141st Legislative Day

1

November 19, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Anthony Tzortzis from the St. Anthony's Hellenic Orthodox Church of Springfield, Illinios. Reverend Tzortzis."
- Reverend Tzortzis: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Oh Christ, the true light which illumines and sanctifies every man who comes into the world, let the light of Thy continents be shone upon all our State Representatives and all loyal officers of our government, of our country; that in it we may behold the light ineffable that guide our footsteps, our eyes to the keeping of Thy Commandments, through the decisions of Thy own pure mother and all the Saints. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. The Pledge will be led today by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Telcser,
 do you have any excused absences? Representative Telcser
 on the floor? Representative Telcser. Is Representative
 Telcser on the floor? Representative Collins, do you have
 any excused absences?"
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May the record show that Representative Macdonald is excused because of illness in the family?"
- Speaker Ryan: "And Representative Miller because of illness himself."
- Collins: "Representative Miller. I didn't know that."
- Speaker Ryan: "Yeah, well..."
- Collins: "May the record also show that Representative Miller is

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Anthony Tzortzis from the St. Anthony's Hellenic Orthodox Church of Springfield, Illinios. Reverend Tzortzis."
- Reverend Tzortzis: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Oh Christ, the true light which illumines and sanctifies every man who comes into the world, let the light of Thy continents be shone upon all our State Representatives and all loyal officers of our government, of our country; that in it we may behold the light ineffable that guide our footsteps, our eyes to the keeping of Thy Commandments, through the decisions of Thy own pure mother and all the Saints. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. The Pledge will be led today by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Telcser,
 do you have any excused absences? Representative Telcser
 on the floor? Representative Telcser. Is Representative
 Telcser on the floor? Representative Collins, do you have
 any excused absences?"
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May the record show that Representative Macdonald is excused because of illness in the family?"
- Speaker Ryan: "And Representative Miller because of illness himself."
- Collins: "Representative Miller. I didn't know that."
- Speaker Ryan: "Yeah, well..."
- Collins: "May the record also show that Representative Miller is

- 141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982
 absent because of illness."
- Speaker Ryan: "That's what I said. Is Representative Telcser on the floor? No, go ahead."
- Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was just informed that Representative Oblinger is also absent. Maybe she...may be...she be excused because of illness."
- Speaker Ryan: "The record will so indicate. Representative Getty, do you have anybody you'd like to excuse today?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I have had no requests for excused absenses.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Madigan is here today?"
- Getty: "Of course."
- Speaker Ryan: "Alright, the record will so indicate.

 Representative Ronan. Is he here today, Representative

 Getty? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 171 Members

 answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present.

 Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you seek

 recognition?"
- Friedrich: "I don't know unless we're going to be on Senate Bills
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Ryan: "Would you mumble that once more, Representative?"

 Priedrich: "Well, I have a Bill on...Senate Bill on Third Reading

 if you want to go to that Order."
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, you want to hold that for a minute please?

 Introduction, First Reading of House Bills."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2685, Watson Ebbesen Hallock, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "On page two of the Calendar under the Order of Total Veto Messages...Total Veto Motions appears House Bill 1120, Representative Preston. What's your pleasure, Representative?"
- Preston: "Sure, let's go. Mr...Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

and Gentlemen of the House. Based on representations during meetings with Director Peg 'Blazer', and Vic Worth and former Representative Ben Polk and...based on their assurances that they will try to work with me and with Representative Oblinger and with other Members of the House towards getting a home health care program that is an entitlement program and in existence. And based on their assurances that they are going to do everything in their power to obtain a Medicaid waiver, I am going to withdraw this override Motion."

- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Preston, did you withdraw your...your Bill? The record will so indicate that House Bill 1120 is withdrawn. House Bill 1241, Representative McClain. Representative McClain."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 1241. House Bill 1241 amends the Code of Corrections. What it did is it provided for pay raises for the Chairman and Members of the Governor's own Prison Review Board. The salaries would increase, and they have not increased for some time. This request was made of me by former Speaker Bill Redmond. We put the Amendment on in the House, and it was adopted in the House and adopted by the Senate, and the Governor vetoed, and I'd urge an override success Motion of this veto."
- Speaker Ryan: "...You completed your presentation,

 Representative? Is there any debate? Representative

 Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would suggest to you that this is a pay raise Bill, and if what we heard about the economy of this state is true which I believe to be true I see no point in overriding this veto on this particular Bill. It raises salaries of the Prison Review

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Board from 30 to 40 a year, and the Chairman from 35 to 45, as I understand the issue. And I would suggest to the Membership a 'no' vote would be the proper vote on this Bill."

- Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? Representative McClain to close."
- McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I stated in my opening remarks, this Amendment which was adopted by the House and the Senate provides for pay raises for the Governor's own Prison Review Board. It was presented to me by former Speaker Bill Redmond, and I would urge an "aye" vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1241 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?". All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 37 voting 'aye', 108 voting 'no', and the 8 voting 'present'. And the Motion to override the Governor's veto fails. House Bill 1302, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the General Assembly Act and the State Library Act, among others."
- Speaker Ryan: "Before you start, Representative Bowman, I want to put Representative Collins in the Chair."

Bowman: "Okay with me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Collins: "Proceed, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To refresh the memories of the Members, I would remind them that this Bill is one that is basically a housekeeping Bill for the General Assembly. We get dozens, perhaps even hundreds of reports from state agencies and Commissions coming across our desks in a given

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

year. Now I don't know about you, but I wind up throwing most of these out, and I'd like to reduce the amount of paper that comes to our desks. And I hope that you share my...my interests in doing this. So what this Bill does is it requires the...or it says that the various state agencies may discharge their obligations to report to the General Assembly by sending copies to the Leadership and to the State Library, and then the Legislative Council, which sends us a weekly newsletter anyway with information Commission and Committee hearings, will simply tell us which reports are available. And if we want them, we can call them up, and they will send them to us, so we don't get this paper if we don't want it. Now, the Bill passed the House with 138 votes, only 8 voting in the negative. The Governor, in his veto message, makes it quite clear that he didn't understand the Bill at all. It says that the Bill creates an unnecessary burden on agencies of State Government. Well, that is nonsense. The agencies of State Government have one agency to mail to, namely the Library, instead of 177 House Members and then 5...well, 177 Members of the General Assembly next year. So it is clear that the veto message of the Governor indicates that he does not understand the Bill. It is something that 138 of you have voted for already, and I ask that you do so again on the Motion to override. Thank you."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the override Motion. House Bill 1302 is...has been needed since I got to the General Assembly, and I am sure for many years before. We get more unneeded, unnecessary and costly paperwork floating around our desks, both our desks here on the House floor, and our desks in our district offices and

- our desks in the Stratton Building or elsewhere than can be imagined. It is unneeded. It is a waste of the taxpayers' dollar. This would be a cost savings program and would give you the opportunity to ask for those reports that you
 - dollar. This would be a cost savings program and would give you the opportunity to ask for those reports that you want to read, not to get reports that you're just going to pick up and throw in the garbage. So I urge you to vote
- Speaker Collins: "Is there further discussion? Being none, the...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pres...Bowman, to close."

"yes" on this override Motion."

- Bowman: "I know people confuse us all the time. We're from the same district. No, I'd just like to thank Representative Preston for his support of this, and I ask that the two of us be joined by 105 other Members of this House. Thank you."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1302 veto of the Governor notwithstanding? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 81 'aye', 76 'no', and the Motion to override fails. House Bill 1423. Read the Bill, Clerk. Wait a minute. Is Representative Henry on the On the Calendar, page two, floor? Out of the record. Senate Bills Third Reading. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill Third Reading, Senate Bill 1248."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1248, a Bill for an Act to revise various Acts and to resolve multiple Amendments or additions to correct technical errors. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill

- drafted by the Reference Bureau. It is a clean up, nothing substantive. It is a thing we do periodically to bring the statutes up to date and eliminate obsolete material. I submitted the Amendment to Representative Getty, and he assures me that he finds nothing substantive in it. There are a couple typographical errors which will have to be corrected in Enrolling and Engrossing, and I would appreciate your vote."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 160 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Conti: "For a purpose of an introduction. Up in the Speaker's gallery we have members of Representative Melson's Sunday school seminar from the Congressional Church of West...with Dr. John Rogers of Western Springs, their minister, and Henry and Mary 'Linenberry', Sue Williams and Sue Ryan. We would like to welcome them to Springfield. Up in the gallery."
- Speaker Collins: "Welcome to Springfield. On the Calendar on page 15 on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 2102. Representative Levin, do you wish to proceed? I couldn't hear you, Sir."
- Levin: "If McAuliffe isn't here I might as well go ahead with it."
- Speaker Collins: "Turn him on. I can't hear him."
- Levin: "Representative McAuliffe was going to present it. But if

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

he's not here, knowing the hour, I'll go ahead with it."

Speaker Collins: "I don't think Representative McAuliffe is on the floor. Proceed, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that we accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change to House Bill 2102. You may recall this Bill which deals with the Teflon coated bullets, the armor piercing bullets, and there were two Bills that we considered. One was a Senate Bill that made possession a crime, and then there was this Bill which came out of the House overwhelmingly which made the discharge of these bullets a crime. What the Governor did through his amendatory veto is to... is two things. He signed, first of all, the Senate Bill 1519. That is now law, and he made some changes in this Bill to conform to what it was in 1519. First of all, he changed the name of the offense: and secondly, he modified the definition of the bullet that would be covered under this Bill so that it was the same definition as in Senate Bill 1519. I would...in all the respects, it is the same Bill that we passed, and I would urge concurrence in the Governor's specific recommendation for change."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change to House Bill 2102?". All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 153 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2102 by adoption of the Amendment.

141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982
Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 112, Keane. House Resolution 1179, Ronan Madigan Pouncey et al. House Resolution 1180, Mulcahey."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution #112. The House of Representatives concurring herein that the reporting date for the Local Accounting Task Force is hereby extended from April 1, 1983 to October 1, 1983. There is a six month delay on it. This will not require additional appropriation. That's þγ House Resolution 1179, Ronan - Madigan - et al. Τt has been the pleasure of the Members of this House to work and associate with Deborah Smith, the lobbyist from Relation Office of the Illinois Governmental Throughout her tenure with the Illinois Association. Nurses' Association, Ms. Smith proved herself to be a highly articulate, effective spokesperson on behalf of the interest of Illinois nurses. This House also congratulates the American Nurses' Association on its wisdom exhibited in choosing its new director of the Federal Governmental Relation in Washington, D. C. We wish her luck. Resolution 1180, Mulcahey. The Reverend Thomas Hardwick, Pastor of the United Methodist Church of Durand, will celebrate 25th...25 years in the pastorate on November 21, 1982. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Collins: "The question is with the exclusion of Senate Joint Resolution 112 'Shall the Agreed Resolutions be adopted?'. All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no', and it is a tie vote. And the Resolutions are adopted. Alright, but...in error, Senate

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Joint Resolution 112 was taken off the agreed list. It was in error. And with leave of the House, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call for the adoption of the Resolution. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, Senate Joint Resolution 112 is adopted. Change of vote.

