to "aye".

Representative Jane Barnes from "no" to "aye". Do you have
that, Mr. Clerk? Representative Miller from "no" to "aye".

Representative Ebbesen from "no" to "aye". Representative
Irv Smith votes "aye". Representative Alstat...Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting "no"."

Speaker Peters: "I think we might all be better off if we dump this and do it over again...with leave of the House. The question...the question is, once again, 'Shall House Bill 1139 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' 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? Representative Lucco, Mr. Lucco, will you...would you please vote Representative Lechowicz 'aye'? Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster, do you wish to explain your vote?"

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 119 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. The Motion prevails and House Bill 1139 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 1157. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Deuster: "I just want to express my appreciation. Thank you."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 1157 do pass, the veto of
the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Hannig."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hannig."

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

House Bill 1157 proposes to create the Illinois Wildlife
Habitat Commission. Its purpose is to help our state
preserve our dwindling wildlife habitat. Now the Bill
would allow the Department of Conservation to sell wildlife
habitat stamps for \$5.00 each and although the stamps would
not provide any special privileges, the monies would be

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

earmarked for the purchase of wildlife habitat lands. Now the Bill also would create an eight member Commission to advise the Director of the Department of Conservation as to which lands are the best to purchase. Now the Governor has indicated he has vetoed the Bill for two reasons. First, he has said that there's no appropriation for the eight Now shortly we're going to be engaged member Commission. in debate about the state budget and the appropriation overrides and vetoes and the cry is going to be that the state does not have any money. Basically, I believe that that is a true statement and for that reason, intentionally provided that this Commission would serve without compensation. I think it is a good fiscal move and I think that that is the way that it ought to operate, at least Secondly, the Governor has said that the the beginning. program has had limited success in other states. simply say that very few states have undertaken this program. It is a new concept. We've never tested it in Illinois and basically, it is a no risk opportunity to raise money for the State of Illinois in a voluntary manner. I think it is a good program and in any case, the program will automatically expire December 31st, 1982. if there is any risk that the program will not work, the program will automatically be abolished. And I would simply close by saying that in the past the Bill has passed by a vote of 135 to 6 and on a Senate concurrence, the House by a vote of 162 to 3 and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield? There is a little conflict
 in the veto book that I have here. One of them, the
 Governor indicates that Colorado withdrew the program when
 it failed to collect enough revenue and then in the

- 80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981 comments it said, Colorado raised \$750,000 a year through voluntary contributions. Now, which is correct? It's a little.."
- Hannig: "I'm not 100% correct, Dwight, as to which approach would be correct. All I could say is that it is a voluntary program. I don't anticipate that it will cost the Department of Conservation a lot of money to run it. They are in favor of it. And I would simple say, I would like to give the state an opportunity to try the program for at least one year."
- Friedrich: "Well, do you have any history of what's happened in other states, I guess that's what I'm asking?"
- Hannig: "It's relatively a new idea and there is really not a lot of history throughout the United States."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Well, I understand that this \$750,000 was from an income tax check off as opposed to a voluntary contribution. I guess it's a voluntary contribution if you check it off on your income tax but nevertheless, that's the explanation I've just been given."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Friedrich, have you concluded, Sir?"
- Friedrich: "Well, I think I have a clarification, the stamp program didn't work the income tax check off did. And this thing we're talking about now is a stamp program and is the one that Colorado banned. So, I would have to be with the Governor's veto."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Hannig to close. Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Hannig to close."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I would simply say that this is basically a no risk opportunity for the State of Illinois to raise money. Even if this program

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

should fail, it will be automatically repealed in one year and it will not cost the taxpayers of this state any dollars. If the program is successful and I must emphasize that it is an experimental program. It has not been used in very many states in the past but if it is successful it can be a painless way for the State of Illinois to raise revenues without raising taxes. So, I would simply say that if you feel that we could use the money without raising the taxes, I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1157 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Woodyard. 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 87 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the Motion to override House Bill 1157 fails. House Bill 1417. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 1417 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Rhem."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Rhem."

Rhem: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1417 amends the Juvenile Court Act to provide for a \$25.00 fine on parents, guardians or custodians whose delinquent or neglected minor or minors in need of supervision violates the dispositional order or condition of probation for the third time. This Bill came because of the concerns of residents in my district and other districts. There is a serious crime rate being conducted by juveniles and it's the opinion of many residents that in order to alleviate some of these crimes we must start placing more responsibilities on the parents. In the long run, I believe, that the courts would be able to handle

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

these kind of problems and it won't be too much of an encumbrance on them that the Governor says is happening now. I believe that we have enough clerks in the courts to handle the amount of fines that would be collected by the courts and in the long run the parents eventually would be able to take hold of their kids and cut down on some of the crimes that the kids are committing in our communities. I ask for a favorable override of this veto."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you very much. Again I address the issue of the juvenile courts and from my court system I've been advised that the juvenile courts could support this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Rhem to close."

Rhem: "I would just ask the Members of the House to vote in favor of overriding this veto."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1417 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Woodyard. Representative Woodyard, please, and Representative Wolf. Thank you, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And the Motion to override House Bill 1417 fails. House Bill 1439. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move House Bill 1439 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Preston."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. What

House Bill 1439 accomplishes is to keep the legislative

scholarships that we now have intact for distribution to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

students throughout Illinois notwithstanding the cutback Amendment which will take effect in 1983_ Right now because of 177 Members of the House and 59 Members of the Senate, we as a Legislative Body of the General Assembly 472 legislative scholarships to give out, four year year. scholarships to give out every However, 19...January 1st of 1983 we have cut this Body back to 118, therefore, we're depriving students in Illinois of the benefit of those 118 legislative...excuse me, the 59 we re depriving students of 118 legislative cutback, scholarships. What this Bill will do is to do little more than to keep that number intact. It doubles the number of legislative scholarships, starting in 1983. So. is not doubling the scholarships, it's doubling the scholarships for that time, a much smaller Body. tell you, among the people who withdrew the opposition to this Bill, is the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the University of Illinois and on and on. This was tailored with their original objections. We made it effective in 1983 after the cutback Amendment takes affect 50 the net great addition...additional scholarships is not very As many of you, I'm sure, are aware you have received numerous..far more requests for legislative scholarships than in the past. Because of the cutbacks in educational funding, there are few directions that a needy student can go for scholarship assistance. This is one that we have in the General Assembly and it's going to be eroded without this Bill. In 1983 there are going to be 118 fewer scholarships than we have today. This is not the time with dwindling monies available for students. They can't get the same kind of money they did from the Federal Government. They can't get the same kind of money that they did

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

formerly from State Government because of the cutbacks. If we now cut the scholarship assistance, you're going to have a generation of people where only the wealthy can afford higher education. So, I do urge you to please vote to override the Governor's veto of this Bill. I think his arithmetic was off and I'm sure that if he reconsidered, he would support this and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

J.J. Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Speaker, Members of the House, you know last November the voters of Illinois voted to cut the size of this House by one-third, supposedly to save some money, both on salaries and all the other accouterments and subsidies. I suppose, that go along with it. Now, this particular Motion flies in the face of that. We're talking about roughly 1.7 million dollars in income fund revenue to the universities right now which would have to be made up then by GRF dollars. Currently, if we would do this now, it would cost approximately three and a half million and of course after the size of the House is reduced in the next Session one-third, it's 2.6 million dollars. I don't think this is a good idea at all. I think the Governor in his wisdom did the proper thing by vetoing this particular piece of legislation and I would ask the Members of this House for a negative vote on the Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kustra. K-u-s-t-r-a."

Kustra: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to sustain the Governor's veto. I just wish there was a way he could have vetoed the whole program.

Not long after we returned home after our last Session, Channel 2-WBBM, did a little report on legislative scholarships and a couple of our Members were interviewed by the reporter and in one quote I remember specifically it

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

said, "If you can't give them to your friends, who can you give them to?" Now I set up a legislative Commission, or a scholarship Commission which awards these scholarships to people who qualify by a board of people who I have selected from education to award these scholarships. Unfortunately, it's not done that way by all Members of the General Assembly and as far as I'm concerned, some Members of the General Assembly have given this program a bad name. It strikes me as odd that we should talk about giving scholarship aid to needy students when we can point to the fact that there are a lot of these scholarships that go to friends, cronies, and political supporters. As far as I'm concerned, the program should go right down the tubes and the last thing we want to do is expand it."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of sustaining the Governor's veto. I concur with both speakers in the sense that those of us who ve been here for any length of time recognize that have probably been much better off in all ways if we hadn't had to deal with this scholarship program. Those students who are in need can identify, can substantiate that need with the Scholarship Commission, they're going to qualify for a scholarship. To have to set up committees and commissions which some of us have done to filter through scholarship applications is just a nonsensical kind of a task from a political point of view. You give two scholarships, you give four, you give eight, depending on how you divide it and then you tell 70 other people that they can't have it. There's no advantage to any of us in any of this and I would rise in opposition to this Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hudson."

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

House. I rise in support of the Governor's veto of this particular Bill. It seems to me that if one thing is clear if it is that this years, over the scholarship...scholarships are to be administered bγ Members of the Illinois General Assembly they have imposed upon them, I think, a terrific responsibility to be fair, to be impartial, to be totally just in their administration of the taxpayers money in this respect. It's a difficult job at best. It seems to me that we are cast whether we to be or not into the role of administrators want scholarships and scholarship funds. I am not convinced my own mind after having dealt with this for some period of years here in the Illinois General Assembly that that is really totally our job. I think the points that have been made here today have been good, against it. The question probably is whether we should be doing this at all or not. at least, it would seem to me to be ill-advised to expand the program at this time. Let's keep it where Support the Governor's veto."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Motion. Those in favor signify
by saying 'aye', those opposed. Opinion of the Chair, the

'ayes' have it. Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I..in
response to some of the comments that were made by the
other speakers, among the most rewarding experiences that
I've had in the General Assembly was indeed the awarding of
these General Assembly scholarships to needy students who
would but, for in many cases but, for those scholarships
would not have been able to attend college. That's been my
experience. I can tell you that when one of the previous
speakers who made a big point of his appointing a

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

legislative commission or a scholarship commission in his community, well, I'll be glad to issue that speaker a certificate of appreciation for his good works, but he also the same individual who sponsored a Bill to indeed reduce the amount of scholarship money available scholars in Illinois and that Bill passed and is now law. So. I'm not terribly impressed. I... I can only tell this, from my experience every person that I ve given a scholarship to was indeed grateful and but for that scholarship either they would not have been able to attend college or they would have been in dire financial straits to make up for that money. That's been having The people I've talked to are...have experience. Right now, by a failure to override similar experiences. the Governor's veto, the net effect is 118 students per year or using the Governor's figures, would be 472 students year will not be able to have scholarships to attend colleges. This is a time when other financial aid is being dried up and we here are also saying, 'we cannot help students, not only do better than they did in the past but we're going to dry up your scholarship money at this level I think that'd be a shame and a bad message but if that's the message you want to give then vote to sustain the Governor's veto. I, for one, am asking you to override his veto. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1439 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' 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? Take the record, Nr. Clerk. On this question there are 47 voting 'aye', 98 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Motion to override House Bill 1439 fails. House Bill 1487. Read the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 1487 do pass, and the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Getty."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, murderers and others convicted of violent crimes belong in prison not on our streets. That's why a couple of years ago this General Assembly passed the Determinat Sentencing Law for Illinois, sometimes referred to as Class X. I was one of the principle sponsors of that legislation and I strongly believe that violent offenders belong in our prisons. Problem is almost 50% of the Illi...inmates in Illinois because they were convicted of prisons are there non-violent crimes. Many of those convicts, particularly deserve a chance at rehabilitation. young. Unfortunately, neither judges, the media nor the public have much confidence in our probation system and no wonder. In Cook County alone there are 182 probationers per officer. Think about that for a minute, 182 persons on assigned to each probation officer on the probation average. That's why I sponsored House Bill 1487 which before you now. The purpose of this Bill is to provide the resources and the professional standards necessary to ensure that the probation system, both punishes criminals and serves the public interest. A good probation system will require criminals to pay restitution to the victims of crime. It will mean close surveillance of all cases probation officers. It will mean residential detention in rehabilitation programs in lieu of prison. And it will include restitution to society through mandatory work by these people in community service projects. Most important the criminals, not the taxpayers, will be required to work and support themselves and their dependents. The cost of

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

the improvements that will be made by this is certainly far, far better than the small additional cost to our state budget which will not even take effect during this fiscal year. It will not harm the Governor's budget this fiscal It will be phased in and not come in until the second half of fiscal 1983. I will not at this time over the Governor's message. The Governor's message, unfortunately, is in error. The comments which I have made I think will indicate that. If anyone has any specific question, I will be more than happy to answer it. I think that this will be the greatest savings and I will be happy to explain to you why and how it works. This will be the greatest savings to the people of the State of Illinois that we could enact in this legislative Session. It will save us from committing people who should not be committed to the penitentiary and making them violent offenders. will give us the real tools to rehabilitate people who are first offenders and who are in that half, one-half, of our prison population that would be classified non-violent crime area. I ask for your support in overriding this veto of the Governor which was unfortunately ill-advised."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlmen of the House, I rise in support of the Motion. At the time the Class X legislation was adopted it was pointed out that as a result of the more severe treatment, the prison population was going to rise astronomically. I don't think we have to belabor this point very far to realize that since Class X has gone into effect, we've had a new penitentiary in Centralia, a new penitentiary in Hillsboro, we additional detention facilities in Moline...in Moline-Rock Island area. We have additional facilities in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Lincoln and we also have additional facilities Springfield and we've had to release early some 44 hundred prisoners because we don't have enough room to take care of them in the prison institutions. It would seem to me that practically every authority on the subject has indicated that it should be that violent prisoners are restrained and kept confined, but those who threat...who pose no threat to society should be given alternative methods of punishment and supervision. I believe that the commission that was appointed by the President of the United States of which our Governor was a chairman strongly urged that we take a look at the treatment that we had for violent prisoners and that we consider alternatives to confinement. the recommendation of the John Howard Association. there is any chance of rehabilitation and I don't quite frankly know whether there is, but if there is there absolutely no chance in the world that we're going to rehabilitate anyone by sending them to the I think in the long run, they will save us a institution. great deal of money and I strongly urge the support of Representative Getty's Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Getty and Redmond's efforts are certainly laudible, desirable to try to attempt to not incarcerate and to rehabilitate those people who can be rehabilitated, and I would be the first person to vote for a Bill which provided the resources necessary to do that if, and only if, those resources could be used and used efficiently. The current Bill does not do that. The current Bill that we're voting on, the Bill which the Governor has vetoed because of the extraordinary cost requires no standards, no experience, no education, no

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

professionalism on the part of the probation officers that would be funded. We could be spending money on people who have no experience, no education, and no professionalism in this field. There is no requirement that there be a successful performance by the agency involved in order to continue to get funding. Now, the argument is that we can reduce recidivism, that we can put people back on the street and that ¥e don't need additional prison...facilities. That argument may be right and it may be wrong. But there is no requirement in this Bill that if that argument proves to be wrong, if an agency fails in its then it would not continue to get that money. I believe that any Bill that would appropriate money for this purpose, that would authorize this purpose, ought to require successful performance by the probation agency involved before it could get additional money. That's required in this Bill. So, we have two negative situations. We have a situation number one, where we have totally unqualified people performing the function, people selected through the patronage mechanism who cannot do this, who cannot successfully rehabilitate or supervise criminals. Secondly, we can have a situation where they can continue to have the same people be resentenced, commit new crimes, go to prison, jack up the cost of the prison They can continue to get the money, the subsidy system. because there's no requirement for good performance. would suggest that this Bill is defective for reasons. I would suggest that we ought to subsidize probation services but not in the Bill which gives all the power to a group of non-elected bureaucrats who have no requirements, no incentive in the law to ensure that an agency perform well or that an agency choose its personnel well. For those reasons and because of the extraordinary

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

cost of the Bill, some 19 and a half million dollars, I would suggest that we put that money into something of a much higher priority nature. I would urge that you vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Motion to override so that we can indeed balance the budget so that this date will stay fiscally solvent. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Wolf, J. J. " J.J. Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Well. liked the price tag on the last Bill, you ought to be crazy about this one. This Bill, first of all, does not place a ceiling on cost, doesn't provide any mechanism for Currently, the situation is that the their containment. state provides counties with \$400 each month for every probation officer that earns in excess of \$11,000 a year. This reimbursement will cost the state some six and a million dollars during the coming fiscal year. And the Bill, of course, would expand state reimbursement expenses to cover not only the probation officers salaries as we now cover, but all expenses incurred in operating a probation office, that would be the rent, the telephone, all the other expenses. And while it is absolutely true that there is no cost to this fiscal year which will end on July 1, there's a half a million dollars, or rather there is 19 and a half million dollars which would be in the first full year of operation. I think that at this particular time, this particular period of fiscal restraint, such a program would be ill-advised and I would urge a 'no' vote on the part of this House on the Gentleman's Motion."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to respond to the comments of both of those gentlemen. The

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

first speaker in opposition said that the Bill contained no standards for the qualifications of probation officers. That is not true. The existing law already requires that in order that a county be eligible to receive its \$400.00 subsidy per officer that that probation officer must have a college degree in an appropriate discipline. further standards already set down in the law regarding the type of person that must be hired by probation departments. This General Assembly already dealt with that three years ago, Representative, and it's too bad that you didn't check into that. But, moreover, this Bill goes further. requires that the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts set down the standards that would be followed bу any probation department applying for reimbursement under this. The Bill is very specific. doesn't use merely permissive language. It uses mandatory lanaguage. It says, the department shall have what the office of Administrative...the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts a probation plan continuing and new probation services. It details what that is to contain. It sets out the salary schedule. Somebody said it didn't have cost containment. Cost containment is doubly, doubly covered in this Bill. all. you must have the primary salary schedule αf maintenance in order to even qualify for Secondly, it specifically says, every General Assembly in the future is going to be able to review the expenses of this plan and either grant more or less money because any amounts would be pro-rated based upon the total appropriated by this General Assembly. We have built in dual controls into this. Apparently, that speaker hadn't bothered to check into that aspect either. As a matter of fact, it covers in mandatory terms standards for training,

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

personnel, hiring, promotion, delivery of programmatic services, including work loads, classification of the defenders. intensive supervision, pretrial services, standards relating to restitution, standards relating to community service and employment service. As a matter of fact, I think that those comments deal with most of the points raised and the only other point is cost. I agree with you, 19 and a half million dollars is not a amount of money. It's not a small amount of money and that's one of the reasons we decided it would he more effective to phase it in into installments over two fiscal years so that the cost is nothing this fiscal year and only 9.75 million dollars in the second fiscal year and that's assuming every county came under it. As of this date, most of the major counties have already passed resolutions in support of this legislation. Just to name a few, they include Crawford, DeWitt, Knox, Lawrence, Livingston, Madison, Marion, Montgomery, Massac, Piatt, DuPage, Will, Stephenson, Lake, Rock (sic) Island, Mercer, Stephenson and Kane. I suggest to you that this has very substantial support from those counties through actions by their county boards throughout our state. It is not something that's lightly been undertaken. If you've been reading the editorial pages of most of our major newspapers or watching television in the metropolitan you will see that this Bill has been endorsed by the media. And let's talk about the final thing that was raised, the issue of cost. Let's talk about cost, let's talk about the Right now there are approximately 12,000 effectiveness. people in the Illinois penitentiary. Of those people 402 are there for murder, 2,269 for Class X offenses; 320 for Class I; 3,314 for Class II; 2,574 for Class III; 964 for Class IV, and 583 misdemeanants, in the penitentiary mind

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

The first classes that I read, murder, Class X and Class I, all belong there, there's no question about it. That amounts to a little over 3,000 people. The second group would be the Class II felons, half of them belong there because they're violent. After that you get Class Those are only property climbs, they re not nice people maybe but they re never committed a violent offense in most instances. Most of them are first offenders. Class IV are the lowest scaled and they involve property or position status crimes. Misdemeanants, I can't imagine why Illinois continues to keep them in our What will it cost to house those penitentiary system. people? The cost, Ladies and Gentlemen, is absolutely astronomical. Operating cost per inmate is 16,524 per year. The Governor has just authorized the go-ahead with the new medium security prison at Vienna. That will house 750 people, that's less than the Class offenders that we presently have in the Illinois Those 75...750 people will cost penitentiary. million in construction costs. But the amortized cost of that, including interest will be at the most conservative rate of 9%, which is unrealistic in this market, 4.5 million per year in amortized construction costs over the years. In addition to that, the annual operating cost will be \$12,393,000 for a total cost of 16.9 million dollars per year in present day dollars, present day dollars for every...for the housing of only 750 people and the passage of this legislation we could give a judge a reasonable option, not give him the alpha or the omega, give him a probation system which currently means nothing because there's no restitution, there's no surveillance, there's no supervision and there's 182 people per caseload. We could give him something more than just

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

sending somebody to the prison, we could give him the opportunity to place them on probation. require restitution. require employment, require that individual participate in a community service program. A11 of these things would provide the tools for meaningful rehabilitation. This would be a net savings, saving of human life, instead of sending them to a penitentiary, that's a school for crime, we could give them an opportunity at rehabilitation, and at the same time keep those people who don't belong in the penitentiary out, not cost the taxpayers the money and have a net savings of a tremendous amount to the people of Illinois. I ask for your favorable support in overriding this veto."

- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1487 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative....Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative John Dunn to explain his vote, for one minute."
- John Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Mr. Getty and urge an 'aye' vote on this important issue. Those of us downstate who do have county probation systems find our systems operating in county budgets which are badly strapped for funds, funds which largely come from real property taxes. You can help yourself and help your constituents and help your taxpayers back home by voting green on this important issue. Let's get 107 votes up there."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. Representative Getty."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is such an important issue. I rarely ask for a poll of the absentees, but I'd like people to have an opportunity..."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees.

 Read the list, Mr. Clerk. Representative Conti, for what
 purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Conti: "If this reaches 107, I'd like a verification of the Roll Call."
- Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Barkhausen. Bluthardt. Griffin. Jackson.

 Martire. Ozella. Pullen. Reed. Stanley. Stearney and
 Wikoff."
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Getty. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Motion to override House Bill 1487 fails. House Bill 1489. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "'I move that House Bill 1489 do pass the veto of
 the Governor notwithstanding', Representative O'Connell."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels in the Chair."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think one of the few Bills to succeed in overriding the Governor's veto was one where it was prefaced that this will not cost the State of Illinois any money. So, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that this will not cost the State of Illinois one dime, but rather it will save the State of Illinois millions and millions of dollars; not only for us, but for our children and our grandchildren. This is a Bill that would provide a cap on the amount of outstanding bond indebtedness that the State of Illinois can incure. We have discussed this Bill at least on two other occasions on the floor of this House. It received an overwhelmingly large plurality of votes to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

leave this House floor as well as the similar plurality in the Senate. The Governor's veto message was simply that he, while concurring with the concepts of the Bill, did not that the methodology was correct. Яe forgot, however, to provide us with an alternative, but rather simply suggested that, if the interest rates were to reduce, this Bill would not provide the flexibility accelerate future bond programs. I would respectfully submit that quite the contrary that this Bill is an ingenious economic criteria for greater flexibility in not only containing a rapidly expanding debt service, but also provides us with the flexibility so that our future and current bonding programs will not be jeopardized. The Bill provides a 2.57% limitation on the amount of increase of indebtedness over personal income. It simply says that if personal income increases so, too, maybe the amount principal in the bond sales. Presently, the amount of outstanding bonds represents 2.57% of personal income the State of Illinois. I think that that's far enough. Since 1971, outstanding indebtedness has increased 900%, Ladies and Gentlemen, 900%. What that represents in terms of indebtedness to each individual in this state is an increase from 40 dollars to 423 dollars per person. one of us has that liability. If we are allowed to permit this increase, what this represents, in terms of debt at this time, is 308 million dollars. That's 308 million dollars that comes right off the top of the General Revenue Fund. If we gage a similar increase over the next ten years, that debt service will not simply double, Ladies and Gentlemen, but double and then some. Can we, honestly, here today and expect ourselves and our children and our grandchildren to confront a debt service of billion dollars? It is not beyond the realm of possibility

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

that in ten or fifteen years given the consistent increase in debts that we will be confronted with a billion dollar debt service. Let me put that in simple terms. We already have a 308 million debt service. What that represents is the total budget for the Public Health and for the Department of Corrections. We have been talking all day about fiscal integrity, saving the taxpayer's money, abiding by the Governor's vetoes to keep our budget in line with his requests. This is a litmus test for your sincerity in that regard. I would be happy to answer any questions that might arise."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from DeWitt,
Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I would remind the Assembly of something that House. Prince Clemens Von 'Meterneck' once said. He said that phrases like the defense of high sounding civilization which desolve into nothingness upon close scrutiny, nothing can be defined. Such is the case in this Bill. The Gentleman proposes, claims to propose a limitation on indebtedness, but no limitation is contained It takes, in our system, 107 votes to pass in the Bill. the House for a new authorization for bonded indebtedness for the state. 107 votes. This Bill can be amended any time with 89 votes. All that would be required to pass any new bonded indebtedness authorization would be a simple boiler plate piece of language in the Bill that would say that the contents of this particular statute do not apply to this bond issue. That would only require 89 votes, the authorization would require 107. So, get authorization, you can necessarily abort the provisions of this Bill. Now, what that suggests to me is that there's no financial integrity of the state being protected by this

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Bill. In order to have financial integrity, you first have to have a little bit of intellectual integrity. And when you can completely avoid the provisions of this Bill with fewer votes than are necessary to issue bonds, there's no intellectual integrity in the concept of this Bill. would suggest I'd be glad to work with the Gentleman on legislation to amend the Constitution on a Resolution to do that which would require 107 votes or some super majority or just simply impose the limitation in the Constitution bonded indebtedness. That would limiting state he meaningful. Through either legislative enforcement or judicial enforcement, that could be a meaningful way to control indebtedness, which we need to do. But this is a This is nothing more than a press release, and gimmick. what we're doing with this gimmick or this press release, we're deceiving the people of this state. We're deceiving them to suggest there's a limitation when, in fact, is no limitation. That's a lack of intellectual integrity. It's the kind of thing that the people of this state have been voting against in recent years and they're not going to be deceived by something like this. I would urge a 'no' the Gentleman's Motion to override. Please vote vote ΩD red."

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

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I must respectfully disagree with the prior speaker, my colleague from DeWitt County. This Bill, while actually not being what we would have sought in a Constitutional Amendment, today, of course, will require an extraordinary majority, and it will put its imprint on this veto override on the notion that there should be some settling, some look, some step and fallback at the ticking time bomb that is the bonding capabilities in the bonding...the wholesale

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

bonding authorizations that we've gone through in the last ten years. I wholeheartedly endorse the concept, not going far enough I understand to a Constitutional Amendment, but to abort this and to circumvent this particular provision will require an open—ended statement of aborting this provision if it's overridden and put into law. So I thoroughly support Representative Totten's... Oh. I meant Representative O'Connell's bond limitation Bill. I supported it in Committee. I supported it on the floor, and I wholeheartedly, enthusiastically support it now because I don't wish to chain and bind future generations to pay for our excesses in the 80's."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, stand in support of the override on House Bill 1489. I do it for a few different reasons that have been presented here before us. Number one, the bonding authorization provisions have been the largest growth of any state, in the central United States, and second only to the State of New York, which was in a much graver posture approximately two and a half years ago. But the most important factor is that, Ladies and Gentlemen, there comes a time when we all have to look in the mirror, and when look in that mirror I think we'll find out that you cannot speak conservative control fiscal policies and then stand up and vote against the legislation that brings that certain posture to being. What we have is the of legislation that puts a cap on our future generations: your children, my children and our grandchildren. want to act responsibly and to put those caps on that all of the members of the administration and that side of the aisle have been preaching for the last two and a half

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

years, it's time to put your votes where your mouths are.

I recommend an "aye" vote and over 107 on this most important question."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Zito: Everyone has talked about the need for fiscal restraint and that government spending has to be limited, but no one the question of the state's ever addressed general obligation bonded indebtedness. Our ratio statewide outstanding principal indebtedness is personal income to 2.61%. That's to say current outstanding principal of 2.68 billion dollars in Illinois general obligation personal income in Illinois represents 2.61% of determined under this Bill. In 1975, this ratio was Accordingly, this Bill was drafted...that will cap outstanding general obligation principal indebtedness in relation to the current level of 2.61% of Illinois personal By keeping the ratio at current levels, we will income. not be jeopardizing any pending bond sales or bond sales for fiscal year 1982. The method contained in House Bill 1489 will give Illinois a healthy but controlled bond sales program. If our total income goes up, then our debt will be allowed to increase by no more than the percentage increase in personal income. We, in the State of Illinois, have decided not to spend ourselves broke. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, I suggest we support this Motion so that the State of Illinois does not borrow itself broke. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentlemen from Franklin, Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 1489. Last Spring we passed out of this House, House Bill 1489 which would limit our state's outstanding indebtedness. It's a type of Bill that every

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

financially responsible House Member should be supporting. It's popularity is evidenced by the widespread editorial support that it has received from throughout this state. Also the Auditor General of Illinois, Robert Cronson, stated and I quote, "I feel certain that the enactment of House Bill 1489 would be considered as a favorable factor in the evaluation of the credit worthiness of Illinois general obligation indebtedness*, unquote. Today we ourselves in the unedible position of paying 308 million dollars in debt service right off the top of our state It is becoming extremely obvious that Governor revenue. Thompson is playing dangerous rhetoric games with our states financial ratings, and we are currently rated as triple A, a rating that saves the State of Illinois millions of dollars each year. The administration buy now, attitude; however, not only is going to later jeopardize this rating but will place a burden of payment on our children and grandchildren and for generations to come. The Governor says he agrees with the goals of the Bill, but he has not offered an alternative. The only alternative that he has offered is that of rejection. Ιt is time for my friends from throughout the House and especially from the other side of the aisle to stand up for what they profess to believe in. It is time for them to being intimidated by the Governor who is more concerned with his image than our state's financial security. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DeKalb,

Representative Ebbesen."

Bbbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

have it. Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell, to close."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the previous speakers on the other side of the aisle raised some intellectual integrity questions. I would submit that Attorney ... Auditor General rather, Robert G. Cronson, has done outstanding job of monitoring our fiscal policies. Ιn 1978, the Auditor General's Office conducted an audit Audit of the Management entitled Program of State Long-Term Debt. He issued a report following that audit and in that report he pointed out that among criteria used by the investment community to evaluate credit worthiness of state debt instruments are, number one, a per capita Number two, a ratio of per capita debt to total personal income; and, finally, a ratio of debt service requirements to total state generated revenues. The significance behind appeasing bond purchasers. bond investers, is a question of interest. The Governor states that by being unable to take advantage of lower interest rates in a fluctuating market, we will lose certain elements of interest savings. That's totally false. have here an objective report made at least three years before this event stating that we will save on interest if we adhere to a debt ratio such as proposed in this Bill. half a percent of interest over a 20 to 25 year issue or longer can save this state millions of dollars. Why we cannot adopt such a policy is beyond me. One of the previous speakers suggested that, by adopting this, it would be purely surplusage in that it takes a 3/5 vote to pass bond programs for various departments. I would submit that if you recall the end of the Spring Session we agonized through a number of different long debates dealing with various bond issued programs. What you would have,

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

under this Bill, is a consolidation of our entire state debt program that would prevent any of these individual department's programs from exceeding the debt limitation of 2.57%. You would have a consolidation as opposed to a sporadic individual by individual debate without control whatsoever. Furthermore, one of the previous speakers suggested that it would take 107 votes and that this would simply be a simple majority. I would submit to you that if you are willing, if you have the fiscal integrity that you stated during the last campaign, if you are willing to protect the interests of your children and grandchildren and yourself that you will join with me in providing the 107 votes that it will need to override this regretting... regretful veto of this significant piece of legislation. Please, I ask your vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1489 and shall the veto of the Governor notwithstanding pass?". All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.

Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig, to explain his vote."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to explain my vote on this Bill. It's hard for me to understand why the Governor would veto House Bill 1489. The Bill's main impact is to control outstanding general obligation bonds. It will not affect the planned sale of 380 million dollars in general obligation bonds during fiscal '82. It will not affect current authorized capital projects. What it will do is cap the levels of growth so that our debt will increase by no more than the increase in our personal income. This logical approach to government will allow us to maintain a sensible fiscal program and prevent us from mortgaging our future. Now, the Governor's

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

veto, in my opinion, is just another buck passing tactic and we must stop it before it's too late. mentioned, the biggest surge in our outstanding indebtedness has occurred during the last ten years. During that time, the total state budget has risen 34%, but state indebtedness has risen over 900%. Do you really want to carry the burden of that irresponsibility? These bonds are an economic time bomb waiting to explode. They must be repaid someday and so let's show some fiscal restraint and ensure that we pass no more bond issues without thinking about it. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn, to explain his vote. Timer's on, Sir."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Dunn: Much has been made recently at the federal level about the national budget going over the one trillion All of our constituents back home wish we dollar mark. could do something about that, to put a lid on it or bring it down to a lower level. Well, maybe you can't do anything about that, but if you vote "yes" on this Bill you can go home and tell them that you did your job in the State of Illinois where you do have some jurisdiction, some responsibility and some control and you have done your part to put a cap, to put a lid, to put a ceiling on bonded indebtedness and borrowings in the State of Illinois to make Illinois a better place for your children grandchildren. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Donovan, to explain his vote. Timer's on, Sir."

Donovan: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote in support of House Bill 1489. You know, we hear constantly from the Governor, certainly you people have on your side of the aisle. We have heard it on this side of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the aisle. We we heard it from the public to slow down spending, get things under control. I think this is a fine, fine opportunity on this Bill to certainly control the outstanding indebtedness and bring the indebtedness somewhat into line. Our analyst tells me that we have risen to 4.7 billion dollars as of today up from 2.7 in 1979. Now what better job or what better Bill could we use, at this point, to bring things into line? I think it's a good idea, very good idea. It's not Constitutional Amendment like Jack Davis has indicated. T+ will be a statute. It gives all the flexibilities that the Governor spoke to in his veto message. So, I hope that each and everyone of us will get a few more votes on board to pass this fine Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Marion, Representative Priedrich, to explain his vote. The timer's on, Sir."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, reluctantly, I am going to speak in favor of this, and, if you'll permit me, I'll reminisce just a little bit. Prior to 1970 the only way you could have a bond issue is by the vote of the people. Well, the delegates at the Constitutional Convention said, that's horse and buggy. Let's turn it over to Legislature and with a 3/5 vote they will never pass a bond issue unless it's absolutely essential. Well, I predicted at that time and the prediction has come true that every Session you would have new issuance of bonds. Well, this has gone on and we've enjoyed it because it's a way of having it today and passing it on to tomorrows generations. But General Cronson has indeed made a deep study of this in which it points out that we are rapidly increasing the saturation point. Unless some restraints are put on, may go overboard and lose our bond rating."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

80th Legislative Day

- October 15, 1981
- wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

 Representative Collins.**
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification of the Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Collins, requests a verification of the affirmative roll. Proceed.

 Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, the conservative union requests that I poll the absentees first."
- Speaker Daniels: "Poll of the absentees."

White. Sam Wolf.

- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alstat. Bluthardt.

 Deuster. Griffin. Huskey. Karpiel. Oblinger. Reed.

 Irv Smith. Stearney and Wikoff."
- "Proceed with a poll of the affirmative roll." Speaker Daniels: Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. Barr. Bell. Boucek. Bower. Bartulis. Beatty. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Deuchler. DiPrima. Donico. Donovan. Ewell. Doyle. John Dunn. Farley. Plinn. Dwight Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Grossi. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Hudson. Huff. Jaffe. Jones. Katz. Keane. Jim Kelley. Dick Jackson. Kelly. Koehler. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Madigan. McMaster. Matijevich. Mautino. Mays. McGrew. McPike. Neff. O'Brien. J. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Connell. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Rea. Redmond. Rhem. Richmond. Robbins. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. Watson. Topinka. Tuerk. Turner.

Woodyard. Younge. Yourell.

Zito and

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Zwick."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bower asks for leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Leave is granted.

Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Vote to 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Boucek from 'aye' to
'no'. Questions of the affirmative roll, Representative
Collins."

Collins: "May I ask where we're starting, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "108, Sir."

Collins: "Thank you. Representative Braun."

Speaker Daniels: "Carol Mosely Braun. Representative Braun.

Lady in the chambers? She's in the back aisle. Will the

Members please be in their seats? All those persons not

entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery.

Proceed, Sir."

Collins: "Representative Bullock."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Younge requests

leave to be verified. Does she have leave? Hearing no
objections, leave is granted. Purther questions, Sir?"

Collins: "Yes, Sir. Representative Capparelli."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Daniels: "Chapman. She's in the chambers."

Collins: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Daniels: "Domico. Domico. Gentleman in the chambers?

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded ..."

Speaker Daniels: "Here he is. Okay."

Collins: "Representative Farley."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Garmisa is here."

Collins: "Representative Giglio."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Greiman."

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

Collins: "Representative Hanahan."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Daniels: "Hannig. He's here. Representative Madigan asks for leave to be verified. He's back drawing another map."

Collins: "I thank him for the first one."

· Speaker Daniels: "Thank you."

Collins: "Representative Jackson."

Speaker Daniels: "Jaffe."

Collins: "Jackson."

Speaker Daniels: "Oh. Jackson. He's there."

Collins: "Representative Katz."

Speake Daniels: "Excuse me. Return Representative Capparelli to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Roll....the affirmative roll. Alright. Representative Katz. Harold Katz. Gentleman in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Collins: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Daniels: "Leon. John Leon. He's here."

Collins: "Representative Neff."

Speaker Daniels: "Clarence Neff is here."

Collins: "I see him. Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Daniels: "O'Brien. He's here."

Collins: "Represe..."

Speaker Daniels: "Talking to the guy he's running against in the new map. The Madigan map."

Collins: "Is there any way they could both lose?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yeah, there is."

Collins: "Representative Ozella."

Speaker Daniels: "Ozella. Ozella. Gentleman in the chambers?

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Now, Nr. Clerk, what's the count?

Remove Ozella. There are 102 'aye', 57 'no', none voting
'present'. The Motion to override fails. House Bill 1570.

Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1570, 'I move that House Bill 1570 do

pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding',

Representative Younge."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Younge, House Bill 1570."

Younge: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to override the Governor's veto on House Bill 1570. This Bill amends the Human Rights Act by impowering the Department of Human Rights to investigate all violations of regulations relating to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

minority set-aside programs and other minority programs. Last year we caused to be the Illinois Legislative Small Business Conference. As a part of that Conference there was a minorities and business workshop. One of the requests of the group of minorities that came here, the minority businessmen, was that there be an investigation of programs of State Government having to do minorities. I asked the Director and...the Director of the Department of Human Rights if she would cooperate and implement a investigation into these programs and she said that she would gladly do so if given the statutory authority. I asked her whether or not any additional appropriation would be needed in order to constitute and implement this investigation. She informed me that additional appropriation is needed. So, therefore, that is first point that I want to make. We are talking about the the override of a veto that does not require expenditure of funds, and we're talking about the override of a veto that would investigate a very important program. We, in the General Assembly, have the responsibility of setting public policy. We have set the public policy that in employment, want fairness fairness and an wе opportunity. We know that small businesses provide most of the innovation and 70 to 80% of most of Illinois. Just as that is true as a general proposition it is equally true that in minority communities the minority businessmen are the ones who provide the jobs. It is very necessary that they get a fair and equitable share of the contracts of State Government. Since we asked them to come down here and express their views and make recommendations to us, and since they have asked us to investigate the programs having to do with their benefit, I think that we ought to ask the Department of Human Rights to investigate

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

We're...find...the reason for these programs. investigation is that we're finding that less of the work, a smaller percentage of the work today than ever before is going to minorities in State Government. Although there was some 500 million dollars worth of work that was contracted by the state, less than one half of one percent went to minorities. Now, the only thing that we can expect if minorities do not get contracts is for there to greater public aid and none of us want this. We want gainful employment. Now, because this matter has been a matter of great expose in the various newspaper articles that you have read, this matter has been the subject matter of comment by 60 Minutes. This matter is a matter of grave concern because we want to put people to work and; therefore, raise state revenues. I ask you to join with me in overriding the Governor's veto on this matter and it will not cost any state expenditures. And for those reasons, I ask you to join in this override."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1570 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. 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. Lady, Representative Younge, explain your vote."

Younge: "I would ask you to join with me in this override. It will not cause for any expenditure. It is a matter of grave concern to the minority communities. It's a Bill that will stimulate small business, and so I ask you to please join with me to override this veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I had an experience with this issue. In fact, I've asked

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

John Ryan who's a aide to the Governor to look into the matter at our Waukegan Developmental Center. We have had two minority contractors who have lost bids because the rules and regulations now favor the large contractors, and I think this is absurd when we're trying to help, not only small businesses, but small minority businesses. So, I think this is a good vehicle to investigate this so that we do treat minority contractors in a fair manner so that people can help themselves and be employed. And I would urge the Membership to vote on this override."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, would you please record me as voting

Speaker Daniels: "Record O'Connell as 'aye'. O'Connell 'aye'.

Hastert 'no'. Leinenweber 'no'. Domico 'aye'. Kosinski
'aye'. Kosinski 'aye'. Representative Alexander, for what
purpose do you rise?"

Alexander: "I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. You know,
we complain about the high cost of public welfare and those
persons who are on the dole system, and this Bill that I
stand in support of, which would encourage the continuation
of small minority businesses, is a means of offering to
that segment or community an opportunity to remain
gainfully employed. It doesn't cost a penny, it just costs
your "aye" vote up there to, again, give what is rightfully
and just."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer (Ted): "'No' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Mr. Meyer as 'aye' from 'no'.

