144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

- Speaker Peters: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived, the House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Pastor Paul Flesner from Grace Lutheran Church located here in Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Flesner."
- Pastor Flesner: "Let us bow our heads in a word of prayer. Oh God, we give You thanks for the gift of this new day with all of its opportunities. In doing so, we acknowledge as the Creator of all things in this universe. We stand humbly before You as we know that you have entrusted to us its care and its keeping. We give You thanks for these people who represent the people of the State of Illinois. We ask that You guide them in their efforts; that You grant to all of us the gift of Your wisdom that we may deal faithfully with those opportunities and those issues which You present before us. We pray this in Your name. Amen." Speaker Peters: "Amen. Be led in the pledge this morning by
- Representative Krska."
- Krska 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 justice for all."
- Speaker Peters: "Roll Call for Attendance. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Mr. Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to which are attached the Bills the following title, to wit; House Bills 93, 394, 579, 608, 958, 1607, 1971, 2116, 2133, 2234, 2310, 2356 991, 2102 and 1244, concurred in by the Senate December 2, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Wright, Secretary. *Mr. Speaker, I am Senate by Mr. directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to which attached to the Bills of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2485, action taken by the Senate December 2, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Further Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt First Conference Committee Second Conference Committee Report and requests a consist of five Members from each House to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1652, action taken by the Senate December 2, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. **

- Speaker Peters: "Representative Conti, do we have a Resolution?

 Agreed Resolutions."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Joint... Senate Joint Resolution 107 by Krska. The Good
 Shepherd Church of South 'Cohen' Avenue in Chicago,
 Illinois will celebrate its Diamond Jubilee on October 24,
 1982. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."
- Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Notion. Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?'. Representative Conti."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor, two years ago today we introduced a young man to take the place of Mike Malloy, who passed away, and Red Griffin. Today, we stand before you two day... two years later, and we're celebrating his birth anniversary. It's his birthday today. Let's all wish Red Griffin a happy birthday.
- Speaker Peters: "Happy birthday, Representative. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion on the Resolution. Those in favor

144th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1982
- will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Representative... Are we all on the roll?

 Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Excused absences, Representative Getty?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, may the record indicate that the same persons who were excused yesterday would be excused today for the same reasons?"
- Speaker Peters: "The Clerk will so note. Representative Telcser, excused absences? Virginia Macdonald."
- Telcser: "Representative Macdonald is all I have."
- Speaker Peters: "Thank you. There are 166 answering the roll. A quorum is present. Representative Collins in the Chair."
- Speaker Collins: "On page two of the Calendar, Senate Bills Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 501. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 501, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Collins: "I understand that Representative Keane is going to present the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the... We amended Senate Bill 501 yesterday, and the Bill, as it now stands, only deals with the extension of the local accounting task force for reporting and it repeals the repealer that was on the Bill. We discussed the Bill yesterday. The reason that we look for the extension on the reporting was that, while the Commission was authorized in August... or the task force was authorized in August of '81, the members were not assigned, and we didn't have our organizational meeting 'til March of '82. So, we're asking for this extension. I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Collins: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey. Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. 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... Record Representative Nelson as voting 'aye'... 'no'. On this question there are 147 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1267. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto Motions on Senate Bill 12..."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change?'. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer. Your light is... Oh, it is working now. Wasn't working... Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I wonder if the maker of the Motion might briefly explain what the Governor's amendatory veto does."

Speaker Collins: "I think he'd be happy to do that."

Keane: "I was about to do that when all of a sudden my mic went dead. But what it does is it broadens the scope of the Bill. The Bill allowed, originally allowed the Assessor of Cook County to access every other year instead of every fourth year, if he was given the money by the County Board and the personnel authorizations that would, you know, that would be required for that kind of a thing. And so, it said the... the Governor's recommendation said, 'any number of them', if you look at it. And then, on page two, he said... where it said, 'no less frequently than once

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

every four years, but no more frequently than once every two years, and what the Governor did was he took that language out and said, 'at regular intervals determined by the County Board, which is what, in effect, will happen anyway but makes the language broader."

Speaker Collins: "The ... "

- Brummer: "I note, in our veto analysis, it indicates that this veto is another example of this Governor's abusive treatment of his amendatory powers. Do you concur in that statement in the analysis?"
- Keane: "I don't have any opinion on that. I... am not an attorney, and I didn't look at the... I don't have problems with the Governor's veto. So, I did not look to ...at rationales as to why I should oppose it."
- Brummer: "Did you check with our legal counsel, Representative Getty?"
- Keane: "No, I haven't. Unfortunate, though, that I am. I am willing to accept it as it is. Mumble, mumble."
- Speaker Collins: "Is there further discussion? Representative Brummer, do you wish to be heard on that matter? Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change by adoption of the Amendment?'. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 155 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1539. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Bell."
- Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I move that we accept the Governor's specific

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

recommendation relating to this Bill. What he simply did was delete the words, 'vacant lot sales', when the Department of Revenue makes their sales ratio studies. It was overwhelmingly accepted by the Senate, and I move that we accept it here in the House also."