- Clerk Leone: "Representative Karpiel requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2102. Representative Fawell requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 1302. Representative George 'Ray' Hudson requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2102."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there objection? Hearing none, the Motion shall be adopted. On the Calendar on page two on the Order of Total Veto Motions appears House Bill 1423. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Henry."
- Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise to move to override the Governor's total veto of House Bill for these reasons: One, it allows remarriages of a surviving spouse of a Chicago teacher at the age without loss of pension benefits, and most under the system It would grant a one time increase of 3% to allow this. survivors of Chicago teachers who had been receiving benefits at least 12 months prior to January 1, 1982. Bill would make the early retirement option for the Chicago teachers, the same as for the downstate teachers the colleges. university teachers. This is a lump sum contribution of 7% of last year's salary from the teacher each year the teacher is less than 60 years old. The Board contribution is 20% of last year's salary for each year the less than 60 years old. In order to make it teacher is fair to the Chicago teachers, in order to make it fair for a surviving spouse to remarry without being penalized, I ask your support of the Motion to override the Governor's total veto of House Bill 1423."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Mr. Representative, in terms of this legislation, does this, in fact, mean that the school board will be responsible for picking up the increased cost for the retirement? Does that system currently now have sufficient dollars to do that, or will, in fact, they have to come to the General Assembly to ask for money to do that?"

Henry: "I think that the system can pay for itself, based on the fact that if you remove a teacher...if she pays into the system and that teacher retires, the teacher usually has paid...the salary is paid over 18 to \$25,000 a year. You would hire a teacher at \$13,000, so the board would be saving 10 to 15,000."

Ropp: "How many teachers in Chicago get \$13,000?"

Henry: "The new ones."

Ropp: "The new ones? Okay, thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Coles,
Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I rise in support of this Motion by Representative Henry. We've debated this particular Bill with regard to the major portion of the Bill concerning early retirement with regard to the downstate teachers' system that is in force now. Arguments were made on this floor that would be overly costly to the school systems, and it has not been. It, in fact, to save money, in the long will save even more due to the fact you're bringing in lower paid teachers. You're allowing those who want to pension off to do so, and they're having to pay for early retirement...for the reduction that's already in the law. They're paying their share. The school systems also ask to pay a small share, too. But in the long run, there's a great savings. It

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

costs the school systems. You're trading dollars for early retirement that's partially being paid for by teachers in the system for bringing in new teachers and creating has worked overly well in the downstate system. taken in 10 times as much money each year, as was expended. It's worked very well. It is a cost saving mechanism. in a period of time when we have economic difficulties. also adds to the economic climate by creating jobs for new teachers and allowing those who want to leave to do so. don't think arguments can be made to the contrary that it isn't cost saving, because it is. Those arguments have made. They've been in error. Representative Henry's Motion deserves an 'aye' vote."

"The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick." Speaker Collins: Prederick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to especially support this Motion. This similar Bill passed out of the House a few years ago allowing surviving spouses of teachers to remarry after the age of 55 and still collect their pension. This equitable, because when people have paid into a pension system for a working lifetime whether they marry again not, is irrelevant. This is a just Bill. It is equitable, and it is a provision that needs to apply in every single pension system in our country. I urge your *aye* vote."

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Representative Henry's Bill. This Bill does not cost anything to the Board of Education. Is it...it does not cost the State of Illinois any money, and the Pension Laws Commission does not opppose the Bill in its present form. I urge your support of this measure. Thank you."

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

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...first of all, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Collins: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative, according to our analysis, that...the Governor stated that there were two measures within the Bill. I don't think anybody has any argument about the remarriage of the surviving spouse without loss of benefits. But, there is a State Mandate Act situation here in two cases. And according to our digest...analysis, that the estimated cost of the two provisions — which would be the State of Illinois — we're talking about an increase of the accrued liability of a million two hundred thousand and the annual cost of one hundred and ninety thousand. Is that correct?"

Henry: "According to my staff analysis, that is not correct."

Ebbesen: "Well, all I can go by is the accuracy of ours, and I'm sure that they wouldn't have stated it, because the Governor brought it out, and I think that you may have an inaccurate analysis there. But, I would remind every Member of the House that what you are doing here if you support this override is you're talking about...about \$1,390,000, and that comes out of general revenue. And I think just on that basis alone...and not that some of this basic...the basis of the Bill, but there's just too much in it, and we're talking about an awful lot of money, and it ought to receive a negative vote."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This may alarm you, but a lot of you have already voted for a similar provision in 1108 which applies to the downstate teachers only. Now what this proposal intends to do is: number one, to bring that into balance with downstate

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

teachers. The second notion, I think, that's important is that the outstanding Representative from DeKalb who has been a watchdog for pensions for some time has watched this only to a point, and that is the point at which we seem to have a blind spot is that the assumption is the cost. reality is that since we've had in place the language from 1108 which I sponsored this year in a similar provision which was sponsored a year ago, the reality is to downstate school districts is the incentive to save money is created, and school boards do save money. It's not damaging to the retirement system. It is, in fact, a twofold benefit. Number one, for those teachers that are high on the salary schedule who wish to retire early have an incentive reason to do so; and the district has a reason, therefore, to hire perhaps newer teachers - possibly as good as that senior retiring teacher - at a substantially reduced salary. So, you're really doing the school district a favor in the sense of the financial angle. I'm not saying what it means to the district educationally, what I'm saying, financially it's a benefit to the district. save money on the salary schedule. They'd save money in the retirement system. And as a matter of fact, it is a sensible provision that I find very few school boards have any problems with in the experience of the downstate teacher. It is a good provision. I would encourage all of you to support Representative Henry's Motion."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor of this Motion would respond to two questions."

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

Hoffman: "What is the position of the Chicago Board of Education on this measure? His mike isn't on."

- 141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982
- Henry: "Representative, Representative, I have not discussed this with the Board of Education."
- Hoffman: "Have they had any...they have had no contact with you on the issue."
- Henry: "Last year they discussed this with me, but not this year."
- Hoffman: "What was their position last year?"
- Henry: "They did not...they did not understand it, because they had not had a chance to analyze the total impact of the Bill."
- Hoffman: "I think I like that answer. Would you repeat that please, Mr. Henry?"
- Henry: "At that particular time, they did not understand the impact of the Bill, because no one had analyzed it fully."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much for your direct and specific answer to my question. My next question, which I trust you will be equally oblique, what is the position of the Chicago Pension Board?"
- Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the Gentleman's question."
- Speaker Collins: "Could we have a little order please? Repeat your question, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is the position of the Chicago Teachers Retirement System trustees...Board of Trustees?"
- Henry: "I can't answer that, because no one contacted me from that Board."
- Hoffman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know if one should assume that lack of contact...contact with the Sponsor on this is a lack of interest, or support or non-support. Since we do not have that information, I would just share a couple of observations with you as you make your decision on this.

 One, yes, this does align the system of Chicago with

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

the ... with the downstate system. As many of you may or may not know, the Chicago teachers are covered under different pension board and pension system. This has been a program of long standing, the separation of the two. reason it was put in as optional originally, presently the Board has the option to provide for early retirement. would only share with you the original concern, and that was that because of the demography of the teaching staff in the City of Chicago, that if they had to allow the percentage required by this Bill to retire early if they so wished, that it would be a severe drain on the ... on the Board and on the pension system. I'm not sure that's the case, because it has not proved to be true downstate. must assume, because of the comments made by the Sponsor, that the Board of Education and the Board of Trustees silent on the issue for whatever the reason, and I, for one, will accept that silence as a scent and will support the passage of this legislation."

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

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

Speaker Collins: "Indicates he will."

Levin: "Just one point of clarification. It is my understanding that there was an Amendment in the Senate that provides that this has no effect on state revenues. The Mandates Act does not apply, so it is not going to cost the state any money whatsoever. Is that correct?"

Henry: "My best knowledge and understanding, Representative Levin, you're exactly right."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Henry, to close."

Henry: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

House, I'd just like to make two observations here. One is that we are trying to bring the Chicago teachers into with the rest of the states. I remember my first year here, we voted for the downstate teachers university teachers. And all we're trying to do is bring the Chicago teachers in line with the rest of the state. Another point is that the teachers are able to buy out; therefore, the cost to the Board, the cost to the state is nil. The...the spouse remarriaging is a family...American family tradition. What are we supposed to say to a lady that wants to remarry after she lost her husband? That she can't remarry? What she must do, shack? No, we don't want We want the American position to keep...continue. We want strong family ties in the State of Illinois, and I ask your support for the veto override of Governor... 1423." Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1423 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? . All in favor will indicate by say...by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Vote me 'no', Mr. Leinenweber. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this...take the record. 0.n this question there are 9...there are 95 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Motion, having failed to receive

Henry: "Poll the absentees."

Cook, Representative Henry."

Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees.

Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

a Constitutional...Representative...the Gentleman

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson, Beatty, Bianco, Brummer, Deuchler, Deuster."

Speaker Collins: "Brummer *aye"."

Clerk Leone: "Farley, Dwight Friedrich, Huskey, Katz, Margalus, Martire, Mautino, Boland Meyer, Miller."

from

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Speaker Collins: "Mautino 'aye'."

- Clerk Leone: "Oblinger, Stanley, Stearney, Tate, Winchester and Younge."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with my speaking light there, but I do wish to be recorded as 'aye'."
- Speaker Collins: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Rep...Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Vote me 'aye' please."

- Representative Barnes. Record the Lady as voting 'aye'.