Representative Laurino 'aye'. Mautino 'aye'. Winchester
'no'. Chapman 'aye'. Okay, what's the count? There're 84
'ayes', 71 'nos' and the Motion to override fails. House
Bill 1880. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1880, 'I move that House Bill 1880 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding', Representative Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, hesitate to use the phrase that this won't cost the State of Illinois because I don't know if that automatically means we will be successful or not with the override Motion, but I will make that statement anyway. What 1880 does, Mr. Speaker, is to recognize the Office of the Taiwan Government in Chicago and give them the same rights and privileges they enjoyed prior to January 1, 1979 with the recognition of Red China. And, in a minor sort of way, we throw in the opportunity for them to purchase official license plates with consular titles on the license plates. In the Governor's message, he...quote..and I quote, 'He's informed by the State Department that signing this piece of legislation would be inconsistent with the policy of the Federal Government. Well, he doesn't explain that it would not be inconsistent with all of the Federal Government because the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government, Congress, enacted in 1979 the Taiwan Relations Act which is now Public Law 968. In 968, that was adopted on April 10th of 1979, and I read, 'Was an Act to maintain peace, security and stability in the Western Pacific and to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the continuation of commercial. cultural and other relations between the people in the United States and the people on Taiwan. So you could ask, I imagine, ask a question as to why we should be adopting this legislation and why I think we should be interested in promoting the good relationships between the Government of Taiwan and the State of Illinois. Just last month, in the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

City of Chicago, the Taiwan Government signed a five billion five year contract to purchase grain from the United States. It's a 29% increase over what the former five year contract was. This increase places the Republic of China as the eighth largest trading partner United States and the purchases of more than one billion dollars worth of grain last year made it the eleventh largest agricultural partner that the United States has in the world. And, as you and I well know, a lot of that grain is purchased and a lot of that grain is grown in the great State of Illinois. On the signing of the five billion dollar contract between Taiwan and the United States, the Governor of this state was there to thank for the business of coming to Chicago to sign the contract and continue to be one of our best friends insofar as import-export of grain goes. The Governor of Arkansas, in his wisdom, flew to Chicago to express his thanks because Arkansas is one of our main producers of soy beans, and six other Lieutenant Governor's were sent to the State of Illinois into the City of Chicago to express their appreciation for the huge contract that was signed by the Governor ... Government of Taiwan. I think the least that we can do is to make sure that they receive the same rights and privileges they did prior to the recognition of Red The Taiwan..the Federal Taiwan Relations Act, in my opinion, does just that along with our recognition of them giving them the right to purchase some license plates that they will receive the same dignity that they received prior to 1979. It's a way, in my opinion, to say 'thank you! to some of ... to one of our best international friends and friends that think well of Illinois and purchase a great deal of the grain that we produce in Illinois. And Mr. Speaker, if there are any questions, I'd be happy to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

answer them, and I would hope and I would ask that you recognize Representative Birkinbine to close the debate, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, Bepresentative Birkinbine, to close."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the As Mr. Bradley indicated, the reason for the veto House. of this Bill, like several other vetoes, is, frankly, incorrect in that the Governor was afraid we would not be consistent with policy of the Pederal Government. Many of the courtesies and honors have been restored in Washington to the delegation there in Washington. This is simply asking that we do the same sort of thing here in Chicago. Several of the people who work in the Office of the Republic of China in that Chicago office live in my district. The attention that they've shown to this state, the courtesy, it's a small thing for the state. It's very important to them. One thing that Mr. Bradley did not mention was that while Taiwan represents the eighth largest trading partner of this country, Illinois is the number one trading state with the Republic of China. I think it's a courtesy that means very little on behalf of the state, but it means a great deal to those people who have shown such favoritism, if you will, in their friendliness and purchases toward the State of Illinois. And, I, too, would ask that you vote 'yes' on this override. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1880 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?". All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, to explain his vote. Timer's on, Sir."

Ropp: "Yes, thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

House. I think this is a vote that I certainly don't want to interfere with the Federal Government necessarily, but it is a small measure of expression of appreciation for what the State of Illinois can do in terms of getting additional, hopeful agricultural trade with that country. One of the things that will probably help more people around this state and nation is through the expansion of international agricultural products as well as industrial products. And I think this is a good gesture. It certainly isn't going to cost very much and it could sell many, many more billion dollars worth of products."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will... Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote.

 Timer's on, Sir."
- Robbins: "Illinois is a large agriculture exporting state. At a time when agriculture products are depressed because we don't have the agricultural market that we need, I think it's time that we stood up and recognized the... one of the main countries that we trade with, a country that is trying to continue as a free partner in a free world, and I ask you to reconsider your vote before you vote against this Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 129 'aye', 32 'nay', none voting 'present' the Motion prevails and House Bill 1880 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding.

 Page six, Reduction Veto Motions, House Bill 491, Representative Davis. Read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 491, ''I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 491, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding'."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Da... Excuse me, Representative.
- Representative Schneider, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Schneider: "On the Calendar, Mr. Speaker, 496 was jumped over because I was gone and...off the floor. I'd like to have the courtesy of calling that Bill. I think it's the only one remaining."
- Speaker Daniels: "We'll see if we can get back to it. Right now, we're on..."
- Schneider: "You can do it now. It's right on the Order of Business."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, we're on Reduction Veto Motions right now, Sir. Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Well, thank you Mr ... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I offer to you the restoration of some 371,000 dollars to House Bill 491 at the request of the State Board of Education, and I think their reasoning awfully good. And I know the Governor's trying to be consistent in his cuts along the retirement provisions of the education community; however, this particular cut was made in federal dollars to reduce from the actuarial to the payout level those federal dollars for employees that are covered under federal funds. And I can only tell you that it seems to be counterproductive because, if this reduction veto should stand, not only will we lose 371,000 dollars in federal matching funds for the actuarial level, but we find ourselves in the predicament then of having to fund at that level through federal requirements and having then to up that 371,000 dollars ultimately in general revenue So, I understand the consistent theme of the Governor's cuts and I wholeheartedly applaud except, in this particular one small instance. We're talking about 371,000 dollars that is required to fund an actuarial level of those federally funded employees of the State Board of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Education. The money is there, the federal money is there at this point in time, and rather than spend GRF money, I recommend to you that we restore 371,911 dollars in federal funds to ease the ultimate burden on the General Revenue Fund.

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

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I will have to reluctantly rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion. The Governor, of course as you know, reduced on a one time basis the retirement systems by 38% in order to balance our budget. I think this is important to maintain consistency so we don't have other funds coming in here maybe argued that ...about federal funds. Of course, in some small way, if the federal funds are not spent, they will return to the Federal Government, and in some small way, with that 372,000 dollars will help with the federal balancing of the budget. And I would ask the colleagues of this House to oppose the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Davis, to close. Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Motion. Question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on the pages and lines contained in the Motion of House 491 be restored to their original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? ... All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 70 'ayes', 77 'no', one voting 'present'. And this Motion having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill Representative Steczo. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 493, Motion 1, 'I move to restore the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

following reduced item of appropriation on House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page one, line 23°, Representative Steczo."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 493 contains the appropriations for formula driven mandated programs for the Illinois Office of Education. There are nine Motions filed for the various line items that were reduced by the Governor, but I mean to indicate at the outset that Motions #4 and #6 will be withdrawn for a very specific reason. Motion #4 was to deal with orphanage tuition which the Governor reduced by It has come to our attention that at the level dollars. that was reduced by the Governor that item is fully funded. The regular and vocational transportation line reduction made in Motion #6 was also fully funded now and, on that line item, the Office of Education indicates to that approximately 2.6 million dollars will lapse at the end of this fiscal year. I mentioned that to indicate to you that that means that we have approximately 3.6 million dollars that we can shift from one item to another, items that were originally appropriated by the General Assembly for the purposes of education. And what better use can use them for than for special education? Motion #1 deals with special education private school tuition. The purpose of the program is to ensure that all handicapped children receive special education and related services when public schools are unable to provide appropriate programs and also applies to summer school programs when determined necessary. The General Assembly passed this appropriation at 13.1 million dollars. The Governor reduced it to 13....12.257 million for a reduction of 865,000 dollars. In fiscal year 1979, this program was funded at 100%. The

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

same was the case in fiscal year 1980. In fiscal year 1981, the proration was down to 93% and, with the amount that was originally appropriated by the General Assembly, 13.1 million dollars, that proration has dropped to 91%. The Governor reduced it even further so it would be a fall over 10% over the last two years. This is a very necessary program. It serves approximately 6,700 students, and residential care is being provided for over 2,000 students. So I ask the House to restore the funds to its original level, at 13.1 million dollars."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Wolf: of the great fiscal impact of this Bill and the Bill coming up, I think I should make a few remarks on the subject. First of all, I don't think it's any shock to anybody that Illinois is in a difficult fiscal situation which has been caused by a sluggish economy and for certain federal fudget decisions. Now, these factors force us to carefully review all of our state funded programs to assure that limited funds are allocated effectively. Let me look at some of the facts here, help us explain how we got in this First of all, due to the general economic slow down and the tax relief laws that this General passed over the past few years states sales tax collections were nearly 50 million, that's 5 0, nearly 50 million dollars less than collections of the year before. Now I believe this is probably the first time, since the imposition of the sales tax, that a reduction in any sales tax revenue from one year to the next has occurred, at least during my legislative career. Mainly due to the fact that the sales tax were rolled back on business and farm machinery and the sales tax in FY *82 is expected to grow

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

by 6%. But that's only a very moderate growth and will certainly be temporary as further statutory tax rate decreases scheduled for business machinery will occur in FY 183. The other major source of our revenue is our income And, as you know, this source grew at a rate of only tar. half percent in FY '81, just barely enough to four the reduction in the sales tax collections. point is that the federal budget decisions have Another negated practically everything that impacted our state The general revenue sharing program, which had herebrought us 114 million dollars every year, has been eliminated completely. Budget decisions affecting Medicaid and Title 20 reimbursements will mean reduced aid in our fiscal '82. The Economic and Fiscal Commission estimates that we will receive in FY '82 55 million dollars less in federal aid reimbursements to the General Fund than we did Welfare costs are continuing to rise despite year. all our attempts at containment. The welfare grants last year increased by over 17% over the prior year and the state provided about two and a half billion dollars in welfare grants in last year. Now, I can understand why a lot of you out here and I hope like I say I will that the economy will improve and we can be optimistic, but if the improvement does come it certainly is not going to overnight and evidence to this...our actual receipts that we've received so far this year. Now, I read in newspapers that the House Minority Leader and the Comptroller have complained that the Governor purposefully withheld depositing some September receipts in order to artificially lower the available balance and that way it presents a worse picture for us. But since nobody complained about the receipts through August, let me use these figures for comparison, and, as you will note, they

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

still paint a pretty bleak picture. Sales tax receipts are 2% below the level at the end of two months last year. And this is kind of surprising, since the business tax roll back should bring in more money in FY *82. Federal reimbursements to the General Fund are 24% less receipts during the same period last year. dollars, we received 46 million dollars less in the two months of this fiscal year as compared with the same fiscal period last year. And Public Aid spending, while only 8%, will probably eat up most of any revenue increases that we may see. Now one particular significant piece of information I think we should mention is revenue forecasts. Now, if you will recall last Spring, the Bureau of the Budget, which is the Governor's agency, and the Economic and Piscal Commission, which is the legislative bipartisan estimating were somewhat apart. They've closed gap now, but still the Economic and Fiscal Commission says we will have 115 million dollars less than the Bureau of the Budget claims. The Bureau of the Budget, the Governor's agency, says, assuming that we don't have any overrides during this Session, we will end up with 170 million dollar cash balance at the end of this fiscal year. That represents approximately six days of working cash. takes 34 million dollars a day to run this state and pay Now, that's if the Bureau of the Budget is the bills. correct and if we don't override any of these vetoes. the Economic and Fiscal Commission, which is our bipartisan legislative agency is correct, you take 115 million dollars from the 170 million dollars we end up with a year end cash balance of 55 million dollars. That doesn't operate this state for two days. Now I know we're going to have a lot of issues on here that you want to be caught up in. There are a lot of issues that all of us would like to vote

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

What I'm trying to tell you in plain English - the money And if we don't exercise fiscal just is not there. restraint and bite the bullet on this particular issue, we can have worse consequences. Those of you who ve been around here a few years, you know what the state of ... the fiscal condition of this state was at the end of the previous administration. We were ao the bankruptcy and we brought it back because this Legislature exercised a certain amount of fiscal constraint and because the Governor did use a veto pen and because we had a little helpful turn in the economy which was to us. Unfortunately, we don't have that going for us now. Speaker and Members of the House, I would ask the Members of this General Assembly to use restraint on this, to vote against this measure and others to come. I know I've a lot of public opinion polls that Members of this House have sent out to their constituents. And inevitably, the question is asked if we have to stop increasing taxes or balance the budget. First of all, do you believe in a balanced budget? Everybody out there will say yes and of course we have a constitutional mandate to do just that. And then you'll ask them if it comes down to raising taxes or reducing services to balance the budget, what would you rather see? I've yet to see the first public opinion survey whether that was circulated by a Democrat or Republican that didn't say cut the services. And if that's the people want, I think that is our obligation as Representatives in this General Assembly and I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Oh. I forgot ... the new map."

Schneider: "You should be listening closely because, especially

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker, since you skipped over 496. Now, we're vou. Mr. οn 493 which tells you basically the same story. Backtracking over Representative Wolf's comments about when you send out your surveys and ask if you're against or for increases, the logic is obvious. Everybody is against tax increases, but your responsibility and mine, obviously, too, in this situation, is to make some choices. That we're against increasing taxes also but we're also in a position to make decisions for programs, and I think one of the things that we've got to look at is what Representative Steczo has pointed out. Within that educational framework in 493 there will be over two million dollars lapsing which could effectively deal with the programs that we like to restore the funds to. Now, if you don't do that, then the other part of that questionaire is, do you think the state, which has mandated programs, should increase taxes to pay for those programs? The other part of the questionaire should be, would you pick it up on your local taxes within the district? I think if you give them that choice the answer is if the state is imposing the mandates they ought to foot the bill, not the local school district as long as the imposition has been placed in the statutes by us. So I think when you send out that questionaire, when you're locked into a position where you have to deal with education, then I think the answer is appropriately, if there's two million bucks or more available in lapsed funds for children of special ed. for transportation, for extraordinary then I think the constituency would say, *Yes, I would advocate that in lieu of increasing any Those dollars are there. They're lapsing. taxes. either a state tax, if that's your survey, or it's a local tax. I think people find local taxes repugnant. When vou go back and they say, 'Why is my local tax increasing?',

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

it's because you and I say, 'We have a program that we mandate that you must fund that we're not giving you money for, so the responsibility is yours locally. That's why your taxes are increasing. The Thompson years, over the have shown a decline in the state four years, and an increase in the local participation. That's an explanation only from the point of view education. I'm sure there are other kinds of programs that are like that. I would ask you to support the Motion to override."

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

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: "Thank you, House. With all due respect to the last speaker and comments, I rise to suggest that many of the things he said That; however, does not change the fact that the are true. as an entity, is in serious... in a State of Illinois. serious financial condition. I would suggest to you the experiences which our surrounding states have had where they have actually had to go in beyond the agreement that was finally reached between Legislator and Governor and cut, not only back on the proration of some of the categorical programs, but have also had to go into General Distributive Fund and cut those back very, very The State of Michigan, the State of Ohio, significantly. State of Iowa, the State of Kentucky, the State of Indiana have all been faced with this very difficulty where the money was already thought to be there and, in fact, it was not and the state had to come in take it away. Ladies and Gentlemen, what we do here today will determine to a great extent what we will be able to do in fiscal '83. This is, without a doubt, the beginning of our budget considerations for PY *73 (sic *83) and as many of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

you know I certainly find it personally very difficult to get up and suggest to you that we should not support education to the maximum. I would suggest to you; however, that if the entire body of the state is unhealthy, then the condition of part of that body, namely in this case education, is also going to be extremely unhealthy. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't believe that it is prudent or wise for us to move in that direction, and, for that reason, I stand in support of the Governor in these reduction vetoes. I wish he didn't have to do it. I don't like this one bit and I don't like to have to go back and tell some of the people who have supported me strongly that we just don't have the money, but the fact of the matter is we do not. We will not and if, in fact, we do then we certainly, and I will be glad to lead the charge, we will certainly be more than willing to fund these programs. Ladies and Gentlemen, with all due respect to the maker of the Motion, I would ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti." Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to get up and talk on all of these line item reductions, but I just want to remind you at the beginning of the year the Governor came down here and warned us that he had a 14 7/10 billion dollar budget and that would be the first of about three or four budgets that he would present to us as we get the variables in the economy. as Representative Kosinski and myself and a few others here have suggested, that if we have to and not want to increase taxes that we had just two subjects here alone that there's 16,900,000 dollars on bilingual education. That the Board of Education, if they want these funds, they should come in and they should make the initiative to transfer some of these funds to take care of some of these reductions. And

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

to the people on the other side of the aisle, to the two announced candidates that they have running for Governor, their first plea and the first common pleas that they re making is that they re going to run for Governor - and they're not going to increases taxes. But we have already slashed our budget 600 million dollars because of the austerity program and because of the tax relief that the people on the other side of the aisle were trying to us all year long. We went along with some of their reductions. Now, how are we going to pay for it? Where is this free lunch that we all expect? There's some of us that don't even have a district to go back to. Some of us will not be back here. There's nothing that would be popular for me to be up here and vote for everyone of these Bills and every one of these give-away programs, every one of these social programs. If higher education wants to eliminate some of these reductions, let them make their transfers. Let them make their suggestions to this Body so that ... show us where they can cut, because the Governor's already slashed over 600 million dollars and there's more to come. And the state is going to be facing the same situation as the State of New York unless we do something responsible in the remaining days of this Veto Session."

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

Hatijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've heard some comments from Members telling us what we do today is going to affect what we do in the next fiscal year and what we're going to do in the future, and I think there's some truth to that. However, I think what we're going to face in the future is going to be higher property taxes. I think all of us realize that education ought to be our first priority, and surely special education ought

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

And these programs that are to be our first priority. under this mandated category surely ought to be our first I think there is a truism that much of our priority. problem is emanating from Washington, Τ but think everybody's caved in. Many who supported the philosophies in Washington now are going to have second thoughts about I'm here to tell you that I think that, you know, I hear a lot of people talk about the map. I really think if it were an at- large election, Democrats are going to have a good year next year because there are some issues that are coming to the floor that all stem from the Reaganomics, if you want to call it that. Because what it's going to mean and what it's going to mean to education is that the local taxpayer's going to foot the bill. So you are shifting the burden to the local taxpayer, and I think you ought to realize that. I don't think any of us ought to be ashamed of supporting education as much as we can, think that we can do better in education. Serving on the Appropriations Committee I want to tell you that I didnot see all of these cuts in the administration...in the administrative cuts and I think that if you really are serious about cutting, then you ought to cut administrative costs in the fat of the state bureaucracy. That would make In fact, I think before we make these cuts in sense. education, that ought to be done first, and we haven't done that and the Governor hasn't done that. So, I really think that we can afford it. Now also many of us are hearing about what we can and what we can't afford, and we're here today and let me tell you I think that it probably is accident that later on in this whole legislative day the matter of human services is going to be at the tail end what we're doing today. That's really where we put our priorities. We are letting human services have the tail

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

end of our business, and I don't think that's fair to human services and I don't think that's fair to education. I think they deserve better. Yet, we are not going to leave this legislative Session, this Fall Veto Session without supplemental Bills coming in. All of us are being told that we can't afford this, we can't afford this, yet the executive is going to tell us what we can afford. I don't think that's right either. I think that we have a stake in this ballgame and, as far as I'm concerned, education ought to be our priority. Human Services, too, ought to be our first priority and I'm going to fight for them whether anybody else on this floor does or doesn't."

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

Piel: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

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

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #1 seeks to restore 865,000 dollars in special education private school tuition. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee mentioned that the Governor had seen revenue forecasts and people have gotten together on revenue forecasts, and, if that's the case, the Governor made decisions on some of these Bills based on those revenue projections. Yet, we have found out in just the last few days that at the level that the Governor reduced some of these line items that they will be fully funded and yet lapse extra dollars. So there are extra dollars available for education. This is one item in the realm of special education that's extremely important. It's a mandated program and I ask for your support."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the reduced item of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

appropriation on page one, line 23 of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?... All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to explain his vote. The timer's one"

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is an extremely important line item. I have seen the results of special education. You're talking about troubled kids who would either end up in correctional institutions or mental health facilities costing the state thousands of dollars, getting a little bit of service in terms of special education, a couple of years and they come out productive tarpaying citizens. I think this is a good investment. One that's going to save the state money and I urge a few more votes to get us up to 89 so that we can restore this money. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 88 ayes, 78 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, please poll the absentees."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees.

Representative J. J. Wolf seeks a verification in the event that this gets 89 votes. It takes 89. While we're waiting for that, it's the intention of the Chair to continue to work until we have completed most of the Calendar. 8:00 — somewhere in that area. These Motions, each one are put. You have a right to verify if you so seek. We'll proceed at your pace. Proceed with a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alstat. Domico. Ralph
Dunn. Kane. Laurino. Lechowicz. Ozella. Reed. Irv

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Smith. Stearney. No further."