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor*s specific recommendation for change by adoption of the Amendment? . 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 Take the record. On this question there are 158 voting *aye*, 1 voting *no*, 1 voting *present*, and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1614. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Bower: the Senate Bill 1614 amends the Medical Practice Act. House. The Governor's amendatory veto has... the Department of Registration of the Illinois State Medical Society and all other groups that are interested in the Bill that The amendatory veto provides that the public aware of. members cannot be involved in providing health care; that the reporting of physician malpractice by health care institutions is based upon a final determination by that institution. The confidentiality components of the Board are extended to include the Board's staff. The subject of a case is required to be notified when a case is closed because of insufficient evidence. The reports are to filed every other month, rather than monthly, and the effective date is changed to January 1st of 1983. I would move for the acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question *Shall the House accept the Governor*s specific recommendation for change by adoption of the Amendment? *. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 157 voting 'aye', none voting *no*. Record Representative Hudson as voting 158 voting *aye*, none voting *no* and none voting 'present', and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions there appears Senate Bill 1028. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor on Senate Bill 1028. The Governor's sp... The Governor supported the concept of giving an administrative agency the power to grant easements to state land to public utilities. The language, which provides for legislative oversight of the granting of easements, was deleted by the Governor, however, because such a provision would do little to speed up the process. The Governor stated that it made little sense to require legislative oversight for easements granted by the Department of Central Management Services when there is no such oversight required for easements granted by the Department of Transportation or the Department of Conservation. Senate Bill 1028 also incorporated the definition of public utility, as provided in an Act concerning public utilities. Because this definition unnecessarily prohibited Director from granting easements to government-owned and mutually or cooperatively-owned utilities, the Governor recommended specific language to define public utilities for the purposes of this Act."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Collins: "Is there discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change by adoption of the Amendment?".

All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 151 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change. The House will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:00 p.m."

Speaker Peters: "I know you will all be pleased to hear the The House will now stand following bit of news. adjourned... excuse me. Let me back off. The House will be in recess until the hour of 3:30. The Conference Committees have broken up. The Conference Reports are now in the process of being prepared. The one dealing with the supplementals is, as you may know, is lengthy. There's a lot of numbers. They're checking back and forth. So, figure that will take about an hour before they ... they print that. We will be back at 3:30, and it understanding that at 3:30 each side will then ask for a Conference so that the contents of the Conference Committees can be explained in Conference. Hopefully, that will lessen the need for prolonged and protracted questioning on the House floor, hoping that that gets resolved in each of the Conferences. That, at least, is the plan at this time. So, we are in continued recess 'til 3:30, at which point we will come into Session and both the Democrats and Republicans will then go to Conference, come the House floor and vote on the, I think it's two back to or three matters that we have pending. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

be in their seats. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request that the Democrats now be permitted to attend the 2:00 caucus."

Speaker Ryan: "It's certainly alright with me. What room? 118.

How long are you going to need? Couple hours?"

Madigan: "Well, I hope not long. How long will you need, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Ryan: "I would hope not long."

Madigan: "Good."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "There will be a Republican Conference in room 114, immediately."

Speaker Ryan: "The House will stand in recess for not long for purposes of a Republican and Democrat Conference. The Republicans in 114, the Democrats in 118, and the House will stand in recess for... 'til the hour of 4:30. When you return from Conference, there will be a package on your desks Christmas wrapped. We would appreciate it if you would refrain from opening that package until the proper time. — The House will stand at ease 'til 10:00 this evening. Is Representative Danny O'Brien here? For what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

O'Brien: "To say good-bye."

Speaker Ryan: "Good-bye. Who's next?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, many of us are not going to be back. Actually, many, many of us are not going to be back. This House will never be the same due to the cut back. So, a few of us, a few of my friends and I got together and thought that, perhaps, we could get a little momento for everybody, a little Christmas gift or an early Christmas gift. So, we had them appropriately wrapped by your secretaries, and I think there are about 177 shoe

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

boxes in the chamber here. I would just like to say that I've enjoyed the years that I've spent here, the ten or so years I've spent here. I'd like to wish each and every one of you success, good health and happiness. And just remember that, you know, when we get in the heat of debate and so forth and Madigan and Ryan and Daniels are going back and forth at one another, remember — there are no good guys. There are no bad guys. There's just you and me, and we just disagree. Merry Christmas. Thank you."

- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Dan, very much. You can open gifts now, unless it says 'do not open until Christmas' and it's from Santa. Otherwise, you can open it. Republican side, we're pleased to have with us the distinguished Minority Leader from the Illinois Senate, the Honorable Pape Philip. Could I have your attention, please? The President of the Senate has just called, there's been some concern on my announcement of a recess until 10:30. And I would like all of you to know, including the Senate Member, that that was only said in gest. It probably will be a little bit later than Representative Peters is in the Chair."
- Speaker Peters: "No. you're out. As someone who is returning, I can again indicate the truth of what's happening and that is that nothing has... nothing is going to end up happening for awhile. Mr. Clerk, are the Conference Reports passed out? Which two? On Conference 1127, Committee Report #1, Supplemental 1, SB Representative Terzich. Mr. Clerk."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

 Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1127 was a Bill that

 was previously passed out of the House by a substantial

 majority. And what has happened is that the City of

 Chicago has agreed to provide pension benefits similar to

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

those that we previously passed for the Chicago firefighters, and it provides that a widow may receive only widow's annuity under the fund. It raises the one post-retirement from one and a half percent per year to three percent per year, which was previously passed for the firefighter, for those who were born before January 1, This is a similar benefit that all of 1930. the other pension systems throughout the state presently enjoy. provides the... that the policemen who were retired prior to January 1, 1974 shall be entitled to a minimum annuity of 400 dollars per month. It also authorizes the pension fund to provide group health insurance for all annuitants. It provides that the fund may pay premiums for such insurance program up to a maximum of 55 dollars per month, if the annuitant is not qualified to receive Medicare, up to 21 dollars per month for an annuitant who is qualified to receive Medicare. At the present time, we are providing health coverage payments for annuitants under the Illinois teachers pension plan. It provides that if the balance in certain reserve accounts is in excess, that the required pay amounts are chargeable to the account. all of the excess may be transferred to other reserve accounts. Again, Members of the General Assembly, that the other systems throughout the state presently enjoy the The Chicago post-retirement benefit. three percent firefighters and the police department are the only ones that do not have this. It also has a cap that this only applies to members who are born before January 1, 1930, and I would move for adoption of Committee..."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion?"

Terzich: "Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I ... I just have one question, Representative Terzich.

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

If you turn to page eight of the Bill, it provides for other optional coverage, and some of that optional coverage, I think, is coverage that is already given; like, psychological, optometric and so on and so forth. Does that mean that they can now cut back on the services that they already have?"

Terzich: "No, what this does is that the City of Chicago presently has a group insurance program which provides basic hospital and medical insurance, as well as optometric and dental care, and the cost for the retirees, at the present time, is 55 dollars per month and 21 dollars per month for those on the supplemental..."

Jaffe: "No, I... I understand that. All I'm saying to you is, at the present time, under those policies as a matter of right, you can get psychological or optometric services."

Terzich: "Correct."

Jaffe: "Under this Bill, it says other op... other optional coverage. So, it seems to infer that you're actually cutting back on those services, and those services then become optional rather than mandatory."

Terzich: "The op... The optional benefits that the basic health care plan, basically speaking, is hospital, surgical and major medical. Supplemental benefits are generally optometric, dental, additional accident, diagnostic, X-ray and lab. These are supplemental-type benefits."

Jaffe: "I think..."

Terzich: "Because of... Because of the cost of medical care and so on, this is simply the same benefits that are presently enjoyed for the City of Chicago employees, which includes those two benefits."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Tuerk: "What's this program going to cost?"

Terzich: "The estimated cost for the... the health insurance is approximately, for the police department, is one and a half million dollars annually and three and a half million on the post-retirement benefit. And, for the fire department, the annual cost for the health insurance is approximately 600,000 dollars."

Tuerk: "Who's going to pay for this now, the City?"

Terzich: "No, at the... there is no increase in the tax levy or contributions. This will come out of the... the pension fund out of the excess earning reserve fund."

Tuerk: "Comes out of the pension fund itself?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Tuerk: "There's no levy connected, no tax money involved?"

Terzich: "No, Sir."

Tuerk: "What... How much is this going to increase the accrued liability?"

Terzich: "The..."

Tuerk: "Do you know?"

Terzich: "The estimated accrued liability would be, which is amortized over 40 years, is approximately 40 million dollars on the police department and approximately... roughly about three million dollars on the fire department."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? I'm sure he will."

Speaker Peters: "Indicates..."

Terzich: "Yes."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative Terzich, relative to the Pension

Laws Commission, what is their posture on this legislative

proposal?"

Terzich: "The... This Bill came out of a Conference Committee

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Report and was not addressed by the Pension Laws Commission."