 On this question there are now...what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Martire, rise? To vote 'aye'. Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Record Representative Findley as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 102 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Motion fails. Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "Re...Senate Joint Resolution 113, resolved by the Senate of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, November 19, 1982, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 1, 1982 at 12:00 noon. Adopted by the Senate November 19, 1982. Kenneth Wright."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the Resolution is adopted. Supplemental Calendar #1. In...On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 746. The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick. Are there any Motions relative to House Bill

- 141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982
- Clerk Leone: "Motion filed pursuant to Rule 63 A. *I move to take House Bill 746 from the table and suspend Rule 68 E.*"

 Speaker Collins: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick, on the Motion."
- Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, pursuant to Rule 63 A, I move to take House Bill #746 from the table and suspend Rule 68 E in order to achieve a concurrence."
- Speaker Collins: "There's been a request that you explain the substance of the Bill, Representative Frederick."
- Frederick: "Yes. The Bill deals with the Community College Act, and a correction that was made in the Senate and a date that needs to be corrected in order to provide a formula for corporate personal property tax replacement grant."
- Speaker Collins: "You've heard the Lady's Motion and her explanation of the Bill. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."
- Reane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I rise in support of the Lady's Motion. The Amendment in the Bill, or the change in the Bill is strictly a technical one and is needed by the junior colleges' systems to be sure that their formula is correct, and I...I'd support her Motion."
- Speaker Collins: "Does the Lady have leave for the use of the Attendance Roll Call on her Motion? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."
- Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, as a...may I have leave of the House to pursue immediate consideration of the concurrence Motion?"

 Speaker Collins: "Is there objection? Leave is granted."

 Frederick: "Okay."
- Speaker Collins: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick, on House Bill 746. This is on the Order of Concurrence on Supplemental Calendar #1."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Frederick: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 746, which deals with the Community College Act, originally passed out of House with a large vote...large Majority. Senate, an error was discovered in the Bill and is...it was corrected there. The correction provides a change in the date 1981 on page two line 74 of the Bill. This is needed for computing the corporate personal property tax replacement grants, which are based on equalized assessed valuation and on the numbers of full-time students or full-time equivalency students. I move concurrence of Amendment #1 on House Bill 746."

Speaker Collins: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Collins: "She indicates she will."

Brummer: "What did the original 746 do when it passed the House here?"

Frederick: "Well, the original Bill was actually a clean-up Bill on language in the Community College Act."

Brummer: "What did it do with the equalization factor in the community college distribution formula? Anything?"

Frederick: "It really...at that time, it really did nothing, Sir."

Brummer: "Okay, and specifically, what did Amendment #1 do?

Senate Amendment #1, is that was we're in concurrence?"

Frederick: "Yes. Yes."

Brummer: "What does...what did that do?"

Frederick: "It simply changed the date from 1980 to 1981, which is correct in computing those grants."

Brummer: "Is it the same equalization formula that was used in prior years?"

Frederick: "Yes, I believe that is correct. This...this change in date is required in order to have a formula, as I

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

understand it, by the community colleges."

Brunmer: "Is this supported by the Community College Board?"

Frederick: "Yes, it is."

Brummer: "Why wasn't it passed last spring?"

Frederick: "Because they did not detect the mistake in the Bill.

And in the Senate in examining the Bill, they found this error, Sir, and they corrected it there."

Brummer: "Okay, thank you."

Prederick: "And it does nothing to change the formula at all.

Okay, thank you."

Speaker Collins: "Representative Brummer, you've concluded. Is there further discussion? Being none, the Lady from Lake to close."

Frederick: "I simply encourage you to vote 'aye' on concurrence."

Speaker Collins: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 746?'. This is final action. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 163 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and the House having concurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 746...this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, arise?"

Keane: "If we're still on the Order of Motion, I would... I have a Bill on...filed on Motions, House Bill 1254."

Speaker Collins: "We're not still on that Order, but we'll get back to you. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, arise?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I know, boy, this has really been a tumble down affair for me as far as them veteran plaques are concerned. But those of you that haven't picked up

141st Legislative Day

- November 19, 1982
- your Legion plaques, come on down says he won't be here next year. I won't need him. He won't be here next year. I won't need him. No, now the VF...those of you that were awarded VFW plaques, what happened, they said it is going to cost them about \$2,000, and they're having a banquet for the Members of the House and Senate. You know, their dinner they have down here, and I want to invite all those Members that didn't receive a plaque of any kind. Now you..."
- Speaker Collins: "Now wait a minute. General DiPrima deserves a little respect. Let's have some order here. I couldn't hear him up here."
- DiPrima: "Murphy. Murphy won't be here next year. I got no use for him."
- Speaker Collins: "There's no plaque for Murphy?"
- DiPrima: "Short round. No, I really...I feel sorry, you know, I couldn't cover everybody. I tried my best, but like I say...Conti, I got him a VFW citation. I put him on every veteran Bill. But all I can do is invite him to the dinner next..."
- Speaker Collins: "Representative DiPrima, I think Conti*d trade that plaque for about 4,000 votes."
- DiPrima: "Alright, listen. I'm going down to Sam Vadalabene's office downstairs. Those of you that didn't pick up your Legion plaques or the Disabled American Veteran plaques, I'll be down there. And Murphy, he can go with a 'shovel it'. Shuffle along with Murph. Little short round. You know my heart's with you, Murph."
- Speaker Collins: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Murphy.

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

 "Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
 Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

specific recommendations for change which are attached to Bills of the following titles, the acceptance of which I am instructed to concurrence ask of the House Representatives to wit: Senate Bills 730, 1180, 1606, 1028, 1267, 1299, 1305, 1532, 1539, 1599, 1614, action Kenneth Wright, Secretary. taken by the Senate. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed inform the to House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles...the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the contrary notwithstanding, and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 1581. I am further directed to transmit to the House the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the Senate. passed the Senate November 18. three-fifths vote. Kenneth Kenneth... By Wright, Message from the Senate by Mr. Secretary. Wright, 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed item attached Bills of the following title and the item veto of the Governor, contrary notwithstanding, and a passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 1400. 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 November 18, 1982 by three-fifths vote. * Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Collins: "Speaker Ryan in the Chair."

Speaker Ryan: "On page two, Total Veto Motions appears House Bill 2303, Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2303, I am sure everyone is familiar

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

with. It is one that we passed with a substantial Majority here in the House, and also the Senate did likewise. it does, it creates an open formulary for the use of drugs for...on people who are on Medicaid. The present practice of the Illinois Department of Public Aid is to limit the drugs which are given to people on Medicaid. And what the argument is is that the...against this Bill is that these are more expensive drugs that the people can get. And what they're trying to do is to have just the cheaper drugs. But in my mind, this is penny wise and pound foolish, because as those of you who were at the Committee hearings, information which we produced showed that we...the certainly in the long run by having the drugs which approved by the Federal Food and allowed and Drug Administration, the people getting these drugs doctors'...existence and on doctors' recommendations, it keeps people out of the hospitals, and that is where the big expensive costs are on Medicaid. So that is why I say by having the open formula, we're going to save money for the state in the long run, and people are going to be given better service. One of my Cosponsors on this Bill here, Representative Oblinger, also had a Motion. Because as you know, she's very enthused about ... with the senior citizens, and she had information that was going to be presented to you today as far as senior citizens were concerned. But Representative Topinka will give those arguments for I also have information from Representative Oblinger. doctors, because it was pointed out that you can get prior approval if you need a certain drug that is not on the approved list. Well, I have a letter from a doctor in the City of Chicago whose office is on Wilson Avenue, and he says in that letter that he requested 15 different times to get prior approval and the only and one instance did he get

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

the information, and then it was too late to do of any service. So when I say I think my Motion to override the Governor's veto should be approved, because while it is going to save money for the state in the long run and will be service to the people who really need it. And I therefore move that we override the Governor's veto of House Bill 2303."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Braun." Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this override Motion. Bill 2303 passed overwhelmingly in both the House and the Senate, because our colleagues recognized that...the short...that it was shortsighted and counterproductive to give to the bureaucrats and Department of Public Aid the life and death authority over which medication a person could or could not receive. I believe the veto ill-considered. And I ask the question, I raise the question, in whose interest does this veto operate? Certainly not in the interest of consumers, of people who are ill; because, in fact, what it does is discriminate against poor people, and senior citizens, and people who participate in the Medicaid program by denying them would...might otherwise be available to Certainly not in the interest of the producers. no question but that companies who produce drugs have an interest in their...in not being left to the whim of the Department of Public Aid with regard to which drugs will and will not be reimbursable. I submit to you also that it is not in the interest of taxpayers. The Department has failed, in my opinion, to come up with any evidence of real cost savings. At first we were told that it would save \$6,000,000, then \$9,000,000. I've recently heard that it is supposed to save \$20,000,000. They haven't come up with

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

evidence to that effect, and in fact, I suggest to you that it will cost more money, because people will have to be put into the hospital to receive care that they might otherwise be able to get while ambulatory. It is also not in the interest of those of us who care about medical treatment. There is little opportunity here and Representative Sandquist correctly stated it - little opportunity to correct a bad decision once made. I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the cookbook approach to medical...medication treatment can only lead to two classes of medical treatment: that for us and that for the and the senior citizens. It is for that reason that I rise support of this veto override Motion. It is for that reason that senior citizens groups throughout this state, the American Association of Retired Persons, Metro-Seniors and the like, have come out in support of overriding this I ask us to stand by the decision that veto. overwhelmingly made in this Legislature when 2303 was first presented, and send a message back that while the Medicaid system is in need of reform, it is in need of reform, this is an ill-conceived, and inconsidered and counterproductive way to do it. I urge your support of this Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join Representative Sandquist and Braun in asking for support for this override Motion. Not to...to fail to adopt...to override the Governor's veto would indeed be penny wise and pound foolish. As was pointed out, restricting a medicine that can be prescribed for a patient will, more times than not, result in a higher cost to the state when that patient has to go in for hospitalization,

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

or not getting needed medicine to prevent deterioration of health will mean that more costly medicines will required later on. In other states, in the states of California, Louisiana and Oregon, studies in those states have shown that having a restrictive formulary restricting the drugs that can be prescribed for the poor and the needy, in fact, doesn't save money, but costs more money. The prior approval provision that the Governor suggest absolutely ineffective. For those of you who have any experience working with prior approvals through Department of Public Aid, the Department tries very hard to be of service, but they are burdened with far too many people to be of service to and burdened at the same time with too little money. And because of that, the delay in getting a prior approval is extraordinary, far in excess of what is needed when medication is involved. By the time the approval comes through, if at all, the need for the medication may be way too late. The health of the patient has deteriorated, or the patient, perhaps, is expired. I have had experience with those prior approvals. take months and months. And if a form isn't exactly filled with every T crossed and every I dotted, they'll send it back, and then it takes further months to get their approval, if at all. House Bill 2303 has the support of members of the state health care community such as the Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois Nurses' Association, the Chicago Pharmacists Association, the Illinois Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons. I urge you to vote in favor of this override Motion so that the poor, the elderly, the needy in our society can get unrestricted health care to the extent their treating physician deems it necessary. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The...Gentleman