- Speaker Daniels: "88 'aye', 78 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Motion fails. Motion #2. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #2, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation on House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page one, line 27:."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, Motion #2."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #2 deals with special education extraordinary services. purpose of the extraordinary services program is to provide special education services to children with complex educational requirements and also provides state reimbursement for local school districts in terms of providing financial assistance for this type of costly education and related services. The General Assembly appropriated 26.9 million dollars. The Governor reduced that amount to 25.1 million dollars so we're seeking a restoration of 1.774 million dollars. reimbursement from this program is provided for in a prior year basis and it's based on the actual cost of educating a handicapped child. And in fiscal year 1979, we prorated 92% of this cost. Fiscal year 1980, 86%, fiscal year 1981, 88%. We are seeking, with the restoration, to prorate this and provide 91% of the funding. There are approximately 16,800 students who are provided with these services. it's an extremely important special education program and I would urge the House to restore these most needed funds."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The same arguments made previously would apply to this particular portion of the Bill. I would like to point out that the FY

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

'81 appropriation for these extraordinary services was 20,800,000 dollars. The Governor's approved funding level; therefore, represents an increase for PY '82 of 4,343,000 or 20.8%. What the Sponsor is looking for is an additional 1 point.... nearly 1.8 million dollars. I would ask again for a negative vote. It seems to me that a 20.8% increase in these austere times should certainly be more than sufficient to cover these costs, and I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page one, line 27 of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?'.. 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. 85 'aye', 78 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I think we'll try it again. Could you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alstat. Barr. Bartulis.

Cullerton. Ewell. Huff. Karpiel. Dick Kelly."

Speaker Daniels: "Kelly "aye". Barr "aye". Barr. Barr. Bob

Clerk O'Brien: "Neff. Ozella. Reed. Sandquist. Irv Smith.
Stearney. No further."

Speaker Daniels: "Cullerton 'aye'. 88 'aye' and 78 'no'.

Sandquist 'no'. 88 'aye', 79 'no'. Motion fails. Motion

#3. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #3, ''I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 493, the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page one, line

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, Motion #3."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #3 is probably the most important special education line item we're going to deal with today. That line item concerns special education personnel reimbursement, and that's a program to reimburse school districts for a portion of salaries for special education teachers and for other hired Currently, there are 238,000 children taking personnel. advantage of special education programs. The law provides 6,200 dollars...6,250 dollars for full time professional workers and 2,500 dollars for full time non-certified We heard the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee indicate on the last Bill that the restoration we were attempting to make was still an increase over last vears appropriation. What we have here is just the opposite. Last year. the appropriation for personnel reimbursement was 129 million dollars. This year, the General Assembly appropriated 122 million dollars or 88% The Governor then reduced that to 118 million proration. dollars. What we are seeking to do is to restore 4.8 million dollars to bring it up to the level that was appropriated by the General Assembly. The ... When I was in Peoria a few weeks ago I know...pardon me. happened to be sitting back at a luncheon with Mandeville and asked him about some of these line item cuts that were being made and the one that was brought up in particular was the bilingual program. The bilingual program was a very emotional vote in this House. The bilingual program passed this House at eight million dollars was passed by the Senate at an increased amount of 16 million dollars and passed the House at that level.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Doctor Mandeville indicated to me that the only reason that the Governor did not make any changes in the bilingual program was because it was approved by the General Assembly at an amount less than was appropriated last year. Well, special education personnel reimbursement is no different than that, yet, the Governor saw fit to reduce line item by 4.8 million dollars. School districts providing these services will only be reimbursed at 88% of the money that's being spent... expended and this is the backbone of the special education program. So I would ask you to think of all those children who are enrolled in special education classes and help them, help the personnel who must teach these children and provide the educational instruction for them. And would ask you to concur in a Motion to restore this money to the special education personnel reimbursement line item.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd like to just point out that this is consistent with the other reductions made in the other areas. It's only a difference of 3% on the prorations. Again, we are talking again of some nearly four million dollars again in general revenue funds that the State does not have at this time. It is not different. It is consistent. We're talking about 85% as compared to 88%. I think that is reasonable in lieu of the fiscal condition of the state, and I would just ask for the same kind of vote we got on the last two."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate the remarks that I used earlier to indicate that there is approximately 3.6 million dollars of educational funds that we found in the last few days will lapse, money that was appropriated by the General Assembly, approved by the Governor and should

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

be used for educational purposes. This is the proper place I feel that we could use those funds. This program, in fiscal year 1981, was funded at 98% and at a level of 129 million dollars. The level we are seeking to restore, the 4.8 million dollars we're seeking to restore would only bring this program up to a level of 122 million dollars or 88%, a loss of ten percent over the previous year. By no means are we trying to break the bank with this, but we're just trying to provide equity, and I would encourage the Members of this House on Motion #3 to restore these funds."

- Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page one, line 31 of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?'.. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote.

 Timer's on, Sir."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would only suggest to the Members that we should be consistent with those dollars that go to local school districts as we have been with those which go out into the private providers. We did not... We did not override the Governor's veto on private tuition, and therefore, we certainly should not do it on personnel."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman, Representative Wolf, requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, if there is a verification request, I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Daniels: "There is a verification requested, Sir."

Steczo: "I'd like to poll the absentees, then."

Speaker Daniels: "Poll of the absentees. Representative Conti.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Poll of the absentees."

- O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Ackerman. Alstat. Clerk McCormick. Laurino. Neff. Deuster. Findley. Kane. Irv Smith. Stearney and Ozella. Pechous. Reed. Winchester."
- Speaker Daniels: "Laurino 'aye'. Proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Will all the Members please be in their seats? All those not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. Members please be in their seats.

 Okay, proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Bowman.

 Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock.

 Capparelli."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "I was wondering if, you know, we could get a little visual clearance here and maybe the Members just kind of wave a little bit."
- Speaker Daniels: "All Members please be in their seats.

 Representative Kelly, Mulcahey, please be in your seat.

 This is at Representative Wolf's request. Representative Zwick, Catania, in the center aisle, will you please be in your seats? This is Representative Wolf's request.

 Alright. Okay, Sir? Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Davis. DiPrima. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Domico. Donovan-Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hannig. Henry. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Hanahan. Keane. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Katz. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. Madigan. McPike. McMaster. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Connell. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Rea.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Redmond. Rhem-Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Turner. Van Vitek. Watson. White. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Duvne. Younge. Yourell and Zito."

- Speaker Daniels: "The map is being discussed in the gallery up there and Mr. Hill can ask the Gentleman how come he's now in Will County instead of DuPage. Alright, Representative Barr from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative McMaster from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Ackerman 'no'. Winchester 'no'. Representative Meyer, you want to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'? Robert Meyer... Cook County. Roland Meyer from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Neff, record him as 'no'. Macdonald from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I have to step outside for a minute. May

 I please be verified at this time?"
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Alright, further changes? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Verified."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Braun asks to be verified.

 Leave is granted. Okay. Questions of the Affirmative

 Roll. Representative J. J. Wolf. What's the count, Mr.

 Clerk? 94 'aye'."
- Wolf: "Representative Breslin. Breslin."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Breslin. She's over here.

 Will the Members please be in their seats so we can
 expedite this? It's your time."

Wolf: "Mr. Cullerton."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cullerton. Cullerton. How's the Gentleman recorded?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Representative Lechowicz asks for leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Leave is granted."

Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Farley. Bruce Farley. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Mr. Flinn."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Daniels: "Garmisa. He's here. Representative Findley.

Record Representative Findley as 'no'."

Wolf: "Representative Huff."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Mr. Katz."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "McClain."

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

Wolf: "McGrew."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Wolf: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Pullen. Penny Pullen. How is the Lady recorded? She's here. Can't see you, Representative Pullen."

Wolf: "You say she's here?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, she is. She's in her chair."

Wolf: "You sure?"

Speaker Daniels: "She's got her back to us."

Wolf: "Stewart."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stewart. She's... Where is she?

She's here."

Wolf: "Representative White."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative White. Jesse White. He's in the aisle. Return Representative McGrew to the Affirmative Roll."

Wolf: "Bell."

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

Wolf: "Representative Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Who?"

Wolf: "Woodyard."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Woodyard, Babe Woodyard? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

J.J. Wolf: "Watson?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Watson, Frank Watson? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Ewell?"

Speaker Daniels: "Ray Ewell? Ray Ewell? Is Ewell here? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Keane?" .

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

J.J. Wolf: "Alright. Dick Kelly?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dick Kelly? He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Daniels: "Yes, Sir?"

Pechous: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Pechous as 'aye'. Eighty-seven 'ayes'...87 'ayes', 74 'no' and the Motion fails. Put Kane 'aye'. It's 88. Motion fails. Motion #4 is withdrawn. Is that correct, Sir?"

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright. Motion 5, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #5, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation in House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page two, line 18'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, Motion #5."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #5 seeks to restore one million dollars that was reduced by the Governor for the textbook program. As you all know, this program is intended to provide opportunities to all students who are enrolled in grades kindergarten through twelvth grade in the state to use textbooks at no cost to the parents or the school district. I'm sure you all recall last year, during the course of House Bill 493 through the General Assembly, the House saw fit to increase this appropriation from 12 million dollars to 14 million dollars. It came back from the Senate at 12 million dollars which was the same amount that was appropriated the year before. In fact, in the textbook program in fiscal

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

year 1981, we appropriated 12 million dollars and in fiscal year 1982 we appropriated 12 million dollars so there was no change that we appropriated. The Governor saw fit to reduce that amount by one million dollars. We feel that this program should not have had that amount reduced and I would ask the Members of the House to restore this money to this textbook program."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative J.J.Wolf?"

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would just use the same arguments that

were made on the last few, and I d be satisfied with the

same Roll Call."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House has always been on record as supporting this program, and we felt that we had been fiscally responsible last year by approving an amount of funding equal to the previous year's funding and we saw no need to reduce that ..that amount any further. So, I would ask the Members of the General Assembly to approve this Motion. Approval means that the textbook program will be funded an extra one million dollars which is the exact same amount that was funded for the last fiscal year."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced items of appropriations on the pages and lines listed in the Motion of House Bill 493 be restored to their original amounts, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?"... 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? Representative Keane, your light's not on, Sir."

Keane: "Thank you. It was flashing on my console here. I'd like to explain my vote. This was a reduction from, as Representative Steczo indicated...The House passed this out with a two million dollar improvement, or two million dollars over fiscal '80...'81, pardon me. What happened

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

was the Senate cut that back to 12 million dollars and left it at 12 million, which was last year's appropriation. What the Governor has, in effect, done is cut one million and reduce it even beyond this year's level. We're having a negative growth in this area. It's very important. The costs of books and all educational materials has gone up. We're going to be losing through the block grant program in this fiscal year a great deal of educational support, and I would urge you to vote 'yes' so that we can continue to provide the necessary educational materials. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Seventy-eight 'aye', 83 'nay', none voting 'present'. Motion 6 is withdrawn, Sir? Motion 7, read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #7, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation in House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page two, line 26'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #7 deals with the subject of special education trans..."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to special education transportation, which is probably one of the most costly types of expenses that can be incurred by a school district. The General Assembly appropriated 60.1 million dollars which would have funded this program at 96%. The Governor reduced that amount to 56.5 million dollars which brings it down to the 91% funding level. That..the amount that we're seeking to restore is 3.5 million dollars. The purpose of the special education transportation program is

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

to assist those school districts in meeting those high costs incurred by transporting handicapped pupils who have special transportation needs. The state pays four-fifths of the allowable cost for transportation and those costs do not differ significantly from costs from the regular transportation reimbursement program. As I had mentioned before, with the levels that were reduced by the Governor on regular and special..and vocational transportation, are now funding at 100%. If we were to take the 3.6 million dollars that will lapse on education and provide that for special education transportation as our area of priority we could also fully fund or come close to fully funding this line item. I'm sure, if any of you go home and talk to you local district superintendents, they would concur that the most expensive cost that they're incurring, the place where they're suffering deficits, is in the transportation program. This is an opportunity for us those local school boards and local superintendents, 'Yes, we know. Yes it's a mandated program, and this our way of at least trying to provide our four-fifths share. And I would ask for your approval of Motion #7." Peters: "Representative Peters in the Chair. Speaker Representative Wolf?"

J.J.Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this nearly
3.6 million dollars, I believe, is unnecessary. The FY '81
appropriation for this purpose was 48,600,000 dollars and
the Governor's approved level represents approximately a
16.3% increase of 7 million 956 thousand dollars for this
fiscal year. So I think a 16.3% increase is good. It is a
92% proration. The other issues we talked about were 85%.
This is even much better than that. The regular
transportation, of course, is fully funded and because of
some of the figures there may possibly even be a lapse. If

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

there is, I would be happy to join the Gentleman on a transfer of funds to this if there is additional need for it. I would ask for a negative vote."

close. There being none, Representative Steczo, to close." Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Steczo: "Thank you, speaker's remarks, but when we deal with mandated programs and we deal with the cost of providing services to students involved in educational programs in the State of Illinois, which our school many times in the context bу superintendents and our school board members like to deal with is in terms of proration and in terms of the amount of money that is supposed to be funded to local school districts that actually is. In FY *81 and in FY *80, the

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Steczo, to

to 96%. The Governor reduced that number to 91%. So actually, in terms of the money that our local school districts will be getting back, it's actually 2% on the average lower than it was last year with an increased dollar amount. So I would ask for this costly program for the Members of the House to..I'd hope they would see fit in restoring the money to the special education transportation line item."

percent of our fulfillment that was paid to local school districts was 93%. The General Assembly having, I believe, as its priority to try to full fund these mandated programs as quickly as possible, saw fit to raise that appropriation

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page two, line 26 of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?"... All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman to explain his vote."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Hoffman: "I would just remind the Nembers of the House that the cut in the categoricals made it possible for a greater amount of money to be put into the General Distributive Fund which is the operating fund that all local school districts can take operating fund money and use it in any fund they like, including transportation. And I would support the Governor's reduction."

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. On this question there are 87 voting 'aye', 77

voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. Representative

Steczo?"

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, although I seem to be stuck at 88, I'd like a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Alstat.

Boucek. Capparelli..."

Speaker Peters: "Capparelli, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huskey. Kosinski..."

Speaker Peters: "Kosinski, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ozella. Pechous..."

Speaker Peters: "Pechous, "aye"."

Clerk O'Brien: "Polk. Preston. Reed. Irv Smith. Stearney. No further."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston? Preston, 'aye'.

Representative Conti? Representative Wolf?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker ... "

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

J.J.Wolf: "Did this reach 89, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Peters: "Ninety-one, Sir."

J.J.Wolf: "Then I would ask, respectfully, for a verification of the Roll."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti?"

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

of these Motions has worked very, very hard. He's very sincere with these Bills and he's put in a good day's work and he's trying to get these Bills passed and if we could only cooperate with him, he knows that...They know ..They should know that we're going to verify each and every one of these Roll Calls. There Bills are very important. I see an awful lot of buttons that are being pushed. They could save the time of the House and at least spare some of the hard work that the Sponsor and the maker of these Motions have made. Please push their own buttons so we don't have to go through these on every Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Point is well taken. Mr. Clerk, read the Roll." Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Affirmative: Alexander. Affirmative. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Bowman. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Braun. Cullerton. Christensen. Currie. Catania. Chapman. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. DiPrima. Domico. Darrow. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Greiman. Hallstrom. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanahan. Getty. Jaffe. Henry. Huff. Jackson. Jones. Katz. Hannig. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Madigan. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike-Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Connell. Pechous. Pierce. Preston. Rea. Redmond. Rhem. Pouncey. Satterthwaite. Ropp. Saltsman. Robbins. Ronan. Margaret Smith. Schraeder. Slape. Steczo. Schneider. Turner. Van Duyne. Vikek. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Ropp? Ropp? Mr. Clerk, change Ropp from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Polk? Record Polk as 'no'. Representative Richmond?"

Richmond: "Request for verification, please."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. You're verified, Sir. We begin with 90 voting 'aye'. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk? Ninety. Mr. Steczo? We start with 90 voting in the affirmative. Proceed, Sir. Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Darrow."

Speaker Peters: "Darrow is here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Ewell."

Speaker Peters: "Ewell is here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove the Gentleman."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Henry?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Henry? Gentleman in the chamber?

Alright, he's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Huff?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff? Gentleman in the chamber?

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Katz?"

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

J.J.Wolf: "... They all look alike."

Speaker Peters: "How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Dick Kelly."

Speaker Peters: "Representative..Dick Kelly? In spirit. Is the Gentleman here? How is he recorded?"

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

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Leon."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leon? The Gentleman's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. McGrew."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him. Representative Garmisa is verified.

Proceed."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Ronan."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan? Is the Gentleman in the...He's in his chair."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Slape?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape. Gentleman in the chamber?

Representative Slape? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him."

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

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle? Stuffle? He's here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Capparelli?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Capparelli's here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Stuffle."

Speaker Peters: "Stuffle is here."

J.J. Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Peters: "No further questions. Return Representative NcGrew. On this question there are 85 'aye', 79 'nos'.

This Motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #8, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation on House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page two, line 35'."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo on Motion #8, page two, line 35 of House Bill 493. Proceed, Sir."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Motion #8 deals with the reduction in the line item for the Illinois free lunch and breakfast program. The Assembly in June appropriated 12.2 million dollars for this The Governor reduced that amount to million, or a reduction of 635 thousand dollars. This reimbursement program for both public and private schools encourages them to provide free breakfast and free lunches to eligible needy children and public schools are mandated to provide free lunches to those eligible needy children. The eligibility for free meal programs is determined by applying the income level guidelines to the National School Lunch Program and there are over 800 attendant centers that participate in the free breakfast program. When schools other designated sponsors submit monthly claims to the State of Illinois, they are reimbursed on a current basis and reimbursed up to 15¢ in state reimbursement for each breakfast and free lunch. In fiscal year 1981, this program ..under this program there were 17 million free breakfasts and 73 million free lunches. Again, it's an Again, when I spoke to Dr. extremely important program. Mandeville just a few weeks in Peoria, he indicated to that the only programs that were cut were programs in which the General Assembly had appropriated more than the year before. Well, in fiscal year 1981, we appropriated million dollars for the free lunch and breakfast program, but for fiscal year 1982, we appropriated 12.285 million dollars which was a little over a million dollars less. believe that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget erred in his assessment. It's an important program and I would ask concurrence of the House in this Motion."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Wolf."

- J.J.Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while it is true that we have reduced the free lunch contribution from 15% to 12.9% per, I have been advised, of course, that the Federal Government had increased their free lunch programs slightly which may balance out. I would just like to make that point. I believe that this restoration of 635 thousand dollars is again..puts unwarranted strain on a particular projected cash balance and would again ask for a negative vote. And, prior to Mr. Conti's request, I would request that everybody just push their own button to save ourselves a little time."
- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Steczo,
 do you wish to close, Sir? Representative..There being no
 further discussion, Representative Steczo, to close.
 Proceed, Sir."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I would just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page two, line 35 of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?"... All 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 78 voting 'no'. Representative Steczo?"
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to poll...ask for a poll of the absentees, please."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, record Representative Celeste Stiehl as voting 'no'.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Alstat. Deuster. Ralph

 Dunn. Farley. Huskey. Macdonald. Ozella. Redmond..."

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Representative Redmond votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Reed. Robbins. Ropp..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ropp votes "no"."

Clerk Leone: "Irv Smith. Stearney. Concludes the poll of the absentees."

Speaker Peters: "That's 86, Representative Steczo. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye', 78 voting 'no'. This Motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion #9, "I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 493, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page three, line three, Representative Steczo."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo on Motion #9 to House Bill 493. Proceed, Sir."

Steczo: "Thank you, This is the final Motion on Mr. Speaker. House Bill 493 and before I begin, I would like to thank Members of the House for the attention that they've given and the patience they've had with the nine Motions that were presented. Motion #9 is an extremely important Motion. It seeks to restore \$150,000 to the Illinois Deaf-Blind Service Center and School located in Glen Ellyn. This is a small amount of money for a program that is extremely worthwhile, a program that has run into some trouble before because of lack of funds and one that the media, especially in and about the Chicago-Metropolitan area, has editorialized in favor of. The Deaf-Blind Center is a program that provides programs for children who are both deaf and blind and who are from...who age from 0 to The General Assembly appropriated 2.167 million dollars. The Governor reduced the amount to 2 million, little over 2 million dollars. The net reduction that the Governor made was approximately \$150,000. The best way

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

probably that I could explain the situation to you, and it is a relatively small amount of money. The Director. Doctor Charles Mitchell, of the Illinois Deaf-Blind Service Center and School wrote to me on August 20th, and he indicated that the Governor had originally intended to cut \$50,000 from their budget which he could have lived with and then he was notified thereafter that the Governor would cut another \$100,000 from the operating budget. gentleman, Doctor Mitchell, cited factors such as accelerating costs and the fact that they have 27 students enrolled in the residential school and also provide a parent-infant program for deaf-blind infants at the Segal Institute in the Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago. indicates that anybody who has not visited the Center would not really have a clear picture of why they have to maintain high staff ratios and why they have one staff member for every two students that incur extreme According to the Illinois Statutes they have to operate on a no reject basis. Any deaf-blind child who comes to them for services must be taken, irregardless."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Sir. Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you seek attention?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, is Representative Myron Olson...he seems to have disappeared. Does anybody know where he is?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Olson is in the balcony looking for a constituent. I'm not sure of his 'levitikas', Representative, but seek and ye shall find. Representative

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Representative."

Steczo, proceed, Sir."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope Representative Olson has better luck up there than I'm having with these Motions so far. But, Mr. Speaker, Motion #9 with regard to the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Illinois Deaf-Blind Service Center and School in Glen Ellyn is an extremely important line item. The amount reduced, as I mentioned before, was only \$150,000 which I don't think the Governor would have too much of a problem with if this were the only Motion that were approved by the House. As I indicated before, the Center must operate on a no reject basis, and any deaf-blind child who comes to the Center must be taken in by the Center and provided with services. Most of the children that they have are not only deaf-blind, but also have severe mental and physical handicaps and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very, very important program. This school is the only one like it in the State. It provides a vital function and I would ask the Members of the House to restore the reduction of the Governor on Motion #9 to House Bill 493."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf."