Ebbesen: "Isn't that kind of non-protocol based on the histor...
on the history of this, historically, on pension Bills?"

Terzich: "Well, the... due to the time element; however, I will state that the.. the main part or the main trust of the Bill, such as the post-retirement benefit, has been before the Pension Laws Commission for a number of years. And, as I stated before, all of the systems in the State of Illinois have the three percent post-retirement benefit. This is simply a limited or an ad hoc, one, where it's only for members who were born before January 1, 1930."

Ebbesen: "Well, I... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, itself. I'd just like to provide the Membership with what they're voting on Now, if this was just the City of Chicago post... I mean... In retirement, these benefits for insurance, health insurance - you're talking about, I think he said dollars a month for retirees and 21 dollars relative of the age factor of 65, but the Pension Laws Commission, when the downstate teachers retirement system first original considered this legislative proposal, the Commission took a position that it was not an appropriate function of the retirement system to provide insurance benefits retirees. Now, I'm sure that all of us are aware that police and fire can retire at the age of 50; and, when you start talking about a retirement with insurance benefits and you look at the magnitude of the dollars we're talking about relative to the City of Chicago, remember one thing; that, constitutionally, you cannot decrease any of those benefits once they re enacted into law. And, if we vote on this proposal here tonight, and the Governor signs this, you know what's going to happen - is the fact that the ... it's the forerunner of every other pension system

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

throughout the entire State of Illinois, and you're talking about millions and millions of dollars. You're going to transfer these payments to the young people for today's services out of general revenue funds. Whether it's the City of Chicago, downstate municipalities, the State of Illinois, you're talking about millions, and millions and millions of dollars. And all I can say to you just very briefly is you better weigh your vote very, very carefully. My vote will be 'no'."

- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Terzich, to close."
- Terzich: "Well, again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that these are benefits that are... have been enjoyed by all of... including Members of the General Assembly, the downstate police, downstate fire, the state employees, the... All of the systems in the State of Illinois do have the post-retirement benefit of three percent. The fact that the health insurance that it's... with the high cost of health insurance, that just simply helps offset that. It does have a limit of a contribution made by the system of 55 dollars and 21 dollars, and this is an urgently needed benefit. It's paid for entirely by the pension funds in the City of Chicago, and I would urge your support."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt...'
 Want to put that up there, Tony? Conference Committee
 Report. 'Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill
 1127?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those
 opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have
 all voted who wish? Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Well, again, yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I mentioned before, this simply pertains to the City of Chicago; that their pension systems, at the

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

present time, are earning excess money in excess of pay outs; that these benefits again have been given to every member in the State of Illinois — the three percent post—retirement benefit. And that the policemen and firemen certainly need the benefit because of the high cost of inflation just as well as everybody that is enjoying pension benefits throughout the State of Illinois, and I certainly do not see any reason why there should be any negative votes up there. And, please, I urge your support on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speak... Mr. Speaker, how many votes will be required for passage?"

Speaker Peters: "One moment, Sir. While we're waiting on that,

Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to rise to explain my 'aye' vote. As Representative Terzich said, this does not cost the state any money. There's excess earnings in the pension fund of the City of Chicago. It won't cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois any money. This is something that the retired policemen and retired firemen have earned by faithful years of service, and I can't see why any Member couldn't put a green vote on this."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan, the legislation does have an immediate effective date. So, it would be 107."

Madigan: "And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

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

Bill reflects an understanding between the police

department of the City of Chicago and the pension system

which services the police officers of the City of Chicago.

That pension system is funded, in part, by contributions

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

directly from the City of Chicago and, in part, by contributions from the participants in the system; that would be the police officers themselves. So that the financial support for the pension system is purely local. There is no support given to this system by any other agency of government, such as the State of Illinois. This is a local decision which is proposed to be supported by local finances; and, for those reasons, I would recommend an "aye" vote."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the information of the Body, presently, this system, without this burden that's being asked to be put on, is funded at a ratio of only 42.3%, and actuarials will tell you that a good system should be funded up closer to 60%. Presently, 42.3% without this burden. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative...

According to the rules of the House, there is no filming during explanation of vote. Okay? Further discussion? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise explain my 'yes' vote. It seems to me that if the Members of this pension system agree that this is a benefit that they could pay, I see no reason why not to support their posture. As everyone knows, people who manage pension systems are very, very cognizant and very much aware of We are also all costs, both present and in the future. aware of the mail we receive during the course of the year from old-time annuitants who have not had cost of living increases, as an example, which has helped them keep up with the cost... would help them keep up with inflationary spiral which we're all familiar with in recent years. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

this is one way in which we could help many of those old-time annuitants who have given so much public service to those of us who have been residents of Illinois for so many years. I think this is a good idea. I think it's one which we can support and, not only support the legislation conceptually, but to be confident that the pension system's fiscal integrity will remain in tact."