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

from Bond, Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise in opposition the Motion, and I want to give several reasons. which was just mentioned. The previous speaker mentioned the Chicago Pharmacists* Association. I'd like to clear one thing up. The Illinois Pharmacists' Association opposed to the Motion. It seems as though the pharmacy industry is divided on this issue, but the Pharmacists' Association of Illinois is opposed. And each of you should have got a memorandum from the Illinois Pharmacists explaining their position on this issue. Primarily, in the rationale that all of us should be opposed to, is because the economic position we find ourselves in here in Illinois today. The Illinois Department of Public Aid estimates this is going to cost about \$20,000,000 to implement this particular measure. As you know, we do not the money currently, and to implement...ask 20 more million dollars out of...the people of Illinois could be possibly asking for a tax increase, which we all would not favor. The mechanisms are available now currently to get approval for medication that's not currently allowed by the Department, and those mechanisms have worked, contrary to some of the previous speakers. I think for the taxpayers of Illinois and for the future of the taxpayers and hopefully not a tax increase, the proper vote is vote on this particular override Motion. Thank you."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am sorry to find myself on the opposite side of this issue from so many colleagues whom I respect and with whom I ordinarily agree. I don't think the override of House Bill 2303 is a vote for the people of this state, whether it is

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

for the poor people or for the tax paying people. I think it is a straight forward vote for a special interest group, the pharmaceutical companies themselves, the people who make the high-priced, expensive drugs that are one of the reasons that we have Medicaid abuse and that we find that our public aid budget goes more into the hands of providers than to the poor people themselves. of services The attempt to save money in the Medicaid program by limiting the drug formulary to drugs that are clearly effective, and some cases less expensive, is one of containment efforts in the Public Aid Department that I think all of us should be supporting. We're hearing a bit about freedom of choice this morning. Freedom of choice for whom? For the patient who doesn't make the choice whether the drug the doctor prescribes is Valium or whether is some other kind of prescription item; freedom of choice for the people who were cut out of the Medicaid program altogether last spring, and this Legislature did not stand up and say no to the Department, say no to the Governor; freedom of choice for the individual, the general assistance recipient who can't walk into the doctor's office today, can't get a drug of any kind prescribed can't have the Department of Public Aid pay for it: freedom of choice for the housewife, the welfare mother, hasn't the choice to choose between baked beans again or some other more nourishing item for her children. aren't rising up in anger because there isn't a cost of living increase for public aid recipients in this budget or in last year's budget. The \$21,000,000 annualized dollars stake in House Bill 2303 could be used better to make sure that some of those people who were cut out of Medicaid have a chance to get a prescription drug rather than ensuring that two million of those dollars will continue to

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

be spent on Valium, the most abused, the most overused drug in this country, or Darvon that has absolutely no medical efficacy. I think we would do better today to take the risk that might be implicit in House Bill 2303 if we don't override it. I think we would do better today to say no to the override Motion, to say yes for a change to the Department of Public Aid and its cost containment efforts: to be able to go back to the people at home, the poor folks, to tell them we're prepared to fight for what they really need in terms of the Public Aid budget; to the taxpaying folks, to say to them, yes we do care about Medicaid abuse, because that is what this Bill is all about. I think that the proper vote on this Bill, on this override Motion, is an absolute and a resounding no."

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

Representative DiPrima, would you take your seat please and remain quiet for a while? Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in support of the Motion to override the House. Governor's veto, and I must, unfortunately, disagree with the previous speaker. I think that the prior approval is a very cost inefficient approach. And what is being suggested in this legislation is very cost effective. I think the best documentation of this is a letter that Representative Oblinger received from a constituent of and I just...it is a very short letter. I'd like to read it. 'Dear Representative Oblinger, I am a citizen who has suffered from severe diabetes all my life. Because of my diabetes, I get open sores on my feet. I am alone and cannot afford to buy medication for my feet. up until the summer of this year, the state paid for a drug called 'creflex'. This medication helped my sores heal. pharmacist says I can no longer Now m y have this

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

medication, and my sores have begun to get worse again. Because I can't get 'creflex' any more, my doctor had to put me into the hospital last week to treat my feet with 'keyflex'. I don't want to be in the hospital. need to be in the hospital. It seems to me that it makes no sense to put people like me in an expensive hospital when I can take 'creflex' at home.' Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the result of the prior approval program. Vе not saving money. We're not saving a few dollars because certain drugs aren't available. We're spending more money, because the people who can't get their medications that they need to stay alive and need to avoid pain, are going into the hospital and into other kind of care that costing the state more money than the few bucks that are saved by cutting down on the number of drugs that available. Yes there is abuse. I think we need to deal with that abuse, but not by a prior approval method like the one we have right now. For these reasons, I urge the overriding of the Governor's veto of House Bill 2303."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Sandquist, I realize that it's sort of a highly emotionally charged issue to be discussing whether or not we're depriving people of an appropriate medication. I talked to one of the staff people in the Department this morning who indicated that, in fact, there have been very few requests for having prescriptions filled outside of the formulary. Why do you feel that it is necessary for such very few requests to go through the process now that we abolish the process that is in effect and put in the open formulary?" Sandquist: "Because I believe that the process is difficult to

obtain, and they be...they've been rejected in order...the

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Department, I suppose, claims to save money. But all of the evidence that we had at the hearings from other states where this was changed, such as California, such as Louisiana, we save money in the long run."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I think unless we have specific instances to show that that is true, we really ought to give the Department a little more time in which to determine whether our system here in Illinois might work more efficiently than California or some other state has done in the past. I am also concerned about the other portion of the Bill, which is not nearly as emotionally charged and not nearly as easy a grabber for people like retirees to deal with, but isn't it true that this Bill would also indicate that there has to be a revision every 30 days of the reimbursement rate for these drugs?"

Sandquist: "That is correct. That is in the Bill."

Satterthwaite: "And there is no other division within the Public Aid Department that gets a similar kind of revision. In aid to family with...families with dependent children, for instance, it has to be a long and hard fight on the House and Senate floors before even very minimal kinds of adjustments to those payments can be made. In regard to hospitals, we know that just a few months ago we were having a very heated battle in regard to rolling over payments into the following fiscal year for reimbursement of services to hospitals for the medically indigent. should we have one segment of the Department of Public Aid's reimbursement mechanism in such an advantageous position of having an updating every 30 days?"

Sandquist: "Well, I wouldn't call that an ad...more advantageous.

What the purpose of that provision was that so that we would have an accurate price of the drugs, and it would be kept up to date."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I I feel that if this piece of may speak to the Bill. legislation becomes law, we will, in fact, have given an advantage to one segment of the public aid recipients when have not given similar kinds of advantages in the other Those other areas also are in drastic need of revision for the levels of payment, and yet, by this legislation, we will be obligating more money for pharmaceutical repayments than for other line items. It will be a mechanism that does not have to come back before the Legislature for approval, but will, in fact, be an automatic increase in the cost of these particular supplies and will, in fact, disadvantage public aid recipients who need to have similar kinds of revisions for other programs as well. I regret that there seems to be such an emotional appeal to the issue that makes it look as though denying people in mass the kinds of prescription drugs that they need to have for appropriate treatment. But I suggest to you that if your constituents are having problems, they should, in fact, be in touch with their Legislative They should, in fact, have the doctors contact Members. the Legislative Members. No doctor in my community has told me that they need to have this Bill. No pharmacist in my community has told me that they need to have this Bill. No constituent has come to me and told me they need to have this Bill, and so I would urge a rejection of this Motion."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In its effort to supposedly save money, the Department of Public Aid is actually trying to make poor people sick. I don't think they are doing that intentionally. I think they are doing that because they

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

are careless, shortsighted, and frankly, the policy is I think the policy also should be questioned from stupid. the standpoint of the morality of it. There is nothing humane about restricted formulary. There is nothing humane about telling an older person who has arthritis and is going to have arthritis for the rest of his or her life, 'Well, that's okay. You can just get crippled up. That's okay. We don't care. We know that we've been giving you this drug to keep you going and to keep you productive and make it possible for you to live a normal life, but we're going to do that any more. It is not very humane to tell that person that they have to go into the hospital order to get the same drug that they ve been using for a long time and that they need for the rest of their lives in order to keep them well. If we look at the fiscal side of issue, I agree with what the previous speakers have said who have commented that this really is penny wise and In attempting to control, or reduce or pound foolish. slice off one line item of the Medicaid budget, the Department is actually going to be putting tremendous pressure on two other line items, doctors* and hospital admissions. Because already. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Medicaid recipients who have been dependent on certain drugs which have now been cut off from them are going back to their doctors two, and three and four times to try to get those drugs and to try to get better, because they are finding themselves getting sicker. They are finding themselves getting into a more disabled condition. Already those people - and we are talking about people, not providers - already those people are having to check into hospitals in order to just get a simple drug that they've been using for years and years and that they need to stay well. We're talking about diabetics. We're talking about

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

arthritics. We're talking about people with chronic illnesses, Ladies and Gentlemen, that aren't going to get better if they don't get medication to control what's happening, so they are going into hospitals. So we save \$7.50 every two months on the person, and instead we spend \$350 a day of our money on hospital stays, because they become acute instead of just chronic. That really makes sense, doesn't it? You know, it's too bad, but apparently Illinois has to always learn from our own mistakes instead of from other states. The mistake has been made in state The mistake has been made of putting in a after state. restrictive formulary for a shortsighted policy supposedly saving money, and over, and over and over again we have seen in these other states the experience that really costs a lot more money. If I did not think that this Bill would end up actually saving us money, I would be standing up and speaking for it. Now, it is interesting. One of the speakers said, 'Gee, last spring they told us it would cost 6,000,000, and then they said 13, and then they said 20. One of the speakers here today said 20 or 21, so it is already up to 21,000,000, and someone from the Governor's Office a couple of minutes ago told me this is going to cost 20 to 25,000,000, and I told him by the time it gets through the Senate, and I mean through the Senate, it will be up to 100,000,000. they sure are precise, aren't they? Is this truth, or is this bandwagoning? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, don't stand before you and beg for measures that are going to cost the taxpayers of this state \$20,000,000 or even 6, but I do stand before you and ask you to pass this Motion. to pass this Bill over the unfortunately well intentioned, but shortsighted policy of the Department of Public Aid of this State. Do this for common sense. Do this for

141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982 people who need this, and do this for the taxpayers. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative White."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in White: support of this meaningful piece of legislation. If our doctors are to be placed in a position to provide good medical care for our people, it is important for us to allow them to use the drugs that will possibly reduce suffering, prevent surgery, and yes, save lives. I ask for your support on this meaningful piece of legislation."