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

 While the amount is not great, the..."
- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, excuse me, Representative.

 Representative Olson, on a point of inquiry."
- Olson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the nice message. I met a very attractive lady from my district and I'm happy I was sent off the floor."

 Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."
- J.J. Wolf: "Reminds me of one of these capers some Sessions back.

 As I was saying, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the

 2,017,000 dollars approved by the Governor is in fact equal
 in the same amount that we received in the FY '81
 appropriation. Seeing as that we have actually reduced our
 total appropriation somewhat less than last year's budget,
 that it would seem to me that this would be consistent and
 I would again ask for a negative vote on the part of this
 House."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated before, the amount that we are seeking to restore is only \$150,000 for the Illinois Deaf-Blind Service Center and School in Glen Ellyn. And I can't reiterate enough the fact that these are children aged 0 to 21 who suffer from both deafness and blindness and the school, if anybody's been out there, does an incredible job. And without the restoration of this \$150,000 it would do irreparable harm to the types of services that this school could provide. This is the last Motion that will be called. It's a very worthy one. It's only \$150,000 and I would ask the Members of the House to approve this restoration."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page three, line three of House Bill 493 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?'... All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 91 voting 'aye', 67 voting 'nay'. Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Respectfully request a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman requests a verification.

Representative Steczo requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Alstat. Capparelli.

Deuster..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Capparelli votes 'aye'."
Clerk Leone: "Deuster. Hoxsey..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hoxsey votes "no"."

Clerk Leone: "Huskey. Jackson. Kosinski..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kosinski votes 'aye'."

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Macdonald. Margalus. Mautino..."

Speaker Peters: "Margalus votes 'no"... aye'. Margalus 'aye'.

I'm sorry. Representative who?"

Clerk Leone: "Mautino. Nelson..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Nelson votes 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Oblinger. Ozella. Polk. Preston. Reed.

Reilly..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Reilly votes 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Irv Smith..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Smith votes 'no'. Irv Smith,

Clerk Leone: "And Stearney."

Speaker Peters: "The beginning...any other changes, additions?

The beginning count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Steczo.

Representative Mautino. Mautino *aye*. We begin the verification with 95 affirmative votes. Proceed with the reading of the Affirmative Roll, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Chapman. John Dunn. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. Ewell. DiPrima. Virginia Frederick. Garmisa. Fawell. Flinn. Farley. Getty, Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Griffin. Hallstrom. Hannig. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Jones. Karpiel. Hanahan. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Katz. Keane. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Madigan. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. Margalus. McGrew. acPike. Roland Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Connell. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Redmond. Rhem. Richmond. Robbins. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Topinka.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell, and Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf. Excuse me, excuse me. The beginning count, Mr. Clerk? 95 'aye'. Representative Preston. Representative Preston wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. We begin with 96 and Representative Younge asks to be verified. The Lady is verified. Proceed, Sir. 96 'ayes'. Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Abramson."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Beatty."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Beatty. Is the Gentleman...Beatty.

Abramson is at the back of the chamber. Mr. Beatty,

Beatty? Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Bell."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Bradley."

Speaker Peters: "Bradley, is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Catania."

Speaker Peters: "Catania, Representative Catania. Is the Lady in the chamber? She's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Cullerton."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Cullerton, he's here."

J.J. Wolf: "I see him, I see him. Mr. Domico."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Domico. Gentleman in the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Garmisa."

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Huff."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff. Gentleman in the chamber?

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll and restore
Representative Domico."

J.J. Wolf: "Karpiel."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Karpiel. Is the Lady in the chamber? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove her from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "McClain."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McClain. How's he recorded?"

Gentleman in the chamber? How's...how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "McGrew."

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Richmond."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll and restore

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Representative McClain."

J.J. Wolf: "Stewart."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stewart? The Lady in the chamber? She is...in the rear."

J.J. Wolf: "Topinka."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Topinka? Is the Lady in the chamber? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove her from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Laurino."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Laurino? Laurino is in his chair."

J.J. Wolf: "Roland Meyer."

Speaker Peters: "Who? Who? Representative Roland Meyer? He's in the rear."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ronan. The Gentleman is in the rear."

J.J. Wolf: "Is Mr. Stuffle in the chamber? Representative Stuffle in the chamber?"

Speaker Peters: "Pardon, Sir?"

J.J. Wolf: "Stuffle?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Stuffle, he's here. He's not in his seat that's why."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Leon?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Leon? The Gentleman is in the front."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr...Mr. Robbins."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

- J.J. Wolf: "No further."
- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 88 'aye", 71 voting 'no'. This Motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Motions."
- Speaker Peters: "House Bill 494. Any Motions, Mr. Clerk? I'm sorry, Representative Steczo, is there more? House Bill 494. Any Motions, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion #1, 'I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 494 and the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page one, line 24, Representative Matijevich.'"
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich. Representative Schneider, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"
- Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Matijevich is at this time not available. With leave of the House I'd like to handle the appropriate Motions."
- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman asks leave... Representative Vinson. There's objection."
- Schneider: "There's objection? What, by Vinson? Come on,
 Vinson, you guys got the votes anyhow Let's run it."
- Speaker Peters: "Out of the record. The House will be at ease for just one minute until we get one record straightened out here. No one leave, please. House Bill 364. Any Motions, Mr. Clerk? Page eight, reduction and item veto Motions. Same order."
- Clerk Leone: "Motion \$1, I move that the following items of House
 Bill 364 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding,
 page seven, lines 30 through 35, page eight, lines one
 through four, Representative Madigan."
- Speaker Peters: "The Motions that were filed by Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan, Motion #1. Is the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Gentleman in the Chamber? Going once... Representative Madigan on Motion #1."

Madigan: " "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Motion would restore 1.2 million dollars which would provided for use in the community mental health centers in the City of Chicago. I appointed a special task force on the question of community needs. There was testimony taken that this task force which clearly showed that without this additional funding in the urban area of Chicago there will suicides. be a severe increase in homicide rates, admissions to state hospitals, more physical illness and school dropouts. Clearly, at a point in our history where the national economic situation has caused great stress, especially in urban areas such as Chicago, we should now move to provide more financing for facilities such as these rather than to be in a retrenchment position where at a time these services are needed government is saying, 'Well, we shall not provide them . There has been a strong effort launched by several citizens statewide on behalf of this I think it's very important to understand that Motion. this effort, the effort on behalf of this Motion, is a grassroots campaign organized by the Citizens Advisory Councils to each of these centers in Chicago. councils act independently of the City of Chicago and in fact, on many occasions, have been at direct odds with the administration of the City of Chicago. These people are citizens in their community. Generally, they have had personal experience, either in their family or with friends or relatives concerning mental illness. This is a Motion which deserves your utmost favorable consideration and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative J.J. Wolf."

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

not going to belabor this Body with many of the arguments that I made in opposition to these...to these increases I would just like to say that, you know, this earlier. Body has had to make some very painful decisions and painful reductions in a number of items that were contained in the budget. I would like to point this is an item that was not even in the Governor's original budget. It wasn't something that was cut. It's an add on that only affects certain parts of the State. Ιt would seem to me, very inconsistent. That if there's not sufficient money to take care of the needs of the entire State, it just seems like it's a grave mistake for us to be going to another million, 250 thousand dollars in GRF dollars to add it to these particular area for these I would ask again for a negative vote on the part of the House. We've...we've made some very tough decisions here today. They're tough for me to stand up and argue against them as well. I'm not talking about the merits. I'm talking about fiscal restraint and the condition this State happens to be in. Those of us who ve been here for a few years don't want to see us back to the brink of bankruptcy as this State was just a few years back. I would respectfully ask a 'no' vote from the Members of this House and ask that everybody respectfully just push own buttons, in the interest of time."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being no indication of such, Representative Madigan to close."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I have adequately stated my position. I would request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the item veto on page seven, lines 30 to 35 and page eight, lines one through four of House Bill 364 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye',

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is an item veto Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie, to explain her vote."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I * m distressed to see only 76 'yes' votes on the board. program that the State requires. It is run and operated in the City of Chicago. When it comes to care for mentally i11 patients before they require institutionalization, other communities in this State get help from our State government, from our General Revenue Fund resources but not in the City of Chicago. For the after care program, for people who are on their way out of institutions and back home into the community the State has traditionally picked up half of the cost, 50% and the local community the other half. Without this override Chicago...the dollars that the State will be providing for these programs operated by the City of Chicago, required to be operated by the City of Chicago will be reduced to 42%. That's not a very fair kind of ratio. It's particularly not a fair ratio if we're as concerned as we say we are about taxes and about the burdens, property tax and otherwise on our people. If we do not override this veto, what we we saying to the people in Chicago? We're telling them that the costs will have to be born increasingly by themselves which means, as you all very well increases in the property taxes. The most regressive kind of tax we have. Illinois can afford this 1.25 million dollars and I would hope that there will be more people supporting this override Motion."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair has been asked to remind the members of the media that filming is prohibited during...by our rules during a...explanation of votes. Have all voted who

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 79 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having failed to receive a...pardon? The Gentleman asks a Poll of the Absentees. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Brummer. Deuster."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Brummer votes 'aye'.
We're starting with 86 votes."

Clerk Leone: "Deuster. Donovan. Huskey. Klemm. Ozella. Reed.

Robbins. Schraeder. Stearney. Sam Wolf, and Zwick."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Sam Wolf votes "aye"."

CLerk Leone: "And Zwick."

Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 88 voting 'aye'.

Representative Schraeder, Representative Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "'Aye'."

Speaker Peter: "Votes 'aye'. Anyone else? On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions."

Speaker Peters: "The Chair is considering use of the Attendance
Roll Call. No, don't...just don't leave. Wait just one
second. We have a little clerical problem here.
Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Session seems to be dragging on at some length and I wonder if a Motion to adjourn sine die might be appropriate?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, for purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Bowman: "Well, just an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Since

I'm the Sponsor of the next Motion, I'd like just to know

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

what the posture of the Chair is and why we're standing around like this?"

Speaker Peters: "The...Mr. Clerk?"

Bowman: "I mean I think I know but I'm ... I'd like to hear."

Speaker Peters: "House Bill 588, are there any Motions, Mr. Clerk? Take your time."

Clerk Leone: "Motion #1, I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16, line 6', Representative Woods Bowman."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman on Motion #1."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was down here for the Perfunctory Session and filed Motion 1, 2, 3 and 4, all of which relate to the subject of day-care..."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman, excuse me. Were you giving me numbers that I need to know, cause I didn't hear them? I'm sorry, would you..."

Bowman: "Yes, I will repeat them.."

Speaker Peters: "Please."

Bowman: "I just wanted to indicate that Motions 1, 2, 3 and 4 all relate to the subject of day-care. Motion #3 is, in particular, is Cosponsored with Representative Ebbesen and Representative Hallock. Now, I sent a memo to all Members of the House explaining the day care funding issue. It is a complicated one. It does appear in four different line items of the budget and it involves several different funds. In order to be able to have...make some sense out of all this, some sober reflections suggested that perhaps these Motions ought to be packaged in some way so people can make a little sense out of them and not have to be hit with four separate Motions. So what we did was package them so that there will be a subsequent Motion that

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

combines the two DCFS lines and a separate Motion combining the two public aid lines. And so, at this time, I would like to ask leave of the House to withdraw Motion #1, Motion #2, Motion #3 and Motion #4 and to be added as a Cosponsor along with Representatives Ebbesen and Hallock of Motion 11."

Speaker Peters: "Of Motion what?"

Bowman: "Eleven. Principle Sponsor, Matijevich."

Speaker Peters: "So you are withdrawing Motions \$1, 2, 3 and 4?"

Bowman: "1, 2, 3, and 4, right. With the indulgence of the Chair and the other Members of the House, I would like to very briefly just repeat that because day-care is something that has gotten a lot of discussion lately and make sure all the signals are straight. The Motions, 10 and 11, will be the Motions involving the day-care funding. Motion \$10 will contain the funding that is appropriated to DCFS, and Motion 11 will contain the funding appropriated for the Department of Public Aid donated funds program. So, I think combining it in that way we'll make more sense of

Speaker Peters: "Right, that...Representative Vinson, on this point, Sir? Proceed."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I object."

Bowman: "To what?"

this."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman's objection is noted but Motions

1, 2, 3 and 4 are withdrawn. That's the privilege of the

Sponsor. Motion #5...are there any further Motions, Mr.

Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion \$5, 'I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 35, line one', Representative Slape."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Slape, on Motion #5 to House Bill

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

588. #

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the The Governor's veto of \$380,000 from the grants House. line item for public health departments within Department of Public Health budget is a move that would further reduce the State's support for these agencies. The basic grants made by the Illinois Public Health Department to these local agencies are utilized to provide services in environmental health, personal health, and health facilities. Even though it's a small reduction in a budget of 18%, it actually, in most cases, will come out to be more around 15% when you add in inflation to the loss to the local health boards. The health board in Bond County notified me that their loss would be around 17%. I would ask that this \$300...\$380,000 be restored to the budget."

Speaker Peters: "Representative...have you concluded,
Representative Slape?"

Slape: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf." J.J. Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman's Motion and others filed on this Bill represent some 12 million dollars in additional monies. I'd like to point out with reference to Motion #5, there are 67 local health departments receiving monies from this appropriation and this reduction would result in only an average cut of \$5,600 per department, or 7% from GRF state sources here only. I would just urge the Members of the House again to cast a negative vote on the Gentleman's Motion. To go into the arguments previously would only be redundant. I think most every Member of this General Assembly and this House of Representatives understands the fiscal consequences of a series of overrides and, as we mentioned before, the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Economic and Fiscal Commission is estimating 115 million dollars less than the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor's agency. This is the first time in history, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that I've ever seen the Economic and Fiscal Commission to be more conservative in a revenue estimates than that of the Executive Branch because Governors historically like to be very conservative their estimates just in case something goes wrong or in case their is additional monies at the end of the year that they can say, 'Well it's because of our great management, we did it. This is not a boogle-man type of threat. is something real. It's not imagined. This State is heading on the brink of some fiscal disaster unless we continue to hold the line and show the restraint and the responsibility that this Body has done this afternoon. would again ask for a negative vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Slape to close."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd only point out that with the...if we...if this override Motion passes and this money is restored, we would only be providing the same level of services that were provided last year and since many of the small counties, particularly the county I live in, Bond County, it might be a small sum of money here, to this Illinois General Assembly, and it might be a small proportion to the Illinois Budget but to our local services this provides 17% of a budget, that we will not be able to provide through local services or local taxes and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "The question is...the question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 35, line one of House Bill 588 be restored to its original amount,

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?. 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'nay'. This Motion having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions?"

- Clerk Leone: "Motion #6, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16, lines 16', Representative Preston."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston on Motion #6 to House Bill 588. Proceed, Sir."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of What my Motion deals with is funding for foster home care for children throughout Illinois who are in of that care for various reasons. Now, basically those reasons have to do if where a child has to be taken out of the home because of sexual abuse inflicted on that child in the home or because of physical abuse. The physical abuse would be abuse such as beatings, starvation, burnings, neglect, that the child has to suffer but at the hands of his or her parents. In those cases these children are home and placed in foster homes where taken out of the volunteer foster parents will take care of the child during whatever period is necessary until either his family or her family is put back on their feet or some other permanent arrangements can be made in the areas of adoption. there are many charitable organizations throughout Illinois who put up their munding...their money rather to fund foster home care for these children. They go out and they find appropriate foster homes for the children. They

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

administer the programs, but they need supplemental monies from the State. The amount of money that has been cut out of this program and what, by this Notion, we are asking you to put back is, percentage-wise, a small amount of money. The total is \$1,300,000. The reason...this is out of some 34-35 million dollars of the budget, and that's the amount that had been cut out. Now, if we should fail to put this money back, what the end result is that these children who otherwise would be able to be placed in foster homes will be told that, no, notwithstanding the abuse that you suffer at home, we cannot take you out of the home. We have to leave you in the home with your parents, with a parent who may be sexually abusing you, with a parent or parents that may be neglecting you or abusing you physically. So. this money is absolutely essential in order to provide absolutely essential services. It has been said, and I've heard it here repeatedly, that the state cannot afford, much as we would like to put this money back in, that we simply cannot afford this money. Well. I would say to those, those people that in this instance that is being very penny wise and very pound foolish because the money that it would now take to take these children out of a devastating home situation and to provide some other for that child is very small compared to the state expenses, the state monies that will be necessary to with this child after this child has undergone years of abuse at the hands of a bad home environment. The psychological damage will have to be treated later on. The physical damage will have to be treated later on and the expense of doing that far, far out weighs what amounts here to a small expenditure for children. Because of that, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. in this case notwithstanding that we all want to be fiscally

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

responsible, we want to have a balanced budget. In this case we have to put a priority and our first priority has to be the children who cannot otherwise fend for themselves. They have no where to go. They are absolutely relying on government to take them out of unlivable situations and to provide other care for them. This 1,300,000 dollars, Ladies and Gentlemen, is essential, absolutely essential to provide needed care for children. I ask for you to vote 'aye' on this Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This 1,333,300 dollars is again a sizable sum of dollars. Let me point out that with with the Governor's reduction, the amount the..even approved is \$352,200 over the expenditures projected for FY Now, all this reduced amount is going to do is postpone a rate increase from January 1 until April 1 of I would like to point out as well that the Gentleman made some...some reference to volunteer foster parent which is, case somebody is maybe mislead, this is not volunteer, you know, where they don't get any money, the money is provided for the care of the children and I can speak with some experience because I was at one time a foster parent, But again, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, myself. again here's some 1.3 million dollars being added on to a budget that is really tightened down and it does, even without this increase, there's a \$352,200 increase provided by the Governor with the amount that he has approved. there is actually an increase, it is not a decrease and it only means a postponing of the rate increase for several months. I would ask, respectfully, for a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing I'd just like to remind my distinguished colleagues that it is programs such as this that were requested by President Reagan, that were requested by Governor Thompson in order to encourage and put the brunt of child care and other welfare services on private organizations, private charities. That's what this This money is being spent, most of the money is being spent by private organizations, by private charities. They are getting supplemental money from the State of Illinois so that they can be encouraged to continue in What will happen is that if the state these programs. shows the state is not interested in these programs, charities will go to other areas. We can't do that to the We have to say that we children of Illinois. priorities and our top priority are the people who cannot That's the whole reason to fend for themselves. government in the first place. I ask you again, please, search your hearts and say, say right now that we have to show that we stand up for the children of Illinois. We're not going to cut these dollars for the most abused among Thank you." us.

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 16, line 16 of House Bill 588 be notwithstanding the to its original amount, restored reduction of the Governor? . All 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? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 69 voting 'nay'. Representative Wolf, the Gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Preston requests a Poll of the Absentees." Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Bartulis. Clerk Bell.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Bluthardt. Deuster. Epton. Huskey. Karpiel. Klemm. Peters. Reed. Robbins. Stanley. Stearney and Stuffle." Peters: "Representative Stuffle votes 'aye'. Speaker Representative Woodyard from 'aye' to 'no'. Any other changes before we start? Representative Bartulis votes Representative Topinka from •ves• to 'no'. Representative Huskey 'no'. Any other changes before we The count is...Mr. Clerk? There are 93 'aves'. begin? Proceed with a...Representative Slape?"

Slape: "Leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. Representative Slape is verified.

Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Abramson. Alexander. Balanoff. Barkhausen. Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carev. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Catania. Chapman. Darrow. Davis. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan-Dovle. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Huff. Hallock. Hanahan. Henry. Jackson-Greiman. Dick Kelly. Kornowicz. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Leon. Madigan. Martire. Matijevich. Leverenz. Levin. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Redmond. Reilly. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan-Rea. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Saltsman. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Schraeder. Slape. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Zito."

Speaker Peters: "Mrs. Smith? You weren't challenged, Ma'am. The beginning count, Mr. Clerk? 93 'ayes'. Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Breslin."

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Breslin? The Lady's in her seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Bullock."

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

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Farley? Gentleman in the

chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove...Farley..."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Flinn."

Speaker Peters: "Who?"

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Flinn."

Speaker Peters: "Monroe Flinn is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Garmisa? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Huff."

Speaker Peters: "Here, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Restore

Representative Garmisa. Proceed, Sir."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Huff."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff? How is the

Gentleman...Gentleman in the chamber? He's in his seat."

J.J.Wolf: "Did you say Mr. Huff was in his seat?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Sir. He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Hanahan."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Hanahan? He's here."

J.J.Wolf: "Laurino."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Martire."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Martire? Gentleman in the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Is Mr. McGrew in the chamber?"

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

J.J.Wolf: "McPike."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Return Mr. Laurino to the Roll.."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Pechous."

Speaker Peters: "Representative..Wait a minute. Let's get
Pechous. Pechous is in the aisle and return Representative
McPike to the Roll. Laurino's been restored."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Terzich."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Kane."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Kane is in the rear."

J.J.Wolf: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Braun is in her seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. McClain."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Schneider."

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

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

80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Did you take Mr. McClain off?"

Speaker Peters: "Yes. Representative McClain has been removed."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. White. Oh, he's in his seat. I see him. Reilly."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "No further."