Speaker Peters: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I mean, you know, as far as I'm concerned, the firemen and policemen of any municipality or any part of the state — that's our first line of defense. And, in Chicago alone I guess we've lost about a half a dozen policemen already and, in fires, many times the firemen have given their all and sacrificed their lives for the cause of safety for the people in the communities. I wish all of us would use your heart a little bit and melt down and give us a vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1127 is hereby adopted. Senate Bill 1652, Representative Watson." Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill

is the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill As you all are aware of, we, in Illinois, now find 1652. ourself in a very precarious situation. Revenues have and the costs continue to escalate. depleted The economists tell us that if we fall below the dollar figure in the General Revenue Fund, why we should do one of two things. We should either increase taxes, or we should cut services. We've come to that crossroad, and we've been cutting services for the last year, and we do

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

not have a tax increase before us now. So, we must continue to cut services or at least give some individuals an opportunity to cut those services. What Senate 1652, the Second Conference Committee Report, actually does is establish the Emergency Budget Act in Fis... for Piscal Year of 1983. It deletes the original language of the legislation and now comes with the Emergency Budget Act of Piscal Year 1983. It empowers the Governor to place in reserve no more than 2% of the total General Revenue Fund budget, approximately 164 million for 1983 Fiscal the areas of elementary and secondary education grants, public aid grants and higher education reserves, these reserves cannot exceed 2% of the total General Revenue Fund budget. From what I understand in the area of higher education, this should come to a total figure of about 20 million dollars. In elementary and secondary education, about 42 million dollars, and an additional 40 million dollars from the Department of Public Aid grants."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? I'm sorry."

Watson: "Pardon me."

Speaker Peters: "I'm sorry. Proceed."

Watson: "And it comes to a total of about 102 million dollars. The additional funding will come from the remaining agencies of the General Revenue Fund, and the Governor will have the opportunity to take up to 5% from any one of the agencies appropriations. In the area of personal services, he may not exceed 2% of the agencies appropriations. One area that's important is the elementary and secondary education reduction must be spread evenly throughout the remainder of the fiscal year. This Act is actually repealed on July 1, 1983, has sunset provisions, would move for the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in case you haven't read the paper today, unemployment has hit the highest level in the last 40 years. Unemployment is And what is the response of the government to the 10.8%. State of Illinois? Here's what the response is of government to the State of Illinois - let's give tax breaks to the rich and; secondly, let's cut the heart out of education and services that are vital to the needy. I want to ask you one question. Why give a Governor, who has consistently misled the public about the financial carte blanche condition of this state, power to cut programs over which he has shown absolutely no concern? You know, let's not kid ourselves. We are not solving any problems here today. We are going to be back agonizing over the same problems very early next year. cannot run government by gimmick. Why are we talking about education? Why are we talking about social service cuts in the same Legislature where we have given tax breaks large corporations with the unitary tax Bill? At the same time, we have aided wealthy families with the abolition The Legislature is giving away its the inheritance tax. power of oversight with regard to the budget. We are... We are weakening this branch of government, and we are doing so by imposing penalties on our school children, on our handicapped and other people who must rely upon government. The Sponsor of this Bill says that the Governor has indicated he wants to cut education by 62 million dollars. At the same time later today, we are going to vote on a supplemental Bill that the Governor has given us in which we give 5 million more dollars for lottery enhancement, for wall certificates for 177 thousand appropriation dollars and on, and on, and on and on. I must tell

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

this is not the Legislatures finest hour. I intend to vote 'no' on this particular Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we do Bowman: "Mr. have a serious financial problem, but this is a temporary It is a solution that is gambling with the future of the people of Illinois. It is a gamble, because it is based on the assumption that the economy will turn around sometime during this fiscal year and that everything will, once again, be rosey. Well, let me tell Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, assumption is false. Every observer of the national economy and of the state's economy predicts a long, slow, agonizing climb back to pre-recession employment levels, pre-recession income levels. The problem is much more This solution is... papers over the fundamental cause of the problem. It does not address itself to solving the problem. Representative Jaffe is absolutely It is, in addition, pernicious, because we are right. taking funds from programs with one hand and, at the same giving tax breaks to corporations and to wealthy individuals that the state cannot afford. We have legislation that the state cannot afford, and now this particular Bill is simply a cover up and an attempt to disguise and a gamble that somehow Ronald Reagan and his economic policies will pull Governor Thompson's chestnuts out of the fire. And I think that is a gamble that we can ill afford to take. I also intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "I'm not... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Who's the Sponsor of this thing? Oh, Watson. Thank you. Frank, a question, if you don't mind. On all of the... all of the Sections which designate the certifying officer, constitutional