Speaker Ryan: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes." Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Chairman of the Health and Family Services Committee in which this Bill was heard, and as you all know that serve Committees, you always hear both sides of the issue. Well, I was really shocked that this Bill was vetoed. So what I did when I went home from the last Session, rather than read all of this rhetoric that everybody sent us both sides of the issue, I went on a tour in a district. went and I called on pharmacists. I went and I called on some of the Medicaid people that were ill. I thought I really want to know what this true story is. I'll tell you, I never realized some of the empathy that pharmacists have for their patients and what a personal relationship they build up. Some of the patients that have not able to get the right drug, they've been giving them these little samples trying to tide them over till this would come and be addressed in the right manner that it should be addressed by the General Assembly today. I went and I called on some of the patients, and they are sitting there, and they are not able to get the proper medicine, which is really, really disastrous. One of our own.

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Senator Graham, who has since died on the other side of the House, testified one time in Committee. He was very, very most of you will remember, and he said how important it was to his health to have the right medication, because there had been times when they had prescribed incorrectly, and it was really, really disastrous to his health. I would ask you all to really take a hard line look at this Bill. When you're dealing with people's health, you're not saving money if you're giving them the wrong type of drugs. Do we want all these people to end up in the hospital where people don't want to go today, where the costs are do high? Absolutely not. Please dо the responsible thing and vote Representative Sandquist on this very, very important issue to the people in the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "It seems...it seems to me the issue boils down to, are we going to have a doctor prescribe for the patient, or are we going to have the clerk or a bureaucrat in the Department of Public Aid prescribe for the patient? The other issue involved is, do we want to spend 50, or 35 or 75 for medicine for an indigent person, or do we want to pay \$500 a day in a hospital for the per...for the individual? That's why these two...because of these two issues, I am going to vote for the override."
- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion,
 Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I guess this is one of those Bills that you can say if you're not confused, your haven't been listening. I've heard arguments on both sides, but I understand actually. I have talked to, I think, the one group that is really for this, the drug

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

manufacturers, who are...who admitted to me that this would undoubtedly increase the amount of drugs sold for public ... One of the exceptions, he told me, that public aid aid. had to go to was for penicillin and some antibiotics. I have just talked to one of the pharmacists on this floor. he said there are other drugs which can be substituted for penicillin and some of those things which are on list but can't be bought that will not affect those who are allergic to penicillin. So, I think there's a lot of smoke being blown around here about this. And certainly, if you have a doctor that knows you need a drug, he has a way of getting it for you. So, I don't think we ought to be misled by some of these pleas that have been made about this being a big deal and people going to the hospital because they can't get drugs and so on. I really have had medical profession tell me that they need nobody in the this kind of help."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we've heard a lot of discussion here today. I think you understand what's really involved. I thank my colleagues who have come and supported this legislation, and it's really very simple. There may be other things in the Department of Public Aid should be corrected, Representative Satterthwaite says, and I don't deny that. I think we should move ahead to do that, but that mean we shouldn't move ahead on this which is a positive...going in a positive direction. ¥e. had the witnesses at the hearing. We saw what happened in those states where they did change it, and they did save money. We know what happened in the State of Missouri when they went to a closed formulary. Sure they saved a small amount

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

of money in their drug charges, but what...of you look at their hospital charges in their public aid, they went up tremendously, and that's what we're talking about here. So, we're going to maybe pay a little more in the short run, but in the long run, the state is going to save money. The people are going to have the kinds of drugs that they need, and I therefore ask you to vote 'yes' to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 2303."

Speaker Ryan: "What's the Bill number? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2303 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the exposition on this has been substantial, and I think that when you look at Missouri, at California and the problems those states face, you have to come to the conclusion that defeating this Bill costs money. If we pass this Bill, if we override the veto in this particular case, there is a reasonable case to be made for the fact that we're actually saving money keeping people ambulatory and, in fact, reducing hospital stays. And for those reasons, I would urge the people vote green and override the veto in this matter."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Topinka to explain her vote."

Topinka: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one who doesn't really like overriding gubernatorial vetoes, because I do believe in holding the budget, if we don't look at this in its...on its basis, which is humanity and just being a humane, good, solid piece of legislation, let's look at it as an investment to cost savings. If indeed we were told that we've got to hold the line, that we're going to be dragging reimbursements to hospitals,

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

this is hardly the time to start showing people back in the hospitals and jacking up the cost to them and raising the cost of health care in general. As one who comes from a district that has a high percentage of senior citizens, they all tied in on this. The last woman who talked to me before I came down here very specifically mentioned this and said, 'They're even cutting me off of stuff I need just for basic diabetes, and I need it to live on. I mean, this is just between me and having it over.' It is a very serious Bill. It shouldn't have been overridden in the first place, and I would encourage anybody who is on the red side to move over to green. This one really counts."

Speaker Ryan: "This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "I request a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees.

Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Barr, Beatty, Capparelli."

Speaker Ryan: "Capparelli 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Cullerton, DiPrima."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative DiPrima. Record DiPrima as "aye"."

Clerk Leone: "Doyle, Farley, Findley, Giglio, Huskey, Katz, Keane, Leon."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Leon. How's the Gentleman recorded? Representative Leon."

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's not recorded as voting."

Speaker Ryan: "Record him as 'present'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing, Poll of the Absentees. Macdonald, Roland Meyer, Miller, Oblinger, Rea, Reed, Terzich."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Barr wishes to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "And Wikoff."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any...any other changes? Representative Doyle. Record Representative Doyle as *aye*.

Representative Neff."

Neff: "Record me as 'aye', please."

- Speaker Daniels: "Record Representative Neff as 'aye'. There any other changes? On this question there are 101 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Messages from the Senate."
- *Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolutions, to wit: House Joint Resolution 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123; concurred in by the Senate November 19, 1982.* Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2686, Henry, a Bill for an Act to exempt from taxation the sale of gas or electricity or transmission of messages to any church and religious denomination. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2687, Henry, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Step forward to Sandquist's mike, would you please, so everybody can hear that you're trying to cut a deal with me?"
- DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have...when I men...call these names off, they're receiving the Disabled American Veterans citation. I'd like to take a group picture with the Legislative Chairman for the Disabled American Veterans."
- Speaker Ryan: "Does the Clerk have the list? The Clerk will read the list."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

DiPrima: "I got it right here."

Speaker Ryan: "You're not the Clerk."

DiPrima: "Oh, well then, here."

- Speaker Ryan: "Read the list, Mr. Clerk. When your name is called, please come and report in and salute Rep...Colonel DiPrima, would you please?"
- Clerk Leone: "Representative John Birkinbine. Representative
 Richard Brummer. Representative Barbara Currie.
 Representative Joseph Ebbesen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute. Could we have a column of twos in the center aisle, please?"
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Thomas Ewing. Representative Dolly Representative Hallstrom. Herbert Representative Emil Jones. Representative Doris Representative James Keane. Representative Dick Kelly. Representative Steve Miller. Representative Diana Nelson. Representative Harlan Rigney. Representative Clyde Robbins. Representative Fred Tuerk. Representative Jill Zwick. Representative Michael McClain. Representative Ray Representative Irv Smith. Representative LeRoy Van Duyne. Representative C. L. McCormick. No further."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Braun, could you give us your version of "God Bless America" while we present these plaques, please? Representative DiPrima, do you have that organized like the military down there? All right. Could we have a little order in the chamber, please? Representative DiPrima, have you completed your work there? Colonel DiPrima would like to have a picture if we could get everybody back here to...for the picture. We still have some work to do. It is the intention of the Chair to be out of here by 3, 4 o'clock this afternoon. Okay. The House will be back in order. Representative Priedrich."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to

- 141st Legislative Day

 ask for a recess until 1:00 for the purpose of a Republican conference in room 114 immediately."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Getty, Representative Priedrich has asked for a Republican conference in room 114. What...What are your desires? You don't want to come to our conference?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, are you inviting me to the Republican conference?"
- Speaker Ryan: "You're always welcome."
- Getty: "Well, thank you, very much, but I have a few Bills I have to review first. So..."
- Speaker Ryan: "I can certainly understand that. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 1:00 p.m. The Republicans will be in conference in room 114 immediately. The House will be in order and the Members will be in their chairs. Boll Call. Page 9 of the Calendar under the Order of Reduction Veto Motions appears House Bill 2210, Representative Reilly, on Motion #1."
- Reilly: "Out of the record."
- Speaker Ryan: "Out of the record. House Bill 2456, Motion #1, Representative Bowman. The Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Bowman. The Gentleman on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 2458, Representative Matijevich, Motion #1. Hold on just a minute, Representative Matijevich. Your colleague, Representative Bowman, has just appeared, and would like a minute to get to So, if we'll back up to House Bill 2456, microphone. Motion #1, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have spoken with people who are interested in this legislation, and my understanding is that the...the money is there in sufficient quantities for 100 percent funding of the program despite the reduction veto. So, there were excess

- 141st Legislative Day

 funds appropriated. So, on that understanding, I'd like
 leave of the House to withdraw the Motion."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks leave. Are there any objections?

 Hearing none, leave is granted and Motion #1 to House Bill

 2456 is withdrawn. House Bill 2458, Motion #1,

 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to withdraw Motion #1 and proceed with Motions 2 and 3 on the special ed funding."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Vinson, is this on the Gentleman's Motion?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry."
- Speaker Ryan: "Proceed."
- Vinson: "Has the Motion been distributed?"
- Speaker Ryan: "It's on the Calendar. The Gentleman just withdrew Motion #1, Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Yes, but he's...he's...he's on #2 now, I thought, and
 I...my only question is has the Motion been distributed?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Well, he hasn't explained #2 yet, I don't believe.

 He just asked to withdraw 1 so he could get to 2. But you
 want...you want to address his Motion to withdraw #1?"
- Vinson: "No, I want to...no, #2."
- Speaker Ryan: "Then, you're out of order. Representative Matijevich on Motion #2."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on Motion #2 this is..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Matijevich...Representative Matijevich. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Motion #2 been distributed?"
- Speaker Ryan: "Mr. Clerk, has Motion #2 to House Bill 2458 been distributed? Yes, Mr. Vinson, it has been distributed. It's on your Calendar, and everybody has a Calendar on their desk. Proceed, Representative Matijevich."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Matijevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Motion to restore 4,543,100 dollars to the Special Education Extraordinary Services. What has happened, and I think many of you have received mail from many people with regards to special education. Special education... Mr. Speaker, now could I yield, because I was going to have Ellis Levin open and I was going to close, and I see he is now here?"

Speaker Ryan: "Are there any objections to Representative Matijevich yielding to Representative Levin?"

Matijevich: "He's a Co...He's a Co-chief Sponsor to the Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "I'm hearing objections, Representative Matijevich.