Speaker Peters: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are ... Representative O'Connell?..."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

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

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

Speaker Peters: "You're recorded as voting 'no'."

O'Connell: "Would you please record me as voting 'aye'?"

- Speaker Peters: "Certainly. The Gentleman requested to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 88 'aye', 72 'no'. This Motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Any further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Notion #7, 'I move to restore the following reduced item of appropriation in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16, line 18', Representative Preston."
- Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry, Mr. Clerk. Any further Motions?

 Representative Preston on Motion \$7."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, I don't know what on this Motion I could add to my words. This Motion is to put back funds, some \$900,000, for institutionalized home care for the same sexually abused and physically abused, burned, beaten, starved and neglected children, except this is one

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

step worse than the foster home care situation. These are basically children who cannot be placed in foster homes. The reason they can't be placed in foster homes is they are in such bad shape, they might be dangerous to the parents...the natural children of the foster These children have no where to go whatsoever. They can't be put in foster homes. They can't be left in their own They have to go to institutionalized care. homes. will put back \$900,000 to enable charities to perform their functions to find decent and run decent institutions and get some small supplement from the state to do it. If don't have a feeling for these children and think that a road fund is more important than these children or think that other government expenditures are more important than these children who have no where else in the whole world to turn to but to this Body, I think it's a shame, and I'd ask for your *aye* vote."

- Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Wolf.

 J.J. Wolf."
- J.J. Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, you know the Gentleman who just spoke used the old rhetoric about you care more about roads than you do about children. Now anybody who's in this General Assembly knows good and well the road fund dollars are earmarked dollars and you don't transfer into other services that come from general revenue funds. Now that's an old cliche, an old argument that's been years and years. I've heard it since I've been here since We always hear this kind of argument. And it Now what the Governor's done even with his doesn't gel. reduction has actually supplied an increase of \$209,900, an increase over last year's budget. And all the Governor's reduction has done was to delay a cost of living increase

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

by three months. Instead of going January 1st, it goes April 1. That's all it does. There is an increase of nearly \$210,000 and all it is is a three month delay in the cost of living. And I know darn well how ... the importance of these programs, but it would just seem to me that three months is not going to make the world of difference. again a \$972,000 some odd dollars involved in this thing it's a nickeling, diming as we always say, you know, a million here and few hundred thousand there and before you know it, you're talking about some real dollars. Again, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I would ask for the same type of vote and ask, respectfully, for a negative vote on the Gentleman's Motion. And again, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, could we just punch our own buttons and save a lot of time."

Speaker Peters: "Point is well taken. Any further discussion?

Representative Ewell."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, just to touch Ewell: hearts a little I should like to point out to this Body that we have gone on record time and time again as loving children, as wanting to care for them. We have hearts so tender we can even hear the unborn cry. But here are some the most deprived children in our society and we now turn a deaf ear. Gentlemen, I say to you, You do not believe the things that you preach insincere. because here we certainly have those children that time and again you have voted to say that surely they are entitled Now we're talking about the quality of that life, and I must ask you to consider what you are doing. your conscience, is this vote consistent with those plaintful (sic) pleas that we heard you make for children that aren't even born? These are here. They are here now. They're in deep trouble and we ask only that you turn a

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

little tenderness and turn your hardened hearts from your ways of evil and again join the society as it ought to be thinking of only those children and the interests of the children that you have so properly spawned and now are here. Thank you."

- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none,
 Representative Preston. Oh, I'm sorry. Representative
 Sandquist."
- Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Motion, not because of the children who I know need help, and of course, the children don't vote and that's probably why we can't give them all the things they need. But the reason I'm supporting this is that we have to look...we're talking about private agencies who are trying to help out the state. This is part of the whole Reagan economic program and what we've got to do, we've got to give the public sector ..has to give some help to these private agencies as mandated by our law and by doing that, we're..in the long run we're going to save the state money. So, therefore, I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none,
 Representative Preston to close."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the previous speakers talked about a three month delay and how unimportant a simple three month delay can be. These dollars don't indicate a delay. These dollars may indicate a denial of ..of any care for children. Tell me that three months to a child, an eight year old girl who might be sexually molested by a deranged father, isn't important. Tell me that three months to a child that may be routinely burned when the child cries is unimportant. These are the most disadvantaged children,

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

whether they're rich, they're middle income, they're poor. These are children who need help from the only place they have to turn. They can't fight for themselves. They can't fend for themselves. Three months might be a lifetime to someone in these circumstances. These are children that cannot even be placed into foster homes. They have to placed into institutions. Think of that. Think of a child that has to be placed into an institution and tell me that this isn't an important allocation of money. This is the same Body that allocated funds to help Chrysler out of a problem to the tune of 20 million dollars, and we can't \$900.000 help people have find to who institutionalized, defenseless children. I ask for aye vote."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 16, line 18 of House Bill 588 be to its original amount, notwithstanding the All those in favor will reduction of the Governor? ... 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? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay'. Representative Wolf? The Gentleman asks for a verification of the vote. Representative Preston? Where Representative Preston, poll of the is the Gentleman? absent...Poll of the absentees? The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Bluthardt. Deuster. Ralph
Dunn. Findley. Virginia Frederick. Margalus. Oblinger.
Peters. Reed. Reilly. Robbins. Irv Smith. Stanley.
Stearney, and Winchester."

Speaker Peters: "The count remains 94. Proceed with a call of the Affirmative Roll, Mr. Clerk."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Abramson. Alexander.

Balanoff. Barkhausen. Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Bradley.

Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey.

Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie.

Darrow. Davis..."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk. Slow down just a little bit, please."

Clerk Leone: "DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Henry. Hoffman. Hanahan. Huff. Jackson. Greiman. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Keane. Dick Kelly. Koehler. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Madigan. Martire. Matijevich. McClain. Mautino. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Connell. Ozella. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Redmond. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan-Satterthwaite. Saltsman. Sandquist. Schneider. Schraeder. Slape. Margaret Smith. Steczo. Stewart. Stuffle. Terzich. Turner. Van Duvne. Vitek. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Zito."

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

Representative Preston, we begin with 94. Change

Representative Hoffman from 'yes' to 'no'. We start with

now 93. Representative Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Turner? Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Abramson."

Speaker Peters: "Pardon?"

J.J. Wolf: "Abramson."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Abramson? Gentleman in the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll. Restore
Representative Turner. And the sound man, take that hum
out of the system."

J.J. Wolf: "DiPrima."

Speaker Peters: "Representative DiPrima? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove DiPrima. Turner has been restored. How is Representative DiPrima recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Domico."

Speaker Peters: "Hold on now. Remove DiPrima. Restore Abramson.

Proceed."

J.J. Wolf: "Domico."

Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Henry."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Henry? The Gentleman is in his seat."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Huff."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Huff? The Gentleman is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Laurino."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Laurino's in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Leverenz."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. McGrew."

Speaker Peters: "Representative McGrew is here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Pierce."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Pierce is here."

J.J.Wolf: "Is Mr. Redmond in his chair? I can't see."

Speaker Peters: "Yes, Representative Redmond is here. Go ahead, Nike. Representative McClain is verified."

J.J.Wolf: "Steczo."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Steczo? Is the Gentleman...He's

J.J. Wolf: "Terzich."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Terzich? He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Martire."

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

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll."

J.J. Wolf: "Catania."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Catania? Is the Lady in the chamber? How is she recorded? Pardon? She's here. I'm sorry."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. McPike."

Speaker Peters: "He's here."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Ronan here?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Roman? Representative Roman?

Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded? He's here.

Restore Representative DiPrima to the Roll."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. ..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Let the record indicate that the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Chair verifies Representative Getty. Proceed."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Schneider."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider? He's here."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. O'Brien."

Speaker Peters: "Representative O'Brien? Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Peters: "Remove him from the Roll and restore ...restore

Representative Leverenz and restore Representative

O'Brien."

J.J.Wolf: "Is Mr. Bowman in the chamber? Oh, I see him now."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry."

J.J.Wolf: "I see him now. I was looking for Mr. Bowman. He's in the corner. Mr. Bradley? Oh, I see him. Mr. Doyle in the chamber?"

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Doyle in the chamber?"

Speaker Peters: "Doyle is in the center aisle."

J.J.Wolf: "Mr. Ozella."

Speaker Peters: "Mr. Ozella is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Mr. Leon in the chamber?"

Speaker Peters: "Leon? Yes, Mr. Leon is in his seat."

J.J. Wolf: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite? The Lady...the Lady's in the chamber."

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

Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 91 'aye', 69 'no' and this..this Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 16, line 18 of House Bill 588 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Any further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion #8, 'I move to restore the following reduced

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

item of appropriation in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16, line 31°,. Representative Preston."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston on Motion #8."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, we withdraw this Motion."

- Speaker Peters: "Excuse me, Sir. Might I introduce to the Members the new Minority Leader of the Senate, Senator Pate Philip. Welcome, Senator Philip. Motion #8, Senator..er..Representative Preston. Withdraw 8? Motion 8 is withdrawn. Objections of Representative Vinson are noted. Motion...Any further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion #9, 'I move that the following items of
 House Bill 588 do pass, the veto of the Governor
 notwithstanding, page 16, line 32', Representative
 Preston."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston on Motion #9."

Preston: "We withdraw that Motion, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Peters: "The Gentleman...The Gentleman withdraws Motion #9. Further Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Motion #10, ''I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16, line six and page 16, line seven', Representative Bowman."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Bowman on Motion #10 to House
 Bill 588. Proceed, Sir."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Motion #10 is a day-care restoration Motion appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Services; two line items, one GRF and one local effort Day-Care Fund for a total of approximately four million dollars. I would like to address my remarks to basically two questions. One is, you've heard a lot of discussion about negotiations and a possible settlement to this

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

day-care problem, without the necessity of an override. However, I would like to put at rest some of the concerns questions about that..about those rumors by reading a statement, a very short statement, from the statewide explaining what has happened. It says, *Representatives of the statewide coalition on Fiscal Human Service veto reductions have repeatedly and in good faith made attempts beginning on June 30th, 1981 and extending through yesterday to initiate discussions with the Governor's Office. At no time has any representative of the Governor's initiated any contact with the coalition or its members in an effort to address serious community service issues which have led to what is now an apparent deadlock. The first contact with a concrete proposal was The proposal was to settle for ten cents on the yesterday. dollar and the vetoed amount for next year and that, needless to say, is pretty small potatoes and, if they were going to accept it, they would certainly have to check back with the people they represented and it was impossible to do so in the time frame available to them. Therefore, the .. that was the last that was heard from the I'm sure if the Governor's Office Governor's Office. wanted to offer 75%, they would probably have jumped at it without feeling the necessity for checking back. I assure you...I can assure you the coalition is eager to negotiate. After all, a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. They know that. They know that the Governor need not spend the money that is appropriated. In fact, the Governor said just today in the rotunda at an impromptu news conference he doesn't plan to spend the money if it is that appropriated. I think, first of all, that's thumbing his nose at the Legislature. But second of all, it makes it quite clear that the coalition, it seems to me, really has

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

every incentive to negotiate and, in fact, still has the opportunity to do so if we override here in the House. we do not override, however, there is no negotiation for them. Their backs are up against the wall now, and if we fail to override in the House, that's it, period, done, over and done with. If, however, we override in the House, I think there is still a genuine possibility negotiations can take place before the Senate considers this. If any negotiations have been taking place, I think it's been between the Governor and Doctor Mandeville, not with the coalition. Let me now turn to the question of the budget. We have had several Motions to override, and each the Sponsor of this Bill earnestly gets up and addresses the problem of the budget. I sit on the Economic too, and we are in desperate and Fiscal Commission, it is quite clear to me that the In fact, situation is much, much more serious than the Governor letting on at this point. However, this program, day-care, is the only cost-effective, social service program that we have that is very clearly and obviously cost effective. You can make some esoteric arguments about a lot of others, We have people who are working, single here it is. parent families...in Evanston where I...which I represent, 80% of the day-care slots that are subsidized by the state are assigned to single-parent households. These are prime candidates for welfare, and it costs a lot more to keep a family on welfare than it does to subsidize a day-care slot. Lastly, I would point out that to the extent that we...we're not using GRF money here. We are usinglocal money which has been contributed by United Ways and other local charities with the ... to the Governor's donated initiative program with the understanding that their would be used to capture federal dollars. If we do not

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

override this veto, we are breaking faith with the local people. I would point out that the Governor vetoed Of that amount, \$245,000,000 in general revenue funds. (million) came out of retirement funds. In other words, only \$62,000,000 were vetoed out of actual programs. 20% of that was taken out of the hides of local providers, the YWCA's, the United Ways, the local providers, the local day care centers. That is a disproportionate amount. If we are going to be cutting back on programs, then at least let's have the courage and the nerve to stand up here and cut across the boards, cut the state programs as well as the local programs. Let's stop passing our burden down to the local effort...local level. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a cost-effective program. The only alternative for many, many of these people is welfare. I think this is a very, very poor time to be pushing, literally pushing people out the door and onto welfare, and I urge an affirmative vote on this override Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Any further discussion? Representative Ewell.

Representative Henry."

Henry: "Yes. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion for several reasons. One is that I have the support of a number of working mothers and fathers in the district that I represent on the west side of the City of Chicago. I also have several letters here on my desk from not only people from my District, but mothers and fathers throughout the State of Illinois. After the hearings in Chicago on September 28th I learned some things, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I didn't know. I did not know that there were a number, a large number, of mothers with youngsters and the mother is trying to attend school so she will not go on welfare. There were a large number of

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

working mothers that are poor working mothers that do not want to become a member of welfare, and, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the alternative to the day care, you will for available homes to take care of youngsters. It reminds me of the budget manager, Mr. Stockman. Where they were cutting the CETA jobs, he said that the President wants the people to go elsewhere. With a neighborhood such as mine, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no elsewhere for a mother to take her youngster while she's trying to work or attend school. There is no elsewhere, and even if she finds an elsewhere, she must go through a crime-ridden area to leave her youngsters, where just two weeks ago in one of the local newspapers where a left her two kids with a grown-up that a crime was committed against two young girls. Now, what are we doing? Are we going to throw away the youngsters to unsavory We can't check to see if this mother and characters? father or this lady and gentleman are worthwhile to care of youngsters while their mother and father attempt to work. And if you're talking about welfare, are we to say that we're going to stop mothers and fathers from working and get back on welfare, or do we want to stop youngsters from going to school to better their education so they will not become recipients of welfare? I think it's in the those who say they are supporting the minorities hands of and the browns and the blacks and the DOOL throughout the State of Illinois. I hope you will take a real good look at what you're doing to some of the youngsters in the State of Illinois when you have no protection for their mothers and fathers while they work for their youngsters. And for that reason, for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I overwhelmingly support Mr. Bowman in his Motion and I

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

hope you feel too...I hope you do, too. Thank you wery much."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are many people in this room who understand principles of banking, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. There are many of you who understand making an investment and hoping that that investment appreciates in value or are hoping that that investment ends up paying good dividends. There is no investment that the State of Illinois can make that is a better investment than trying to keep people off the welfare roles, trying to assist people pull themselves out of the welfare spiral so that they can pull themselves off of the welfare rolls. What better way is there than someone seeking an education or seeking a job, going out and working while they have some place to leave their children so that they can assist themselves in staying off the welfare roles. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Wolf."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Ladies and Wolf: Gentlemen of the House, this is no small item. We're not talking about 50 or 100 or \$150,000. This is a restoration of \$4,093,700 in the combination of general revenue The amount that is left in this budget with other funds. the Governor's reduction would fund, according estimates, 704 more additional slots than were funded last year. In addition, there has been some negotiations with the City of Chicago to transfer about \$1,000,000 in additional from the administrative overhead and take it out of administration and put it into providing more slots to provide more direct care. The ... 2.7 million dollars in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

local effort funds that are seeking to be restored in Motion will be spent on certain programs...day programs over which over 95% of which are in the City of Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Now, mover of this Motion, who is also a Member of the Economic if you'll listen to his earlier Commission, statements by his own admissions he states that the of Illinois...he acknowledges that the state is in much more serious condition than the Bureau of the Budget is willing to admit. We approved the report of the Commission and the Gentleman approved it as I did. And, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand that you feel it's important that we do this, and I realize that 95% of this money in these local funds will go to the City of Chicago which...from which I am elected, but what I am saying as honestly and straightforward as I can, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this state really can't afford to get theirself (sic) down to less than two days cash reserve balance at the end of the fiscal year. Now, I remember the maker of this Motion, we had a little discussion before some senior citizen groups some time back with regard to the elimination of sales tax on food and medicine, and at that time the Gentleman was advocating how we could afford to eliminate the entire amount in one fell swoop over the period of years, and I argued that we probably could stand the first cent certainly, and the second, and maybe even the third cent, and we got down to the fourth and fifth cent of our sales tax, the state would surely be in trouble. Nobody had a crystal ball at that time, but all the economists were predicting a worsened economy, a state of recession, and I am looking forward to some \$200,000,000 additional in public aid monies that will be necessary in the coming fiscal year. And, Mr. Speaker and

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

House, if you want to put the state back to that kind of a position that it was a few years ago where we were hanging by a thread and were worrying whether we could send out the unemployment checks and the rest of the things and had to put delays to people where they couldnot get that money for a week and sometimes even more because the cash flow just wasn't there - then I say then vote for this. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I for one am not willing to put the state back on the brink of bankruptcy, a state in which we were just a few years back, for the sake of trying to override the Governor's vetoes. I think he took a lot of painstaking effort and long hard facts in decision, and federal funds are not in this Illinois will not loss one penny of federal dollars with this reduction, so don't let anybody mislead you thinking that. This is a tough issue. We're talking some real dollars here. We're not talking a few nickels and It is a serious matter, and if you think I'm kidding, well, I'm not. I would ask again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for a negative vote пo the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan. Representative
Birkinbine, I know what you had in mind, and...I think, but
Representative Madigan worked very hard on this, and it is
an important issue. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion to restore this appropriation. Clearly this is a case where Governor Thompson was terribly shortsighted in his exercise of the authority given to him under the Constitution to veto appropriations. At issue in total, not just with this particular Motion, but at issue in total is only \$12,000,000. Of that \$12,000,000, \$1,000,000 is General

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Revenue Fund money. The remainder consists of monies supplied by the Federal Government and by local governments and agencies. The question is simply this, shall the state provide money to support day-care centers so that women who are not being supported by their husbands or by their ex-husbands can leave their children in the proper environment and go to a job where they will be a productive member of the society, where they will earn an income, where they will pay state income taxes to the state Treasury, or shall the state not appropriate that money so that those women will not have their job, and, in all likelihood, eventually, they will be required to apply for welfare? That is the question offered to us today. Clearly, my decision will be in favor of appropriating money for day-care so that women can put their children in a good and decent environment, go to a job, be a productive member of our society. I suggest to you that we are all well advised to vote 'aye' for this Motion to restore."

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Birkinbine?
Representative Kelley."

Kelley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think those of you who know me know I'm not a bleeding heart. In fact, I don't understand you people who are, but this is one issue that I must support because in my own district in Rockford I have seen what day-care centers produce and I want to support Woody on...Woody Bowman on this important issue."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Topinka."

Topinka: "I would like to call the question please."

Speaker Peters: "The question has been called for. You have heard the Motion. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it...or the 'ayes' have it. Representative

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Levin, as Cosponsor, to close."

Levin: "Okay, I will be very brief ... "

Speaker Peters: "Give the Gentleman your attention please."

Levin: "This is an extraordinarily important Motion. It and the next are clearly the most important issues we'll be voting on this week, and I think two weeks from now when we come They are important to the parents of kids that are in day-care. They are important to the children, and are important to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. The parents want to work. These are primarily single parent families where the woman wants to stay off of welfare, wants to be independent, does not want to dependent on the State of Illinois. They want to work, but we were told in justification for this cut that there would be no reduction in slots despite the \$4,000,000 cut. The slack would be taken up by day-care homes. The testimony that we heard in two days of hearings in Chicago and Springfield by the Democratic Task Force suggests, first of all, that there are not vacant slots in day-care homes, and even where there are, there is competing for that slot somebody willing to pay full freight, \$60 a week as opposed to \$30.08 that the state is offering. And secondly, you can't find these slots because there is no coordinating body that can tell you that there is a vacant slot in a day care home on your block. Where those coordinating bodies existed, they have lost their funding. So that argument, makes no sense at all. But going beyond that, think, let's look at this from the standpoint of the taxpayers of this state. Those taxpayers want to save money not waste money, and we heard the arguments. We heard testimony that if these slots are not available, if the day-care centers cannot continue, the women are going to have to go on welfare. We not only heard speculative testimony, but we

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

heard testimony from one day-care center that was forced to make cuts, and the effect of when they followed up was fully one-third of the families that lost their day-care in July of this year are today on public aid. So it is not idle speculation that if we do not override this veto, we are going to increase the welfare roles. I urge your support for this extraordinarily important Amendment."

Speaker Peters: "The chamber thanks the Gentleman for his brief remarks. The question is...now let me find the right line item. The question is, 'Shall the reducted item of appropriation on page 16, line 6 and page 16, line 7...of House Bill 588 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', and all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "You sure you don't want to poll the absentees?"

Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Has everyone voted the way they want to vote? Have all voted who wish? I bet it would get 140. That is why I am waiting. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this ques...on this question there are 128 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails, and the items on...page 16, line 6 and page 16, line 7 of House Bill 588 are restored to their original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Any further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #11, 'I move to restore the following reduced appropriations of House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 23, line 24 and page 24, line 15', Representative Matijevich."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Matijevich. Representative

Daniels in the Chair."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I should first have leave. Jim Kelly gave such a good speech, I wonder if I would have leave to have him and Giorgi as Cosponsors of this Motion, because, Jim, you're in my Motion, not the other one. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a total of \$7,911,400 in restoration in the local initiative \$7,265,180 of it in the donated funds program and \$646,220 in the certified funds program. This is the single largest human services veto reduction in a program from which, and I want to underline this and I don't want anybody to call me a liar, as I've heard someone call Minority Leader a liar, because there are no state dollars in this amount. The local initiative fund programs are supported by a combination of 25% local funds and 75% federal Title XX funds. The 250 programs financed through local initiative fund include over \$3,000,000 in day-care funding. So we didn't take care of all day-care funding in the last Motion. As well, there are a...there are a variety of services to the elderly, mentally ill, and developmentally disabled, troubled youths and children, the handicapped, and ex-offenders. At the hearings recently held both in Chicago and Springfield, testimony indicated that as many as 20,000 clients would either go unserved or would be diverted to state funded services. And there are, under that program, the total program, there are 7...over served in the 70,000 people that are funds initiative was funds...programs. The donated announced by Governor Thompson in the fall of 90...1977 as a long-term commitment, a commitment by the state to make the best use of private sector resources. And I have before me, and I don't want to read from it, but right from the Department of Public Aid on their stationary, an indication that this has been a successful program. Even

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the Governor's advised...Citizens' Advisory Council has said and recommended that this program stay in force, that it stay in effect. This would be a disservice if we do phase out this program. It would be like us giving up something that has been a success. Here is something of what the Governor...Governor's views on the donated funds initiative program is. For example, in October of '77 he said, quote, 'Our priority is to develop greater reliance on in cooperation with the private human services agencies In April of 478 of our state. hе said, quote, \$20,000,000 worth of needed services will be provided by local groups with money provided by the federal government matched on a three to one basis by the local group. the state is finally beginning to lead the business local voluntary groups up to local voluntary groups'. And I could go on with similar statements that he has made August of the same year, and after that, an admission that this has been a successful program and that it serves many. Now, sometimes some of us like to think that we're talking about figures on a blackboard, that we're only talking about numbers in a budget book, but here we aren't just talking about day-care and throwing...and single parents who want to work, and if they can't work, they are going to be on welfare. We're talking about others who are We're talking, and I am sure developmentally disabled. that all of you've received the letters that I have on epileptics and the need for continuation for programs, the palsy, the alcohol...the alcoholics, and the 700,000 which is just touching the surface that are treated with these successful programs. Drug abuse treatment, we're talking about the elderly. I went down the list of these contracts, and believe me, downstaters, you get a shake on this local initiative fund. Time after time I saw

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

downstate counties that ... downstate agencies with their names on these contracts. So you get a good shake on what We're talking about is truly valuable services. retarded. We're talking about the blind, and maybe, know, maybe sometimes for a moment we ought to close our eyes and thank God that we're not blind, and thank we're not deaf because the deaf are serviced here. are people who want to be...who want independence, who need some help, and this is providing the help. The physically disabled in alternative schools which, if we shut down, believe me, they're going to end up in our corrections systems. Later on in this Fall Session, I think there is going to be a supplemental budget for more monies for corrections, for more monies for prisons. That is what is going to happen. If we don't provide these services, what is going to happen? We're going to throw people back where we're going to have to pay anyway with institutions all general revenue funds and it is going to We ought to know here that we're getting a good costly. deal. Even the Governor has admitted in the past that it is a good deal. We must continue it. 1 urge the last Roll Call, Membership, as you did on the to sustain and give full restoration under this Motion #11."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in fiscal year *81 Illinois received approximately \$155,000,000 in federal Title XX dollars. Approximately \$40,000,000 of this was deposited in the local initiative fund and the special purpose trust fund to finance the local effort programs. The remaining \$115,000,000 was placed in the General Revenue Fund for state funded programs. Now, it is being proposed that the Title XX

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

dollars allocated for the local effort programs be reduced so that a larger share of the federal Title XX funds can be diverted to the General Revenue Fund for state funded And while there is no state dollars involved programs. here, as the previous speaker mentioned, we can equate this as a difference between a savings and a checking account, and instead of leaving the money lay in a checking account, you move it into your...in the savings account, you move it into your checking account and use it for General Revenue Fund funded programs to help your cash flow, and that is exactly the problem this state is running into is a cash flow problem. It should be noted also that since the actual expenditures for some of these local programs have been less than their actual grants that they will experience any reduction in spending for fiscal '82. matter of fact, some may not even experience...they may even...an increase in funding because they have been lapsing money. So that is what this does. Instead of putting the money into the local initiative fund, we're transferring...we would like to transfer the money in the General Revenue Fund programs that are funded by the state and help ease the cash flow that this state is going to certainly experience in the months ahead. The amount here is about 7.8 million dollars, and we will ask for a negative vote, respectfully."

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

Representative Bowman. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this particular override of the Governor's policies, I would ask that you join with us and say to the Paroah on the second floor to tend to the needs of the people and let the people go. I ask you, follow our lead. Don't follow him with his head in the clouds and his feet on the road to Washington. I

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

ask you to stay here and tend to the needs of the people of the State of Illinois, for I point out to you that come November, it will be a new day, and each tub will set on its own bottom. Your vote will be duly recorded, and I say to you that the people will care. The people will demonstrate their concern, and they will take you down with the insensitive and uncaring Governor. I ask you to follow your heart and your compassion and join with the people. For in November, they will remember, and we will be here as an eternal reminder. Ladies and Gentlemen, I plead for the people, for the working poor, for the mothers, and for those in the state who cannot help themselves, and I ask you to join us in this righteous cause. Thank you."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative
 Birkinbine."
- Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

 The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. All
 those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
 'ayes' have it. Representative Matijevich to close."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have great confidence in this Body, and all I want is a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is "Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 23 and 24 and page...line 24 and page 24, line 15 be restored to their original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?". 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? Take the record. There are 124 "aye", 42 'no", one voting "present". This Motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails,

80th Legislative Day

- October 15, 1981
- and the item on page 23 line 20...it hasn't passed yet, so maybe you want to save your applause. Page 23, line 24 and page 24, line 15 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Further Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #12. ''I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriationss in House Bill 588, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 34, line 12', Representative Emil Jones."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Emil Jones. On the Motion,
 Representative Jones. Out of the record. Further
 Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."
- Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 591, Representative Wikoff. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 591, Notion #1, ''I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 591, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 26, line 7', Representative Madigan."
- Speaker Daniels: "Motion #1, Representative Madigan. Out of the record. Withdrawn. Purther Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Notion #2, 'I move that the following items of
 House Bill 591 do pass, the veto of the Governor
 notwithstanding, page 26, line 17 through 25',
 Representative Rea."
- Speaker Daniels: "On the Motion, Representative Rea."
- Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This would restore \$200,000 for the ethacoal project which
 we started about a year and a half ago at Southern Illinois
 University. Ethacoal is a...blend of coal and ethanol that
 makes a high burning fuel, and through the research and the
 tests that have been made at Southern Illinois University
 and with the results that have been presented to the

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

Institute of Natural Resources, this process looks very promising commercially and is one that we really need to move ahead very rapidly on. This will reduce the sulfur content by approximately 50%, and maybe even as much as 75% and can make Illinois coal in competition with the western coal as of low sulfur. As you know, there is over 20,000,000 tons of western coal coming into Illinois and we've got to find a way to market Illinois coal, and it has a great effect upon the total economy of this state, not just upon certain regions... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But in terms of the economy of the whole state. has turned about some very This research promising information recently and is one of the two desulfurization processes that is perhaps the most promising here in the state. This one and then one...the geological survey is doing at Champaign. When the Governor vetoed this line item, the Governor's staff was under the opinion that there would be monies available before the end of September under the Coal Board. The Coal Board was not signed recently. and there is no process set up for the application to be made as for the use of those funds. So this would put us another six months to a year behind. This is a program we need to move on rapidly, and certainly is one that is of interest to the Governor's Office, to the Institute of Natural Resources, and to the...to Southern I would ask for a favorable vote on Illinois University. this line item veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative J.J. Wolf."
Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The \$200,000 in General Revenue
Fund that the Gentleman is looking for in this particular
Motion for the ethacoal research was added to the budget
during the Committee process and was not in the Governor's
original budget. I don't think this is necessary at all.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

project can be much better funded and can be funded through the newly created Coal Research Board which we appropriated...there's a million dollars in public utility funds which are allocated to it for fiscal year '82. appropriated through House Bill 590 as a supplemental. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the rather than use general revenue funds which are very scarce and even scarcer since the last couple of votes, we can use this public utility fund money. And by going through the Coal Research Board, the proposed ethacoal project would certainly be given consideration along with several other new promising coal technologies. The Board would be to research this matter thoroughly prior to funding, and it would complete with up to ... it would compete, of course, with other products...projects, and that would be a more cost effective approach. This would be totally unnecessary to expend \$200,000 in general revenue funds, and I would ask for a negative vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I would ask you to consider this carefully. Illinois coal is one of the major assets for all of southern Illinois, and that means from the edge of Chicago south. This is going...this is the industry that is going to be depended upon to provide the jobs, the capital to provide the income and the income tax in order that we may pay for the two programs that we just passed. Since we're a little short of money on this several million, at least we can provide \$200,000 so that we can cut out all of this...help cut out all of this western coal and burn Illinois coal. Thank you for your consideration."

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

Rea: "In closing, let me just respond to the previous speaker in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

terms of not being in the original budget. That is true. It was not in the original budget, and the reason for this was because we did not have the breakthrough at the time that the original budget was prepared. And southern Illinois coal team came to me and told me how they had found that in the grinding and milling process prior to the blending, that they had found that they could reduce the sulfur to a great extent, and that they that this is one of the most promising processes in desulfurization of coal and may be the solution to utilize Illinois coal. So I would ask at this time for a favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is 'Shall the item on page 26, lines 17 through 25, House Bill 591 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 94 'aye', 69 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is declared lost. Representative Rea. Representative Rea."

Rea: "I was trying to get your attention at the time, and I would like for you to poll the absentees."

Speaker Daniels: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Ackerman, Bluthardt,
Dwight Friedrich, Huskey, Macdonald, Martire, Oblinger,
Polk, Redmond, Reed, Irv Smith, Stearney, and C.M. Stiehl."

"94 'aye', 69 'no', 1 **voting** 'present'. Speaker Daniels: Ackerman 'aye'. 95 'a ye'. Okay. Ackerman. Oblinger 'aye'. 96 'aye', 69 'no', one 'present'. Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is declared lost. Motion...further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #3. ''I move to restore the following

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 591..."

Speaker Daniels: "Out of the record. Further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."

Speaker Daniels: "Motion #3 is withdrawn. Okay. House Bill 697.

Read the Motions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 697, Motion #1. 'I move the following item of House Bill 697 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, page 23, line 29', Representative Winchester."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester on the Motion."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the first Motion that I have filed the seven years that I have been in the General Assembly to override a Governor's veto. But I think this is a very important Bill and a mistake on the Governor's part because I think the most important issue facing us in the State of Illinois today is local property taxes and how it is assessed. There is a program that was passed by this General Assembly several years ago that provides 'stipends' in the amounts of \$500 per person to assessors or to assessing officials, or Superintendent of Assessors, or of Review members to attend school to update Board themselves on assessing practices, revenue laws, rules and regulations, things that we have passed in this General Assembly that will help them do a better job in assessing local property taxes. The amount that we're talking about is about \$395,000. I think it is a good investment to make sure that we have good, fair, equal assessing practices in the State of Illinois, and I would ask for a favorable vote on this Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Purther discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The net effect

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

of this is to eliminate another \$395,000 of general revenue funds. The veto eliminated this money in compensation for officials who participate in the training courses which are offered by the Illinois Property Assessment Institute. The program which has been in effect for some time has just gone up from 650 participants to 790. There really isn't any proof that it has amounted to better assessments. But the real thing I want to point out is this is just not paying their tuition, this is a \$500...and not just a bonus. This is \$500 additional as long as they're...continue to assess. So I think we probably would have been better off to pay their tuition to go to the...or take this special training. And certainly more and more people...it is expanding very rapidly because once they take the course, they get an additional \$500 a year as long as they stay on the job. I think it is, again, attacking money that is not there, money that is necessary for other more cost-effective programs, would respectfully request a 'no' vote."

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

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is \$395,000, but to some small counties in the State of Illinois, they don't have any money at all to provide funding for schooling of their assessors. The only assistant...assistance that those assessors get is what comes in the form of a stipend from the Department of Revenue. Local property tax is a serious political issue in this state. We all have that problem. We all know. We're all hearing complaints about how property taxes are being assessed. Assessors are doing the very best they can, but they need the schooling. They need the assistance. The small counties need the assistance to help those assessors get that schooling so that they can

80th Legislative Day

October 15. 1981

assess local property taxes fairly. I think that the majority...more than the majority of the people in this state would be in support of this type of legislation. It is a good Motion, and I would urge a favorable vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "The question is 'Shall the item on page 23,
 line 29 of House Bill 697 pass notwithstanding the veto of
 the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye',
 opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Schraeder to
 explain his vote."
- Schraeder: "Well, Nr. Speaker, this program was initiated a few years back and everybody in the State of Illinois, every taxpayer, every public official knew that the assessing procedure was faulty, and it was faulty in the very fact that you didn't have qualified assessors. I'll shut up. You've got the votes."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 141 'aye', 22 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the item on page 23, line 29 of House Bill 697 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Further Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #2, 'I move to restore the following reduced item...items in appropriation in .House Bill 697, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 9, line 25 and page 10, line 3.

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill...or this Motion involves a very small amount of money as compared to some that we've been listening to here for the last several hours. And it might seem relatively unimportant, but...because it...all it addresses is the money to pay the wages of five people in

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

the State of Illinois. These five people are field inspectors under the Department of Administrative Services. They...they perform a very important function, and as a result of their efforts, they have returned over the past years more than one half a million dollars to the General Revenue. And I think that to...this would be false economy to think of dropping this \$64,000 from the budget and terminate these five people. Incidently, this is...has nothing to do with politics. Three of them are Republicans are Democrats. happen to be personally and two I acquainted with their activities in the various state facilities where they monitor the surplus equipment from the various facilities and see...and locate it in other facilities or ... then if it is not needed elsewhere in the state, it is put on sale and as a result, they have raised, \$64,600 would keep as I say, over half a million dollars. people on the payroll. Otherwise, as of the end of this month, they will be terminated. I think that this is money well spent. I would ask that you support me in this effort."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative J.J. Wolf."
Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think when the Governor utilizes veto
power on this he heeded the words of the distinguished
Minority Spokesman on the House Appropriations Committee.
John Matijevich has always been saying take it out of the
bureaucracy and leave it for services. This is what the
Governor did. He eliminated six jobs, \$69,000."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Richmond: "Yes."

Vinson: "Representative Richmond, are you personally acquainted with any of these employees?"

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Richmond: "Yes, I am."

Vinson: "Is the one you're acquainted with Republican or Democrat?"

Richmond: "I'm sorry. What's that?"

Vinson: "Is the one you're acquainted with Republican or Democrat?"

Richmond: "I am acquainted with one of each. And they both do a tremendous job."

Vinson: "I see. Thank you."

Richmond: "You're welcome."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just like to point out one thing that when we talk about this \$69,000, in the past year, these five employees have returned over a million dollars to the state. So I think it is a good investment, and we should maintain those positions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, this is to my distinguished colleague from Clinton. Representative Richomond does know, in fact, two of those people, because two of them are from southern Illinois. They do do a good job, and it is important to have these six inspectors around the State of Illinois, because we are dealing in hundreds of millions of dollars of state inventory. And without inspectors watching that state inventory, a lot of it would be stolen. Probably high as two or three million dollars in state inventory is preserved as a result of inspectors making periodic agencies, going through their inspections o£ state inventories, making sure the typewriters are in the proper places, and the calculators are in the proper places. supporting this Motion, you're actually saving the State of Illinois money. And I would support the Motion."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Richmond to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly. It has been pointed out why we need to keep these people on the payroll. The alternative would be, as I understand it, that this control would be handled in house. And to me, that would be like putting the rabbit in charge of the lettuce bed. I think that taxpayers would be well served and protected by keeping these people on the job. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 9, line 25 and page 10, line 3 of House Bill 697 be restored to their original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?". All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. '90 'aye', 68 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Absentee. Call the absentees please."

Speaker Daniels: "It only takes 89 votes. Did you still want me to poll the absentees?"

Richmond: "Oh. No, I'm sorry."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there anyone that wants to get off of there so he can poll the absentees? Representative Vinson, you want to get off? He wants to poll the absentees."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I've been persuaded by the debate."

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Ask for a verification of the roll."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman requests a verification. The Gentleman, Representative Richmond, now gets his chance for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson, Alstat, Bullock, Jack Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell..."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Jack Dunn 'no"."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dwight Friedrich, Greiman, Huskey, Leinenweber,
McBroom, Ted Meyer, Peters, Piel, Polk, Reed, Margaret
Smith, Stanley, Stearney, no further."

Speaker Daniels: "Piel 'no'. Proceed with a verification of the affirmative roll. Will all the Members please be in their seats? Representative Smith."

Smith: "I would like to be registered voting 'yes' please."

Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Margaret Smith as 'aye'.

Proceed with a verification of the affirmative roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, Balanoff, Beatty, Bell, Breslin, Brummer, Capparelli, Carey, Bradley, Braun, Chapman, Christensen, Cullerton, Currie, Darrow, DiPrima, Domico, Donovan, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Henry, Huff, Jackson, Jaffe, Jones, Kane, Keane, Dick Kelley, Koehler, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz, Levin, Madigan, Laurino. Martire, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McCormick, McGrew, McPike, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Connell, Ozella, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Redmond, Rhem, Richmond, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Saltsman, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Schraeder, Slape, Margaret Smith. Stewart, Stuffle, Terzich, Turner, Van Duyne, Vinson, Vitek, White, Winchester, Sam Wolf, Younge, and Yourell."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Greiman 'aye'. Representative

Bullock 'aye'. What's the count? 93 'ayes'. Alright,

Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Bradley."

Speaker Daniels: "Bradley. Representative Bradley. The
Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Wolf: "Brummer."

Speaker Daniels: "Brummer. Brummer is here."

Wolf: "Capparelli."

Speaker Daniels: "Capparelli. Capparelli is here."

Wolf: "Terzich."

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

Wolf: "Cullerton."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry."

Wolf: "Cullerton."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Farley."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Hanahan."

Speaker Daniels: "Hanahan. The Gentleman in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Jackson."

Speaker Daniels: "Jesse Jackson. The Gentleman in the chambers?

He's here."

Wolf: "Laurino."

Speaker Daniels: "Laurino. Bill Laurino. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him. Return Representative Hanahan to the affirmative roll."

Wolf: "Bell."

Speaker Daniels: "Bell. Tim Bell. Representative Bell. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Speaker Daniels: "Alright, return Representative Laurino to the affirmative roll and remove Representative Bell."

Wolf: "McClain."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Garmisa requests leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, verified. Alright, Representative McClain. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Braun."

Speaker Daniels: "Braun. Carol Moseley Braun. She's here talking to Representative O'Brien about her new District."

Wolf: "Stewart."

Speaker Daniels: "Stewart. She's here."

Wolf: "Martire."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is..."

Speaker Daniels: "He's in the rear. Change Representative
Robbins from 'aye' to 'no'."

Wolf: "Leverenz."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "Matijevich."

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

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

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Wolf: "McGrew."

Speaker Daniels: "McGrew. He's here. Leverenz has returned, so return Leverenz to the affirmative roll."

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Wolf: "John Dunn-"

Speaker Daniels: "Matijevich has returned. Return Representative Matijevich to the affirmative roll."

Wolf: "John Dunn. John Dunn."

Speaker Daniels: "John Dunn. Representative John Dunn. He's over on the Republican side talking to Clyde."

Wolf: "Bowman."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman. Bowman. How's the Gentleman recorded? Oh, here he is. He's in the back. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Wolf: "Domico."

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

88 'aye', 71 'nos'. Motion fails. Your light's not on
even now, Mr. Zito. I'm sorry. Okay. Motion fails.

Further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion...no further Motions."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 766. Read the Motions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 766, Motion #1. 'I move that the following items of House Bil 766 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, page 16 lines 30 through 34.'