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

officers, I noticed the Attorney General, Lieutenant Governor, Comptroller and so on, and then in the absence of the state officers there is, 'the Governor then shall operate in the place of all the certifying officers. those are all constitutionally secure offices, and I notice that Article of the Constitution makes education... has its own separate Article. I think it's an important question for the Members to know the answer to and, that is: why is the Governor, by the language of the proposal in front of us, being designated the certifying officer for reductions that are appropriate, according to the language, when it is a separate Article in Constitution and we are setting aside the Treasurer or the Comptroller and others to allow them to make their own We have a State Board of Education that I think I cuts? was fundamentally involved in when I came here to become We have a designated certifying officer in a established. variety of capacities, and Doctor 'Gill' whatever you think... or think of him. But, the fact is, we are giving to the Governor authority that is designated, under Article X, to the State Board of Education. My question to you is, why would we allow the Governor to have that authority and then delete or identify, by language in the proposal, other state officers as having separate power?"

Watson: "The Governor originally gave us a budget, which we, of course, acted on in this past... this past spring, and a part of that budget was the... the education appropriation for the State of Illinois. He can have that same authority to reduce it as he wishes. If he can... If he can offer the budget, he can take it away, and this is the powers that we're going to give him. Pardon me."

Schneider: "That's alright. I just don't think that the budget ought to be the determiner of the essence of power, whether

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

he gives or does not give it ... or take it away. In sense, we have that authority, too, and I do believe we may be rambling into territory that I believe we don't want to ramble into and that is the question of the range of constitutional power being granted to the Governor. understand that I... I guess I'd feel better if I knew that a person who is educationally aware, if not educationally competent, would make decisions relevant to education, rather than giving the Governor that range of authority. If I look at the dollars that we're talking about, and I'm kind of digressing a second, but looking at the range of dollars, a good chunk of the dollars that will be cut will be educational dollars. It could be as high as 40 million quess. I think Members ought to give a very dollar, I serious consideration to why they would even think about voting for the proposal on the basis of the power, to begin Secondly, to give some real serious consideration to whether or not you want to roam into Article X, give the Governor that power by statute, even though it's sunsetting, because precedence in government, whether they're given here or in the court, are very significant. I ask you to vote 'no' for that reason. I ask you to vote on the basis of the remarks by шy Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions, please."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Watson, do you yield?

Representative Pullen, Representative Watson yields

willingly to you."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you say, Sir, that this state is currently facing a critical situation, in terms of the balance in the State Treasury?"

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Watson: "Very definitely."

Pullen: "Do the appropriation Bills that have already been enacted into law require the spending by the Executive Branch of a given sum of money and no less?"

Watson: "Yes, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Is it the case that this legislation provides that these emergencies powers for the sake of reducing some of those appropriations are limited to the current fiscal year only?"

Watson: "That's correct."

Pullen: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill for a moment, please?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Ma*am."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is clear to all of us that the state is indeed facing a critical situation in our finances, and the Gentleman is proposing a solution that does not increase taxes, but that cuts spending in a responsible way in the appropriation Bills that have already been enacted into law. absolutely essential that this be passed, and I, for one, am very pleased that it is limited only to this fiscal year; because, I do believe that this is a grave act that we are engaging upon and that it does create a precedent that should not be continued beyond the immediate fiscal crisis. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is indeed a fiscal crisis facing us. This is a responsible action, so long as it is limited only to this fiscal year, and then we can address the spending requirements and the needs of the taxpayers anew for the next fiscal year when we go through the next appropriations process. It is very important that this legislation be passed, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Being none, Representative Watson, to close."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Watson: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The action has to be clear. Either the Legislature has to cut the budget, the Governor has to cut the budget, or we're going to be back here for a tax increase. If we want to come in to a Special Session next weeks or the next couple weeks to talk about a tax increase, and if we aren't willing to bite the bullet ourself and the Legislature make the cuts and let...we should give the power to the Governor. Someone mentioned this as a temporary solution to a temporary I certainly hope that this is correct. why we put the sunset provisions in it. Ι believe Bill should be enacted into law, and I'd appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Peters: "Thank you. The guestion is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1652? . Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'nay' and none voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1652. Representative Currie votes 'no'. Mr. Clerk, record Representative Currie as 'no'. Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell 'aye'. I'm Representative Breslin 'aye'. I can't see back sorry. there. Representative Stewart *aye*. *No*. Representative Stewart *no*. Representative Turner *no*. Okay? Representative Oblinger 'aye'. Representative Hoxsey 'aye'. Okay? On the Calendar is Motion, Senate Representative Krska." Bill 60.