I don't whether we can do that or not. The objections have been withdrawn. Proceed, Representative Levin."

Matijevich: "Atta boy."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Yeah, I move the overriding of the Governor's reduction veto in connection with the Special Eđ Extraordinary Expenses. Special ed is something that I have been involved in for some years, and have been with what it has been able to extremely impressed accomplish. It is something that is bipartisan and goes across ideological lines. There are many conservative Republicans as well liberal Democrats and moderates who have seen the effects of special education. It's a very cost effective type of program. It's one that saves substantial amount of money for state government and for society in general. A good illustration to me of this really brought it home, was one adolescent girl who had severe behavior problems, a lot of brushes with the law, I got to know here through her legal career. and Initially, she was in a psychiatric hospital, and after about a year she was placed in a special ed facility.

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

when I finally met her after three years, I was absolutely amazed at the progress that she had made. perfect, but nobody's perfect. She know... She knew she had had problems. She had overcome them, and she was going to be able to be a productive taxpaying citizen. hadn't gotten the special ed services, she probably would have spent the rest of her life being dependent on state, either in a corrections facility or in a psychiatric institution. Because of the investment in special ed, she was able to be productive and taxpaying. So. I think special ed makes an awful lot of sense from an economic standpoint, even putting aside the fact that we're talking about human lives, and Extraordinary Services is a key portion of special education. Extraordinary provide up to 2,000 dollars for a student to keep kids with particularly severe problems in the public schools. Without Extraordinary Services money, these students would have to have private placements, and I think you all know that a private residential or day placement costs the state and the local school districts many, many times more than the cost of keeping a child in the public schools. have been some surveys that have been done of the effect of these programs, Extraordinary Services, and since the program has taken...been in effect the number of kids who have had to have residential or day special ed placements outside of the public schools has leveled off at the same time that the number of kids who have been able to be kept public schools because of the existence of the been going up. Extraordinary Services has So. it's a...Extraordinary Services is, itself, a tax-saving approach, and what we're doing here is simply restoring the level of reimbursement for Extraordinary Services that...to...that passed by this House overwhelmingly last

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

spring. The Governor's level would only reimburse the public schools for 85 percent of the monies that they already spent. We're talking about reimbursement for last year. This is not for the future. This is monies that the public schools have already spent, and so I think it makes a lot of sense. It's a very cost effective program, not only...not only the special ed, but the Extraordinary Services itself, and I would urge the acceptance of our Motion to override the Governor's reduction veto so that we can restore this badly needed money and save everybody in the short run and in the long run some money."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mr. House, let us make it very clear the issue of particular legislation and this particular Motion. issue is a matter of what fraction of the cost for special education is going to be supported by the local school district and what fraction is going to be supported by the That is the issue. We're not talking about the state. we're talking about the percentage of state Now. as this reduction veto stands. support. Governor's funding level represents a 22.7 percent increase over the previous fiscal year. The Bill, as it passed the Legislature, indi...included a 40 percent increase, and so our discussion is the difference between the 23 percent increase and the 40 percent increase. I would point out to you that in the last decade, the ability of local school districts has...to support their operating expenses has Statistics compiled by the State improved dramatically. Board of Education would indicate that the short-term debt of school districts - meaning tax anticipation notes, tax anticipation warrants and teachers' orders - has dropped

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

from 19 percent of the following year's revenue to 4 percent. Also, some analysis of that data would indicate that those kinds of districts that are having difficulty are in that difficulty primarily because of ... of judgements that have been made in terms of agreeing to...to employee contracts that were beyond their ability to pay or the unwillingness of local school districts to adjust their program to the reduction of students, and this means that they have not closed school buildings as they should have, nor have they reduced staff to the degree that they should have, commensurate to their student enrollment. The financial difficulty that the Chicago public school district has been in for the last few years can be directly traced to both of those particular problems. So, the issue that we're addressing is, who is going to pay differential between the 85 percent support and 100 percent support for the formula established by this Legislature? would suggest to you that the times in which we find ourselves, that the local...the local districts are in much better position to support this small fraction of the total differential than...than is the state. I would also you that if these vetoes are overridden, this suggest to is...if it doesn't put the state below...below the water line, in terms of our cash, it certainly will reduce resources that are available for distribution for the next fiscal year. Ιt seems to me that the fiscal and prudent position which we must take as a Legislature today is support the reduction, recognizing that those of us who will be returning to the next Session of the General Assembly are going to have to address some very serious issues, including the ability of the state to support its present budget, as well as the ability of the state, with its present revenue structure, to support future state

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

programs. I, for one, as you know, have been very actively involved in special education legislation and in education legislation in general. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, judgement, the best way we can support not only these programs, but also all of the programs of the State of Illinois is to sustain the reduction veto of the Governor, and to do that it will be necessary for us to vote against this Motion. And I, for one, don't consider my 'no' vote on this Motion an anti-special education support, because I think my record and the record of this General Assembly has been absolutely outstanding in this area and will continue to be, and I do not believe that there will be any reduction in the service level because of this reduction of reimbursable program. So, for that reason, Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Matijevich, who's going to close on this? You are? Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the reason I am asking the House for an 'aye' vote on both this Motion and the next one is this, I think I'm a reasonable person, and I think that all of us here are reasonable. Because of the huge cut that special education the Governor's reduction in elementary and took i n secondary education, we think that was unfair. So, what we did is, we had the special education people go to Governor and we said, let's negotiate, because there are some supplemental Bills coming up. And I said, you know, we're talking about new money. But, if we really negotiate in a fair way, we could end up with no new money, because there was five million dollars lapse in transportation, which the State Board of Education recommended go to special education; that it stay in special education.

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

that is not new money. It belongs to special education, and I asked the special ed lobbyists, if you want to call I said, to go the Governor and plead with him them that, that that's all you...if you ask for that five million, you'll be satisfied. We'll withdraw our Motions. all go home. It won't add a cent to the budget, and the Governor did not support that; because, for example, he wanted three million dollars to go to computeri...buying some computeri...computers that the State Board has said no, we shouldn't go to that program. So, I think what we..we ought to be doing today is, because the veto Session not over, by voting 'aye', we can still have some room to negotiate, and treat the special education funding in fair and reasonable manner. You know, they...they talk about the...the International Year of the Disabled. know, if we keep cutting special education, this year is going to be known as the year that we really hurt the handicapped. I...I could even go on further and say, you know, we're talking about the severe financial crisis, we saw that we're taking away 6...60 million dollars on the unitary tax issue. We're taking 100 million dollars away on the inheritance tax. Can we do this on the backs of the handicapped in the State of Illinois? I think treating the handicapped unfairly. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote so we can keep the doors of negotiation open for special education and the handicapped students of Illinois, and I plead for your vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 1, line 26 of House Bill 2458 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite, to explain your vote."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was amazed a little while ago to hear a Member from the other side of the aisle talk about poor management on the part of local school districts, if they were not able to make their budgets conform to their revenues; when, what I see happening is that the state is not living up to its statutory obligation to reimburse local our school districts at the level that we have decided in the Legislature in the past they should be entitled to. really are putting an additional burden on our local property taxpayers to try to support their local programs, notwithstanding the fact that we have not provided to our local school districts the amount that the statutes say we will provide for the special education reimbursement. I think, if we are to be honest with our local districts, we should be funding this at an even higher level to make sure that they can plan and be fiscally responsible for all of their programs and not have to siphon off money from other programs into special education. I urge a 'yes' vote on this measure."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative...Representative Matijevich, Representative Giorgi tells me you want to be recognized. Is that right?"

Matijevich: "No, just in case, I was going to poll the absentees."

Speaker Ryan: "Why don't you tell Representative Giorgi you...you don't need his help."

Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi, just in case, I want to poll the absentees."

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

Telcser: "Verification."

141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman asks for a Verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Matijevich calls for a Poll of the Absentees. Is that right? Zeke says you want to poll the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Alstat. Bartulis. Beatty. Bianco. Ewell. Farley. Huskey. Katz. Macdonald. Martire. McAuliffe. McCormick. Roland Meyer. Miller. Oblinger. Pechous. Reed. Robbins. Stanley. Stearney. Vitek and Wikoff."
- Speaker Ryan: "Persist in your verification, Mr. Telcser?

 Gentleman indicates he does. Mr. Clerk, would you poll the

 Affirmative Roll Call, please?"
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brunner. Bullock. Capparelli. Carey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Deuchler. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Findley. Virginia Flinn. Frederick. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallstrom. Grossi. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Huff. Jackson. Jaffe. Jones. Kane. Keane. Dick Kelly. Koehler. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. LaHood. Laurino. Leon. Leverenz. Levin. Loftus. Madigan. Margalus. Matijevich. Mautino. McAvoy. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. Nash. O'Brien. O'Connell. Ozella. Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Reilly. Rhem. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Slape. Margaret Smith. Stuffle. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Zito and Zwick. No further."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser, do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll?"
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell me what the count is right now before we start?"

141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "No."

Telcser: "No. Okay."

Speaker Ryan: "The count is 93 'aye', 59 'no', 2 'present' and 23 'absent'."

Telcser: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Capparelli. Representative Capparelli. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Darrow. Is Representative Darrow in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Domico. Representative Domico.

Representative Domico in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Findley."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Findley. Representative Findley.

Is Representative Findley in the chamber? Representative in the chamber? Representative Findley is in the chamber, in the rear of the chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Darrow. We got him? Representative

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Garmisa."

Speaker Ryan: "Who...What's your question, Representative?"

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Garmisa. Representative Garmisa in

the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser, I think we had some kind

of an agreement early on in the Session to leave

Representative Garmisa alone. I understand he is here."

Telcser: "Oh. Okay, fine."

Speaker Ryan: "So, leave him on the Roll Call."

Telcser: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Grossi is in the back of the

chamber. Representative Grossi is in the back of the

chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Nash."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Nash. Representative Nash. The

Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative McGrew."

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

chamber."

Telcser: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Ryan: "No, we left you on, Spark. We...We...Sorry we

called you. Who?"

Telcser: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Ryan: "In the back on the Republican side."

Telcser: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich.

The Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative O'Brien."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Representative O'Brien. Representative O'Brien.

How's the Gentleman recorded? Gentleman in the chamber?

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Laurino. Is the Gentleman in the

chamber? Representative Laurino. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Huff. Representative Huff.

Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Henry."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Henry. He's over here in the press

box."

Telcser: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Turner. Representative Turner.

Representative Turner. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Ryan: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Sandquist."

Speaker Ryan: "Who?"

Telcser: "Sandquist."

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

Telcser: "Wait...I'm sorry. They wrote down Sandquist."

Speaker Ryan: "Remove that request. Proceed."