Representative Younge."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This line item appropriates \$250,000 to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to make loans to...for the development of industrial parks all over Illinois. Last year the House passed and sent to the Governor House Bill 821 which was signed into law. This Bill gave the Illinois Industrial Development Authority the power to finance industrial parks. This appropriation would make available a small amount to demonstrate that through the development of industrial parks in Illinois, we will be able to assist private industry to modernize and expand through the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

availability of districts set aside exclusively industrial use. This investment of \$250,000 will create some 700 jobs, new jobs considering 14 new jobs per acre at \$5000 an acre on 50 acres of land. These 700 new jobs will produce over a million dollars in additional tax revenues each year for the State of Illinois. This investment will save us from spending valuable tax revenues for public aid. Industry locates new plants where they can get help in putting up these new plants. Industry gets help in doing this through the development of industrial parks. your consideration and that you will assist me in overriding the Governor's veto in this regard. I have in my hand here an article, an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which urged the Governor to sign this Bill because would help to create more jobs in Illinois just as this technique has created more jobs in other states. New Hampshire which has produced some industrial parks, over 55,000 jobs have been made available to people who have become taxpaying citizens. These funds would be matched by federal funds from the federal government. If the State of Illinois makes this investment in land, the federal government has monies that will put the sewers, the lights, and all the infield structure to make these areas available for industry to What we're talking about is making iobs available close to where people live. Right now, a youth the inner city has only the Army or prison to look forward to, and I think that our obligation is to stop this dismal situation that is found with the ever increasing unemployment rate that is occurring by doing job creation through this technique. The facts are we are in trouble in Illinois because we have lost some 32,000 jobs over the last four years, some \$400,000,000 worth of payrolls.

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

is due to plant deterioration and plant closing. This Bill will begin a process of recreation of jobs in areas that are close to the inner city. We have much valuable land which is wasted because it is not properly assembled and it properly managed. I was sent an article by the Chicago Tribune just last week. It was called City on the Brink. Perhaps you saw that too. And one section of that article indicated that many businesses were leaving Chicago because of the unavailability of land. Land is available. The fact is it is not properly assembled and made available for industrial purposes. Our most valuable land is being wasted here in Illinois, and I ask you to consider these advantages and make this investment and job creation. The advantage to industry, of course, is an assembled site, and the advantage to the community is a diversified tax base. And for these reasons, I ask you to join with me to override this veto."

- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative J.J. Wolf, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would just like to point out that this money is probably not needed. The...IDA already has the authority so they can fund the development for purpose of making loans for the development of industrial parks out of their existing bonding authority, and I don't think it is necessary to appropriate an additional \$250,000 in general revenue funds, and I would respectfully request a "no" vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Lady,

 Representative Younge, from St. Clair to close."
- Younge: "I would like to close. I think it would be inappropriate for the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to use its bonding money for the purchase of land for industrial park...parks. It ought to use that money to

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

locate the industry there by helping а particular industrialist move in. But the land assembling ought to be in the way that I have recommended. We're dealing with a very serious thing here. We have people who are becoming very discouraged and very distraught, and I think that we ought to take the time to say that we believe in a poll of the principle of economic justice and provide some employment for people. And I ask you to consider these things. I have talked with many of you about this by telephone and personally, and I ask you to please join in this override of this very important legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall the item on page 16, lines 30 through 34 of House Bill 766 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?" All in favor signify by voting "aye", opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Younge."

Younge: "I think that we're in a very critical time in Illinois. We're suffering from greater unemployment than ever. states have used this technique to create a large number of jobs, and I ask you to consider this, to consider the... The Chicago Tribune is perhaps one of the most conservative papers here in Illinois, and for it to say that it that there ought to be this small demonstration project available for industrial park development is very...a very valuable guide. These funds would be made available in the forms of loans to local development corporations, and that these corporations which are drolly spun off by the municipality would assemble that and make it available. would like to suggest to you that the whole theory of the Reagan administration is putting people back to work, making jobs available in depressed areas. This is an opportunity to implement that theory here in Illinois.

- 80th Legislative Day October 15, 1981

 these reasons I ask you to please favorably consider this
 legislation."
- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record."
- Younge: "Would you poll the absentees please?"
- Speaker Daniels: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Breslin, Jack Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dwight Priedrich, Garmisa, Leinenweber, McBroom, Polk, Reed, Stanley, Stearney, C.M. Stiehl, no further."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Breslin 'aye'. There are 91 'ayes', 74 'no'. This Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Further Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #2. "'I move to restore the following reduced items of appropriations in House Bill 766, the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, page 7, lines 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14°, Representative Polk."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Polk. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Polk. Out of the record.

 Further Notions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #3. 'I move that the following items of
 House Bill 766 do pass, the veto of the Governor
 notwithstanding, page 16, lines 17 through 19',
 Representatives Stanley and Zito."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley. Stanley, the Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Zito, your desire, Sir?"
- This line item was removed to create...what we tried to do is create a Suburban Studies Task Group which would study the suburban problems. One of the biggest problems we have as suburban Legislators on both sides of the aisle is that we continually vote for programs that are good for the City

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

of Chicago and needed in the City of Chicago, and vote for things in downstate that are needed in downstate. We never get the help we need in the suburban areas. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on this issue."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is 'Shall the item on page 16 lines 17 through 19 of House Bill 766 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' 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. There are 72 'ayes', 69 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is declared lost. Hallock 'no'. Further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #4, "I move that the following items of
House Bill 766 do pass, the veto of the Governor
notwithstanding, page 16, lines 20 through 22',
Representative Ronan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am happy to see a trend developing on these line item vetoes. This is the famous Gang Crime Study Commission. This is an attempt by the Legislature to stand up once and for all. We made some courageous votes tonight for day care and for mental health care. All I'm going to let you know is that you'll be recorded either for or against gang crime. If you vote for the veto, you're against gang crime. If you don't vote for the veto, you're for gang crime and probably should be accused as a gang member. I move everyone to vote for this veto."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The question is 'Shall the item on page 16 lines 17...shall the item on page 16 lines 20 through 22 pass, House Bill 766, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

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? Take the record. There's 79 'aye', 75 'no'. This Motion having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion #5, 'I move that the following item in

House Bill 766 do pass, the veto of the Governor

notwithstanding, page 16, lines 17 through 22',

Representatives Roger Stanley and Alfred Ronan."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stanley. Representative Ronan.

Out of the record. Withdrawn. Further Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions."

Speaker Daniels: "Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 529, Yourell; 530, Margaret Smith; 532, Kornowicz; 533, Kornowicz; 534, Deuchler; 537, Lechowicz - et al; 538, Topinka; 539, Topinka; 540, Kornowicz; 541, Lechowicz - et al; 543, Topinka; House Joint Resolution 49, DiPrima; 50, Diprima; 51, DiPrima; 52, DiPrima; 53, Murphy - et al, and also House Resolution 545."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Joint Resolution 529, Yourell — et al, Tilden Tech Alumni
Association will be holding its 10th annual Hall of Fame
dinner on November 20th. House Resolution 530, Margaret
Smith, Doctor Lewis Rawls of the Willow Rawls, etc. which
is a senior citizen — handicapped housing development. We
commend them and Doctor Rawls, and the members of the
Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church upon the completion of
this outstanding facility for senior citizens...for
handicapped. House Resolution 532, Kornowicz, the members
of St. Bruno Parish in Chicago, Illinois celebrate their

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

25th anniversary and dedication of their church on October 11+h_ House Resolution 533, Kornowicz, the principal Sponsor of the Bingo Bill 10 years ago was John Fary, and on October 1st it has been 10 years, a 10 year anniversary which has been a very helpful...in solving some of problems in the State of Illinois. financial House Resolution 534, Deuchler, Sandra Da v O'Connor was administered the oath of office September 25, 1981 in Washington, D.C. and thoughts upon this historic day became the first woman justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Lechowicz - et al on House Resolution 537, whereas sports fans throughout the State of Illinois are ecstatic on Saturday, September 26, 1981 when the Stings brought the first sport championship to the City of Chicago since 1963. House Resolution 538, Topinka, whereas it has come to the attention of this House that George and Marie Ochsner will celebrate their Golden Wedding Anniversary on November 25, 1981. House Resolution 539, Topinka, what did she do here? Oh, Raymond Albert, principal and teacher of Redeemer Lutheran School in Cicero, Illinois will celebrate the 25th anniversary in teaching professionally a special service and a testimonial dinner to be held on October 24th. Resolution 540. Kornowicz, the Southwest Parish and Neighborhood Federation has continued over the years to function as a good friend and neighbor to the residents of the community it serves implementing the following through on numerous programs which have not merely retarded but instead have reversed trend any οf neighborhood deterioration or contrived economic change inimical to the public welfare of the southwest side. House Resolution 541, Lechowicz - et al, the Lerner Newspapers serving the north and northwest portion of Chicago took five awards in the 19...Illinois...in the 1981 Illinois Press Association

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Newspaper Statewide Contest. House Resolution 543, Topinka, the Village of Brookfield, Illinois will celebrate its 50th anniversary of the Sokol activity and service to the community of Brookfield in 1981. House Resolution 545, Topinka and Leverenz, the Village of Maywood is celebrating its 100th anniversary of its incorporation on October Speaker, I move for the adoption of the House Resolutions. Or do you want me to go on with the House Joints? Do you want me to go on with the House Joints? Resolution 49, Mr. Robert P. House Joint Nimmo αf California, having been appointed by President Ronald Reagan as the 11th administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration. Reagan, you Republican. Joint Resolution 50, DiPrima - et al, Margaret Rummel recently was elected national president of the AMVETS Auxiliary at its 36th annual convention held in August 1981 House Joint Resolution in Louisville, Kentucky. 51. DiPrima - et al, Jack Winston Flynt, Commander of the American Legion at the 63rd national convention held this year. House Joint Resolution 52, DiPrima - et al, the American Legion was formed in 1919 at the termination of World War I and has provided our community, and state, and nation with outstanding leadership during peacetime and periods of our country when we was involved in conflict. House Joint Resolution 523 (sic), Murphy and Hastert, National Junior AMVETS met in a convention in Louisville, Kentucky on August 7, 1981 and elected national president of the Junior AMVETS of 1981-82, Jacquelin Marie Perez of Aurora, Illinois. Which one are you questioning? Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move for the adoption of the Resolutions and will you withdraw House Resolution 540?"

Speaker Daniels: "House Resolution 540 was withdrawn from the

80th Legislative Day

- October 15. 1981
- Agreed Resolutions. Alright. On the Agreed Resolutions, Representative J.J. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Oh, I... I just been up on so many Bills today, Mr.

 Speaker, I almost got up and opposed these Agreed

 Resolutions."
- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman, Representative Conti, has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Deuchler. Representative Koehler for an announcement."
- Koehler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the meeting regarding the Regional Schools of Medicine will be held as scheduled tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. in room 122B.

 We hope you will be able to attend. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, could the Clerk please read the Adjournment Resolution?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Adjournment Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 54, resolved by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the House of Representative adjourns on Thursday, October 15th, 1981, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 28, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 16, 1981, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 28, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to offer and move the adoption of this Adjournment Resolution.

 We will then have a Death Resolution upon which we will adjourn until Wednesday, October 28 at the hour of 12 noon.

 Mr. Speaker, I now move for the adoption of the House Joint

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Resolution."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's...You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. May we please have some order. Will the Members please be in their Representative Schneider. Members please be in Mr. Clerk, please read the Death Resolution." their seats. Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 542, Lechowicz - et al. the Members of this Body have learned with great sadness of Redmond, wife of the recent passing of Mrs. Rita M. Representative William Redmond, Dean of this House; and whereas, Mrs. Redmond was born Rita M. Riorden in Chicago on April 25, 1914; and whereas, after graduating from Mundelein College in 1935, Mrs. Redmond pursued her career as a teacher in the Chicago public schools where benefits of both the classics and the brought the commercial subjects to the children of that city: and married Attorney William Redmond on March 6, 1943 and has been his constant helpmate and companion through the rigors of his illustrious career in public service; and whereas, Rita Redmond raised three exemplary children and was intensely devoted to her husband and family, exemplifying the very finest qualities of American womanhood: and whereas. her great sympathetic understanding, and her kind and unflagging generosity will be sorely missed by all who privilege of knowing her; and whereas, the Members of this House were privileged to know Mrs. Redmond personally came to admire and respect her during the six years she stood loyally and lovingly at the side of her husband during his demanding service as Speaker of this House; therefore be it RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

ILLINOIS, that we express our profound sadness and sense of loss at the passing of Mrs. Rita Redmond, and extend our heartfelt sympathy to her bereaved children Colleen, Mary, and William Patrick, and to the three grandchildren of whom she was so proud; and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the Dean of the House, William A. Redmond as an expression of our sorrow and condolence at this time of terrible loss. And as a further token of our respect, the House now stands adjourned."

Speaker Daniels: "On the Resolution, Representative Lechowicz." Lechovicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the...one of the great things of the General Assembly is the Membership and the families that you meet, the people at various walks of life throughout have an opportunity to meet and grow upon the exchange of ideas and the exchange of thoughts which improve the conditions of the people of this state. probably one of the most exemplary factors that you can find is a person who is a loyal, loving spouse, and we all probably hope and dream that this is our type of experience through our own lives. I, personally, could not make wake and the funeral of Mrs. Redmond, and I know that as I asked my wife to represent me she told me of the tremendous outpouring of people to pay their respect to a woman not only was a fine mother, a loyal supporter to her husband, but a person who had her own ideas, and yes, her tremendous amount of influence for the good of own Illinois. To Speaker Redmond, I don't believe that words will ever fill the loss that he and his family experienced, but to all of us who have met Mrs. Redmond and in knowing the type of Lady she was at all times, we will never forget her. And to you, Mr. Speaker, may I express our deepest

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

sympathy on a tremendous loss to all of us."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on behalf of the Democratic Members and on behalf of my own family, I wish to extend my most profound sympathy and condolences to Speaker Redmond upon the loss of Rita Redmond. Rita Redmond and Bill enjoyed a very close, outstanding relationship. It was one that lasted for many years. It was one of closeness and of great love. Rita Redmond was a very, very fine woman. Her lovely children stand as a testament to what a fine woman she was and to the outstanding relationship between her, Bill, and the family. Certainly Speaker Redmond has suffered a terrible, terrible loss, but all of us in the entire community have suffered as well."

Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Ryan."

Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Bill Redmond and I had a little chat just a few minutes ago, and he told me what a terrible time he had forcing himself to come into this chamber today, because I think he knew what he had to go through here at these moments that we now face. But, Bill, let me tell you, that the country and the nation would all be a lot better off if there were more people like Rita Redmond in today's society. There aren't any words that can be said that are going to ease your pain or your grief, but she was a great gal, and you knew it, and you had some great experiences Now, you've got to keep yourself busy, because with her. that is what she would want you to do. So I, on behalf of the Republicans, extend our sympathy to you and your family."

Speaker Daniels: "On the adoption of the Resolution, the House will stand adjourned until noon, October 28th, five minutes

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

for Perfunctory Session. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Death Resolution's adopted. The Clerk will have whatever perfunctory time is needed for today and tomorrow to receive whatever messages necessary from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "General Resolutions. House Resolution 540. Kornowicz: 544. 531. Ewell: Committee on Giglio: Assignment. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 1965, Capparelli - Kosinski, a Bill for an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1966, Kosinski - Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1967, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1968, Huff, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Pirst Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1969, Younge, a Bill for to create the Illinois Municipal Assistance Act Corporation, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1970, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1971, Davis - Kosinski, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1972, Tate - Donovan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 7.... 1973, Tate - Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1974, Catania - Leinenweber - Getty - Currie -Zwick, a Bill for an Act in relation to access to public records. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1975, Ronan, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Scholarship Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1976, Hallock - Johnson - Mautino - Koehler -McGrew - Ackerman - Klemm - Zwick - Mulcahey, a Bill for an

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the organization and maintenance of the University of Illinois, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1977, Donovan. Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1978, Donovan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board Education, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1979, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Truth and Taxation Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1980, Keane, a Bill for an Act in relation to limitation on the property tax equalization factor, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1981, Cullerton, a Bill for an Act in relation to crime victims indemnity insurance, Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1982, Pierce - Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1983, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. General Resolution. House Resolution 546, Catania - et al.

Clerk Leone: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 8r_ Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding in the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate Bills 12, 147, 181, 209, 355, 384, 497, 498, 524, 629, 819, 922, 1148, I am further directed to transmit to the House of 1198. Representatives the following copy to the Governor's veto message to the Senate, passed the Senate October 15th, 1981 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message by the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I aш directed to inform the House Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

specific recommendations for change which are attached to the Bills of the following titles, an acceptance of which am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate Bills 22, 27, 62, 172, 257, 270, 300, 376, 431, 443, 508, 513, 556, 606, 612, 618, 666, 818, 853, 884, 891, 902, 904, 992, 1007, 1038, 1042, 1168, and 1175. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the Senate, action taken by the Senate October 15th, 1981. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives Senate has passed a Bill of the following titles, the Governor's specific recommendations for change to notwithstanding, the passage of which I am contrary instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate Bills 446. 633. and 1085. I an further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the Senate, passed by the Senate October 15th, 1981 by a three-fifths vote. 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 restored the items reduced by the Governor which are attached and the Bills of the following titles in restoration of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 308. T to transmit to the House further directed αf Representatives the following copy of the Governor's item reduction message to the Senate, action taken by the Senate October 15th, 1981. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the

80th Legislative Day

October 15, 1981

Senate has passed the items as attached in a Bill, the following titles of the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills 308 and 311. And I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's item veto message to the Senate, passed the Senate October 15th, 1981 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary....Further business, the House now stands adjourned."

* -- *

OCTOBER 15, 1981

HB-0022	MOTIONS	PAGE	60
нв-0046	MOTIONS	PAGE	4
нв-0076	MOTIONS	PAGE	6
HB-0101	MOTIONS	PAGE	63
HB-0103	MOTIONS	PAGE	8
HB-0108	MOTIONS	PAGE	65
HB-0120	MOTIONS	PAGE	79
HB-0129	MOTIONS	PAGE	9
HB-0132	MOTIONS	PAGE	81
HB-0158	MOTIONS	PAGE	9
HB-0159	MOTIONS	PAGE	85
HB-0239	MOTIONS	PAGE	10
HB-0284	MOTIONS	PAGE	86
HB-0288	MOTIONS	PAGE	55
HB-0318	MOTIONS	PAGE	87
HB-0349	MOTIONS	PAGE	89
HB-0364	MOTIONS	PAGE	201
HB-0381	MOTIONS	PAGE	12
HB-0430	MOTIONS	PAGE	13
HB-0483	MOTIONS	PAGE	57
HB-0491	MOTIONS	PAGE	158
HB-0493	MOTIONS	PAGE	160
HB-0514	MOTIONS	PAGE	18
HB-0515	MOTIONS	PAGE	21
HB-0542	MOTIONS	PAGE	22
HB-0581	MOTIONS	PAGE	92
HB-0588	MOTIONS	PAGE	206
HB-0591		PAGE	242
	MOTIONS		
HB-0598	HOTIONS	PAGE	23
HB-0623	MOTIONS	PAGE	23
HB-0663	MOTIONS	PAGE	25
HB-0681	MOTIONS	PAGE	26
HB-0694	MOTIONS	PAGE	27
яв-0697	MOTIONS	PAGE	246
HB-0732	MOTIONS	PAGE	95
HB-0733	HOTIONS	PAGE	95
нв - 0760	MOTIONS	PAGE	97
HB-0766	MOTIONS	PAGE	255
HB-0781	MOTIONS	PAGE	58
HB-0787	MOTIONS	PAGE	28
HB-0811	MOTIONS	PAGE	51
HB-0846	MOTIONS	PAGE	28
HB-0847	MOTIONS	PAGE	98
HB-0858	MOTIONS	PAGE	29
HB-0979	MOTIONS	PAGE	35
HB-0986	MOTIONS	PAGE	59
HB-0996	MOTIONS	PAGE	102
•			
HB- 1007	MOTIONS	PAGE	109
HB-1049	MOTIONS	PAGE	36
HB-1051	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
HB-1127	MOTIONS		36
		PAGE	
BB-1136	MOTIONS	PAGE	42
HB-1139	MOTIONS	PAGE	114
HB-1157	MOTIONS	PAGE	118
HB-1184	MOTIONS	PAGE	43
HB-1288	MOTIONS	PAGE	44
HB-1294	MOTIONS	PAGE	45
HB-1364	MOTIONS	PAGE	45
			46
HB-1367	MOTIONS	PAGE	
HB-1415	MOTIONS	PAGE	59
HB-1417	MOTIONS	PAGE	121
HB-1439	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
		PAGE	128
HB-1487	MOTIONS		
HB-1489	MOTIONS	PAGE	137
HB- 1535	MOTIONS	PAGE	47

.

OCTOBER 15, 1981

HB-1536	MOT	LONS	PAGE	48
HB-1570	HOT	CONS	PAGE	151
HB-1812	HOT	CONS	PAGE	50
HB-1880	MOT:	CONS	PAGE	155
HB-1953	1ST	READING	PAGE	1
HB-1954	1ST	READING	PAGE	1
HB-1955	1st	READING	PAGE	1
HB-1956	1ST	READING	PAGE	1
HB-1957	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
нв- 1958	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
RB-1959	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
HB-1960	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
HB-1961	1ST	READING	PAGE	2 2 2 2
HB-1962	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
HB-1963	1st	READING	PAGE	
HB-1964	1ST	READING	PAGE	2
HB-1965	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1966	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1967	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB- 1968	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB- 1969	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1970	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1971	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1972	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1973	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1974	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1975	1ST	READING	PAGE	268
HB-1976	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
HB-1977	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
HB-1978	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
HB-1979	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
HB-1980	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
HB- 1981	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
BB-1982	1ST	READING	PAGE	269
яв- 1983	1ST	READING	PAGE	269

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER DANIELS	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND TZORTZIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	81
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	137
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	185
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	236
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	261
HJR 54 - ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION	PAGE	264
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	265
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	268
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	268
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	268
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	269
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	269
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	271
I Day ou of our of post of a pool of the post of the p		