Krska: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to take from the table and suspend Rule 35 to have Senate Bill 60 heard."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. It'll take
107 votes. Those in favor will signify... Oh, excuse me.
Representative... I didn't see your light, Jaffe. It's a
Motion, Representative Jaffe. Representative Krska,
Representative Jaffe would like an explanation."

Krska: "Alright. It's on the Supplemental Calendar."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Take 107 votes. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Hr. Clerk, voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion there are 116 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. On the Calendar, Order of Concurrence, House Bill 900. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 900 is a simple Bill. It merely accelerates the collection of the utility tax in the It is not a tax increase. state. It's merely acceleration. It requires a payment schedule payments per month, where now the schedule is one month. It will substantially bolster the General this Revenue Fund: and. bу non-tax-increase acceleration measure, we may find a way to avoid a tax increase. And so, for those reasons, I would urge Members to vote for concurrence on House Bill 900, and I would move for that concurrence."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? There being none, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Representative... Their lights are not on. Now. Representative Kosinski first."

Kosinski: "Would you yield to a question?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Sam, the cost of this additional reporting, will it go

- 144th Legislative Day

 into their demand for an increase of rate, the cost
 thereof?"
- Vinson: "Well, Roman, I would no... I just would not speculate about what people whom I have no control over will do."
- Kosinski: "There will be some cost concern with additional reporting, won't there?"
- vinson: "Well, my... my presumption is that most of the utilities in the state currently have a computer... computerized reporting system, and turning out three reports a month as opposed to one report a month, you've probably got to put a stamp on it and send it in and... You know, the additional 60 cents a month for the stamps just is not going to be very substantial."
- Kosinski: "Your inference then is the cost would be so low it would not be reflected in rates? Did you hear me?"

Vinson: "No, Sir, I did not."

- Kosinski: "I said, your inference is the cost will be so low with computerization that it would not be reflected in rates to the consumer?"
- Vinson: "Yes, I would not anticipate a need for a rate increase for consumers as a result of this."
- Kosinski: "That would be very unusual before the Board. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Okay. Sam, on page three of Amendment #2 there is a limitation on this acceleration so it does not apply to taxpayers whose average monthly liability was 10,000 dollars or less. Am I correct that this is intended to exclude condominiums, for example, that bulk purchase electricity from having to accelerate their payments?"

Vinson: "That's correct."

Levin: "Thank you."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

- Yourell: "Representative Vinson, I did want to do something further than what Representative Kosinski has alluded to as to what would happen with the accelerated payments of four times a month to the state. Are you telling us that there will be no additional cost to the taxpayer which, of course, is the utilities under this Act and that the utilities or the taxpayer would not pass on that additional cost in additional rates to the consumer? Is there any provision in the Bill that would prevent that from happening?"
- Vinson: "What I'm telling you is that those possibilities are so speculative as to be unable to be predicted on this floor.

 And, secondly, I'm saying to you that those costs are so insignificant that, if you compel me to speculate, I would not anticipate a rate increase."
- Yourell: "So, we hear from time to time that the rates that you suggest are minimal and speculative amount now to about three times what we were paying a year or two ago and that we should disregard them. If there's no guarantee that the taxpayer, in this case utilities, would not pass on the additional cost to the consumer, then I would have to vote 'no'."
- Vinson: "Well, you've got to do what you've got to do,
 Representative."
- Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? There being none, Representative Vinson, to close. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 900?'. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 144 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'nay' and 1 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 900. That's final passage. House Bill 1047, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, maybe the Clerk could check it, but I think this Bill is still on Third Reading in the Senate."

Speaker Peters: "Alright."

Reading in the Senate, and I don't think any final action has taken place on it in the Senate."

Speaker Peters: "Thank you, Representative."

Keane: "If you could get back to me if I'm wrong, I'd appreciate it."

Speaker Peters: "Fine. House Bill 2501, Representative Vinson.
We are right on 2501? Proceed."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Bill, in its amended form... pardon me, will do two things. First, it will strengthen, enormously, agricultural research capability of the University of Illinois and ensure that a major aspect of those resources, the Dixon Springs research facility of southern Illinois, will be fully utilized. In order to do that, it provides for an exchange of land owned by the State of Illinois currently for land owned by the Federal Government at Dixon We're trading some of our surplus property for some of their property at Dixon Springs. The purposes for that are to let the University of Illinois, in their Dixon Springs operation, exercise the full control of that land to be able to make improvements to that land which they cannot or could not make currently and to permit that center just to be more efficiently utilized. I think it's

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

been a proposal that has been negotiated at great length between the University of Illinois, the Department of Administrative Service and the Federal Government, and I believe that you'll find, as you examine your analysis, that it's a proposal that has very favorable benefits for the State of Illinois and for farmers."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Jaffe, an inquiry? No.
Representative Brummer, an inquiry?"