Telcser: "Representative...did I get Turner?"

Speaker Ryan: "Turner has been removed."

Telcser: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Ryan: "In his seat."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Telcser: "That's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this guestion, there are 83 voting 'aye', 53...59 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Where? Further Motions? Motion #3, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I...I think we...on a Friday afternoon, we did pretty good with that vote. I'm going to ask the Membership for their support when that supplemental Bill comes along the first week in December, and that...ask that they support me so that special education can, at least, get that five million dollars that the State Board of Education said is lapsed and they...they deserve and it ought to be theirs. I'm going to, through Amendment, try that process, and therefore, withdraw Motion #2...3 rather."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #3. Motion #4, Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Withdraw the rest."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw what, 4?"

Matijevich: "4 and 5."

Speaker Ryan: "4 and 5, withdraw. Motion #6, Representative Levin. Withdraw #6. Motion #7, Representative Levin. Withdraw. #8, withdraw. #9, withdraw. House Bill 2459, Motion #1, Representative Steczo. Motion #1, Representative Steczo. Motion #1,

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #1 on House Bill 2459 seeks to restore approximately one million dollars that was reduced by the Governor in the line item for public assistance, adult education. This program is a...is a component of the adult education program, and eligible adults are screened by the Illinois Department of Public Aid and may...and referred to the State Board of Education, and this is a program whose purpose is to encourage public and...public

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

school and community college districts to maintain courses or to initiate courses of study, which enable youths and adults to continue their schooling where their schooling's been interrupted and to obtain that elementary equivalency or high school diploma or equivalency certificate. it's important to point out that the Governor has reduced one million dollars and reduced the level to the level of the prior year but, in Fiscal Year 1982, 1,154 adult learners, through this program, were removed from public assistance, thereby saving the state approximately 1.2 million dollars in that year. Because of increasing costs at the local level, the State Board of Education estimates that the five million dollars won't go very far, and the program would allow an extra...an extra approximately 2,000 people to engage in the program. I think that this is...this...this fund restoration would be money well-spent It seems to be a cost effective program, and I would encourage the Members of this House to, indeed, restore this line item to its original level."

Speaker Ryan: "Any discussion? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is only a small item compared to some that we've dealt with today, but it's still a lot of money in a time when the State of Illinois is in such deep financial crisis, at least as it manages its cash flow. We all have an obligation to try and keep this state solvent; particularly, we have that obligation, unless we have the commitment to come here and vote for a tax increase. We really have only those two alternatives: to do our work to balance this budget to hold down the expenditures or to raise taxes. This is a million dollars, and I would urge a 'no'...a 'no' vote on this override Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that it's foolishness like this reduction ve...veto message that has put us in the sad fiscal position we're in today. This money would go to train people to be employable. money would make into employable people those who have basic lack of skills, adults who, for one reason another, have dropped out of school, been too transient to get good educational programs or whatever, who now are back in the adult education field to get them off the Public Aid rolls. If you on the other side of the aisle would prefer pay more money in public aid for people who don't work, then you should be supporting the Governor on this issue. But, if you don't want to pay public aid, and if you want put...want to put people back on the payrolls, you support this Motion to override."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there further discussion? Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. like to clarify that one point, too. Representative Satterthwaite said it extremely well; that this is program to get people off the Public Aid rolls. As I mentioned in my opening remark, that this program in Fiscal Year 1982 succeeded in getting 1,154 people off the Public Aid rolls, thereby reducing the Public Aid budget by 1.2 million dollars. And conversely, when we look at the money that these people earn in income and pay taxes on in the state, we're talking approximately eight million dollars. So, in terms of being a cost-effective program, I think we could not find a better program than this one. We keep on hearing that people cannot get ahead, cannot get jobs, cannot find employment without a GED or an equivalency or a diploma. This is the way for us to do

141st Legislative Day

that, and I think that we would all be well-served by

trying to restore or by restoring this small amount of

funding to this most wor...worthwhile effort, and I would

encourage the Members to support this Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 1, line 14 of House Bill 2459 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. recommend that you push your own switches only. Save a lot of time. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 79 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Purther Motions? Motion #3, Representative Steczo, on House Bill 2459. Motion #2."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to...leave to withdraw Motion #2, please."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw Motion #2. Motion #3, House Bill 2459,
Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Motion #3 seeks to restore approximately 1.5 million dollars wh...which the Governor reduced in the area of vocational education. In Fiscal Year 1982, federal support for vocational education declined by approximately 12 percent, and that level remained unchanged for Fiscal Year 1983. What we are seeing in the state, however, is an approximately 63 percent from ten years ago in the...in the enrollment for vocational education programs, despite the fact that we are experiencing declining enrollments from elementary and secondary educational institutions. Local education agencies are reimbursed for the credit and non-credit hours generated by these programs, and we are as we..as we know, experiencing great economic difficulties,

141st Legislative Day

and it would seem appropriate for us to give a more st...strong..more strongly attuned financial commitment to vocational education."

Speaker Ryan: "Just a minute, Representative. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Gentleman is addressing the wrong Motion. Motion #3 is the HITS program, not the vocational education program."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Motion #2 was the state adult education program, which was 1.375 million dollar reduction by the Governor. That's the one I sought to withdraw."

Speaker Ryan: "You withdrew #2, is that correct?"

Steczo: "Number...Number 2."

Speaker Ryan: "Are you addressing #3 now?"

Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am."

Speaker Ryan: "He's addressing Motion #3, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but Motion #3 restores 550,000 dollars to the High Impact Training Program."

Steczo: "Okay. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, yes, I'd like to apologize. The Motions were filed out of order, so #3 is HITS, and I..I would address that one if... I want to thank Representative Winchester for pointing that out to me."

Speaker Ryan: "Now, what you're telling me is that your intent was to table...withdraw #3 and present #2."

Steczo: "No, Mr. Speaker. Number 2 was correctly withdrawn.

Number 3 deals with HITS and #4 deals with VOC ED, so we'll

do it first."

Speaker Ryan: "Which one do you want?"

Steczo: "Number 3."

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Which one have you been doing?"

Steczo: "Well, I...I was doing #3. I was doing #3, but thought it was vocational education, so we'll do #3 and address the right subject matter."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed, Representative."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize to the House for trying to do #4 in the place of #3, but #...item #3 deals with the restoration of 550,000 dollars for the High Impact Training Services, which is also known as the HITS program. And this additional appropriation had been agreed upon bipartisanly by a five to nothing vote in the House Appropriations Committee last spring, and this was a program that was established in 1978 to assist local educational agencies to bridge the gap between their long-term training programs and immediate training needs. It's a program that is jointly sponsored by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, by the State Board of Education, by DCCA, and it has received a great deal of ... of accolade over the last two years or three years that it's been This program, again, is a cost-effective one. We know that, in our period of unemployment, this is exactly the kind of retraining program that's needed in the state to provide for better opportunities...of better employment opportunities, and I...I think it's right for us to restore the..this appropriation to its original And I think that, if the tenor of the House last Spring was any indication, the fact that this...this Amendment that increased the funding to one million dollars, increased it bу 550,000 dollars was bipartisanly and unanimously supported suggests that there's great merit in restoring this funding."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Hoffman."

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

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

of the House. I would like to rise in opposition to this Motion. The Governor has already indicated that, in the supplemental appropriation that is...be submitted by the administration, that he will include in that supplemental appropriation 550,000 dollars in that supplemental for the HITS...the HITS program. That money will be part of money withdrawn from the regular transportation line item, which appears to have a lapse of somewhat in excess of five million dollars. So, for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's no necessity to override this veto. It will be taken care of in an orderly process, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Motion, or I would suggest to the Sponsor that, perhaps, he would like to withdraw his Motion as being moot."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not so sure that this Motion is moot. I know the Governor has indicated that, with its in lapse transportation funds that the supplemental would include 550,000 dollars: but, I quess best thing to do is to refer to a letter that was received by all of you by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, who also supports this Motion. And they indicate that the training for persons for new jobs under HITS is a most valuable incentive. It is needed now, and next spring may be too late. So, I trust that they, who are the champions of our economic climate know the importance of this program, and I believe in the same way that the extra funding is needed now. There are 12 projects that I...that can't be funded unless this money is restored, and I feel that it behooves us in the General Assembly to restore the funding now. We know the supplemental will be there. know the money will be there. We know the Governor agrees

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

with what we're trying to do here, and I believe we should do it at the quickest possible...in the quickest possible way, and there's no time like the present. And I would encourage a favorable vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item appropriation on page 2, line 2 of House Bill 2459 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? . All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no', and I would recommend that you vote your own switch. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, On this question there are 79 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Further Motion #4, House Bill 2459, Representative Motions? Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is vocational education, let me just point out, as I mentioned before, that the reduction by the Governor was 1.5 million dollars. Again, this was another appropriation that had bipartisan support the in House Appropriations Committee, in the Appropriations Subcommittee last Spring. The vote on this measure was five to nothing. Everybody agreed that, again, vocational education is one of those important programs that can..than can be of great assistance to us in the state, and assist in improving our economy. The Governor, last...last fall, in announcing his Education for Employment Program, stressed the need to reshape education opportunities to help prepare students for employment in the economy in the future. This reduction in vocational education funds do nothing to improve or encourage expansion, and I believe is right in line with what the Governor had indicated he wished to do. Again, it's...it's an extremely cost effective program and provides people

141st Legislative Day

with the proper training that they need. This program
serves more than 830,000 students throughout the State of
Illinois in elementary, secondary and post-secondary areas,
and I would encourage the House to...to do what is right in

restoring this funding."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, "Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 2, line 11 of House Bill 2459 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?". All in favor will signify by voting "aye", all opposed by voting "no". Vote your own switch. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 81 voting "aye", 63 voting "no". The Gentleman's Motion fails. Page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Reduction of Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 2195, Representative McBroom. Out of the record. House Bill 2196, Representative Hoxsey. Motion #1, House Bill 2196."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Motion does not do what I intended, I'd like to explain for a moment that my intention was that money be taken from the Conservation's Land Acquisition Fund to fund these capital projects. In view of the fact that they do not take care of property that they already have, I feel that they should not be allowed to purchase more. But I ask to table this Motion and will try to accomplish it in another way."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw that, Representative? Withdraw Motion #1 to House Bill 2196. Purther Motions? Motion #2, Representative Nelson, House Bill 2196."

Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion #2
to House Bill 2196 is a Motion to restore 35,000 dollars
that this House voted on previously. We are not talking
millions of dollars. We are talking 35,000 dollars for the
Illinois Nature Preserves Commission, and I would

- 141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982 appreciate your affirmative vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and I think this levity has its place, but th...here we're talking about the Nature Preserves Commission. This is a high priority with the Illinois Environmental Council, and I wish that the people, especially on this side of the aisle, would give it a good vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Nelson to close."
- Nelson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate all of your support. I can see it going over the top instantly."
- Speaker Ryan: "What? The question is, 'Shall the item on page 4, line 19...or line 18 of House Bill 2196 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 46... On this question there are 45 voting 'aye', 96 voting 'no' and the Motion fails. Representative McBroom, we'll go back to pick up House Bill 2195, item veto, Motion #1."
- McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this restores an appropriation of 480,000 dollars of capitol bond development money for acquisition of land for flood control in the Soldier Creek area in Kankakee County. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the item on page 20 and 21, lines 35 and 1 through 4 of House Bill 2196 (sic 2195) pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 18 voting

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

'aye' and 123 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion fails.
Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, just to make sure that the record is accurate. I think that you misspoke the Bill number when you introduced the Motion, and I would if you would..."

Speaker Ryan: "2195."

Satterthwaite: "...repeat that. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "House Bill 2195. We certainly want to... House Bill 2209, Motion #1. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I take leave to reverse the last Roll Mac, I voted with you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask this Body to consider my Motion to overrule and override the item veto of the Governor's. The cost - 890,200 dollars. The issue family practice centers, mainly in downstate Illinois and suburban Cook, where right now we have about 26 counties and 20 partial counties in the State of Illinois that are under served for physicians. This is a program whereby the Department of Public Health offers grants to communities with family practice centers so that those family practice centers keep and educate physicians in those under-served areas. It's a very important program. It's an area that the state's been involved in for five years. It's critical, because some family practice centers will close unless we have these kinds of appropriations. So, I would urge a 'yes' vote on my Motion."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, not only is this money not available, it's not needed. The.. The Family Practice Residency Advisory Committee itself said that this money will not be needed in '83, and so it certainly is feudal to go through such a specious Motion as this. And, I would suggest that we reject this as we reject... have rejected

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

all those previous Motions."

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

McClain: "John... Mr. Dunn. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dunn."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a note for the purpose of the transcript that I intend to send a copy of the previous speaker's remarks to my family practice center back in Decatur which desparately needs money."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, tell him to send me a copy, too. It might make interesting reading."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative McClain, you want a copy, too? To close."

McClain: "No. I just want to stay away from the fight between Notre Damer's. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this program for family practice centers are very important for under-served areas. It's critical for southern Illinois and central Illinois but also serves suburban Cook County and nine areas in the City of Chicago. It's not a specious program to keep physicians in the under-served areas. It's an area of concern for offering physicians and medical services that are very critical, and I ask you - it's 890,000 dollars. It's not a budget buster, and it's very important to those communities that are served. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall the item on page 11, line 31 of House Bill 2209 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. House Bill

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

2457, Motion #1. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, leave to withdraw that."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw. Gentleman asks leave. Are there objections? Hearing none, Motion #1 to House Bill 2457 is withdrawn. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 2:30. I'm happy to announce that in the center aisle, the flower of the Illinois Senate, former House Member, Senator Adeline Geo-Karis. The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their chairs. Supplemental Calendar #2, under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, appears Senate Bill 1606, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as you may or may not last spring we passed Senate Bill 1606 thinking recall, full well that it brought us into conformity with the Pederal law on extended benefits for unemployment comp. Actually after we passed the Bill, it was signed into The U. S. Department of Labor told us that there was still a couple of technical difficulties with the Bill and that it should be corrected before it could send us federal So, in effect, for the last few weeks, the U. S. money. Department of Labor has given us a base on balls until such time as we could get together and pass the amendatory veto. And that's basically what it does. It brings us into full compliance with the Pederal law so that our extended benefits are not in jeopardy, as far as federal funds. would move to accept the amendatory veto."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1606 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. And this Motion, having received a

141st Legislative Day November 19, 1982 Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 1606 by adoption of the Amendment. Supplemental... the Calendar, on or, I Supplemental Calendar #3, under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, appears House Bill 2116, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to acc... (mic malfuntion)... specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 2116. This Bill, essentially, was divided into two Sections. One Section dealed ... dealt with the right of the state's attorney to appeal the setting of the amount or condition of bail or changes in bail during criminal trials. The Governor has approved that Section. The second Section demanded request by... in writing by the prosecution and the defense in situations where continuances were requested. The Governor felt that this might, in some way, restrict the present statute concerning the length of time involved in trials and has amendatorily vetoed that out. I will settle for a half loaf. I move to accept the specific recommendations."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Getty." Getty: "Hr. Speaker, the Membership may recall that, when this Bill was before the House, I pointed out that the Bill, it stood before the House, was unconstitutional as held by the Illinois Supreme Court in that it goes into those areas which are reserved, under the language of the Constitution, to the courts. The Governor's amendatory veto has not changed that. Ιt still, in my judgement, an is unconstitutional measure in that it directly conflicts with the Illinois Supreme Court Rule 604; and, for that reason, I believe would be held unconstitutional. Accordingly, I

141st Legislative Day

- November 19, 1982
- am going to register my opposition by a 'present' vote."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Care to close, Representative Kosinski?"
- Kosinski: "Only in this regard, that that portion of the Bill which concerned us very greatly has been approved by the Governor. I see no conflict therein. It evidentally is the second portion to which Mr. Getty has referenced, and that has been amendatorily vetoed. I'm certain the Governor's staff was capable in its analysis: therefore, I solicit a 'yes' vote to accept the Governor's veto."
- Speaker Ryan: "The qustion is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2116 by adoption of the Amendment? . All favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Clerk. On this question there are 120 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. And this Notion, having received Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2116 by adoption of the Amendment. Change of vote."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative McClain requests to vote 'aye' on Motion 4 to House Bill 2559, and Representative Sam Wolf requests to vote 'aye' on Motion 4 to House Bill 2459."
- Speaker Ryan: "Any objections to unanimous consent for change of vote? Hearing no objections, the Gentlemen have unanimous consent. Have a happy Thanksgiving, Adeline. Return back to the Senate. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1181, Harry Smith; 1182, DiPrima et al; 1183, DiPrima et al; 1184, DiPrima et al; 1186, Ryan et al. House Joint Resolution 125, Olson et al. House Joint Resolution 126, DiPrima et al. House Joint Resolution 127, DiPrima et al. House Joint Resolution

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

128, DiPrima - et al. House Joint Resolution 129, DiPrima - et al."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Resolution 1181, Harry Smith; that we memorialize Congress to continue the revenue sharing program which will end January of *83. House Resolution 1182, DiPrima - Ryan -Madigan - et al; that the Justinian Society of Lawyers presented the Man of the Year Award to the Honorable Gerald L. Sbarboro, Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County. House Resolution 1183, DiPrima - et al; that Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church - where's Adeline? - is celebrating this year, 1982, as the 75th Anniversary of its founding of House Resolutoin 1184, Mr. and Mrs. George Satarino of Chicago, Illinois celebrate their 50th Wedding Anniversary on September 19, 1982. House Resolution 1186, Republ... Ryan and Republican Leadership; that we honor and congratulate the House Clerk... House Clerk Leone for this recent appointment to the Executive Committee; and, be it further resolved that we encourage Clerk Leone to continue his hard work with the organization as a representative of the State of Illinois. House Joint Resolution 125, Olson - Mulcahey: that some time ago, a couple of weeks back, the 60 Minute program came in and took a program out of context and there wasn't time to explain, in full context, of what the true story was and certainly some feelings were hurt, and public officials throughout the state felt that they were treated unfairly. And this just backs them up to show them that the rest of the state is behind them. House Joint Resolution 126, DiPrima - Ryan - et al; that the... Albert Keller, Jr. of Kankakee, Illinois was elected the 1982 -*83 National Comander of the American Legion at the 62nd

141st Legislative Day

November 19, 1982

General... National Convention of the American Legion held in Chicago. DiPrima - Ryan - et al, House Joint Resolution 127. The Ladies Auxiliary to the Department of Illinois Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held its annual convention at the Conrad Hilton in Chicago, Illinois June 18 through the 20th and unanimously elected Charlotte M. Rainey of Metamora, Illinois its President for the *82 -*83 term. House Joint Resolution 128, DiPrima - et al. Edward G. Galian, a combat-disabled veteran of World War II, was elected National Commander for *82 - *82 term. House Resolution (sic - Joint) 129, DiPrima - et al. Robert Mitchler, one of our colleagues, was named Man the Year upon his service, and we congratulate and commend him. Robert Mitchler, upon his service to his country and his state and his devotion to the cause of his fellow veterans. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Ryan: "... moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions.

All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Zeke, you're excused. You can go home now, if you'd like. Wish I'd have thought of that at noon. An announcement by the Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Speaker has asked me to remind the Body that the Committee to consider all relevant matters relating to the reduction of the Illinois House of Representatives will... will meet in room 114 of the State Capitol at 4:00; and, immediately after adjournment, Republican Members of that Committee are to meet in the Speaker's Office. Due to popular request, we have now put the Subcommittee Committee to consider all relevant matters of the House at 3:30."

Speaker Ryan: "Death Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Res... House Joint Resolution 124, Zwick, in

- 141st Legislative Day

 respect to the memory of Waldemar 'Wally' Rakow. House

 Resolution 1185, Chapman, in respect to the memory of

 Gilbert Ellis."
- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are... (mic malfuntion)... Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand adjourned until December 1st at the hour of 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Ryan: "I'd like to take this opportunity to wish all of you a happy holiday and a safe journey home. The Gentleman moves the House stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 noon December 1. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. The House now stands adjourned."

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 19, 1982

HB-0746	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
HB-0746	MOTION	PAGE	18
HB-1120	OTHER	PAGE	2
HB-1241	NOTION	PAGE	3
HB-1302	MOTION	PAGE	4
HB-1423	MOTION	PAGE	10
HB-2102		PAGE	7
HB-2116		PAGE	69
HB-2195		PAGE	65
HB-2196	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	PAGE	64
HB-2209		PAGE	66
HB-2303		PAGE	23
HB-2456		PAGE	43
HB-2457		PAGE	67
HB-2458		PAGE	44
HB-2459		PAGE	56
	FIRST READING		
		PAGE	2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	41
HB-2687	FIRST READING	PAGE	41
SB-1248	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-1606	MOTION	PAGE	68
SJR-0113	ADOPTED	PAGE	18

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND ANTHONY TZORTZIS	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS IN CHAIR	PAGE	4
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	9
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	22
SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	23
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	41
RECESS	PAGE	4.3
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	43
RECESS	PAGE	68
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	68
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	70
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	72
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	73