Brummer: "I assume we will be voting on concurrence Amendments #1 and 2 both. I would ask for a division of the guestion, as that was not intended by the Sponsor."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "The second thing that this Bill does ... "

Speaker Peters: "Represen... Excuse me. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if we're going to have a division of the question, if it might not be more expeditious to just consider and vote on... on concurrence Amendment #1 first and then vote on concurrence Amendment #2. I request the division of the question."

Speaker Peters: "Have... Is there any more discussion on Senate

Amendment #1? There is none. Represent... On Senate

Amendment 1? Representative Robbins. Proceed."

Robbins: "This Senate Amendment #1 will help keep the world's foremost research center on soil erosion in place. This is something that is really needed, and I, along with many others from all over the state, have worked for this program. And, whenever you look at what has been accomplished, such as no-till farming, planting in sod. They have experiments now that control the erosion and monitor the phosphates and pot ashes that are in the run off and have a model situation and have exported this technology to India and Africa. So, I think that this is an opportunity to help keep this station open. I have

144th Legislative Day

talked to many of you, and I urge all of you to vote 'aye'

on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2501?". Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay". The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 160 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2501. Now, Senate Amendment #2, Representative Vinson. Representative Keane."

Vinson: "Thank you..."

Speaker Peters: "Excuse me. Representative Keane, there is still some confusion now as to whether the information we had was correct or not. So, we'll wait on that. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of This particular Senate Amendment is a critical House. Amendment for the continued operation of grain elevators in the State of Illinois. Specifically what it does is resolve in a fashion acceptable to the Parm Bureau, to the Elevators Association and to the financial institutions the problem that we created last year in trying to protect farmers. What this does is to make it possible not only to protect farmers, but to protect the financial institutions who engage in loans to grain elevators sufficiently; that the flow of credit to grain elevators will be continued. That is a very substantial problem at this time. adopting this Amendment, we will facilitate that flow of credit, avoid the problem and correct our previous error in a fashion acceptable to the farm organizations. And, for that reason, I would move for the adoption, for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2501."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Peters: "Discussion? Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you... Thank Mr. Speaker. Ladies and you, Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has two sides to it. The first side is that the major lending institutions in this state intend to cut off credit to grain elevators if this Bill is not passed. The advantage to the lending institution is that they will receive a first-claim priority status when a grain elevator goes bankrupt, if they have taken a negotiable warehouse receipt in exchange for the loan that they have given to the warehouse. problem is this, and I don't see any real problem for I'm a farmer and I go to the grain elevator, and instance. I take a warehouse receipt. If I have a warehouse receipt lending institution has taken a warehouse receipt for its loan, they should both be able to go in, claim together and share in the assets equally. The problem is this and this is the reason that ... that we are suspicious, and we came in under the other Bill to try to protect farmers. It is not an uncommon practice for unscrupulous operators, warehouseman, to store grain in their facility, claim to the lending institution that they own it and grant a warehouse receipt in exchange for a loan on that property that they say that they own, remembering that one piece... one kernel of corn looks the same as another and all the beans look the same, and they are co-mingled. In this instance, I don't think ... or at least I believe the agricultural industry is disadvantaged when they allow the lending institution to have the same priority claim they have taken a fraudulently issued warehouse receipt. The lending institution has a... is in a better status, has more authority to look over the books to make a better judgement as to what they own and what they don't own. poor farmer comes in. He believes that he's dealing with

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

an upstanding company, and he has stored his grain there. He's just not dealing in the same position that the lending institution is dealing in, but it is definitely a mixed bag. There is no question that the lending institutions insist upon having this priority status if they intend to continue providing loans to grain operators. So, it is critical to the market in that respect. So, you will have to weigh those two problems in making your decision on how you vote on this Bill."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino."
Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative Vinson, I noticed that you must have inadvertently left one classification out of your earlier remarks. That was the agreement by the financial institutions, the grain elevators and the Farm Bureaus. You made no mention of the grain farmers. My question to you, Sir, do the grain farmers agree having their first priority position now being moved into a first priority position with financial institutions?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir, I believe most of them do, and organizations which even are divergent, frequently, from the Farm Bureau on policy support this. Give you Farmer's Union, for example."

Hautino: "Well, currently, the grain farmer has first priority.

Currently, as we passed 2505. Does it not?"

Vinson: "That's correct."

Mautino: "And now you're putting financial institutions in the same category as the grain farmer, are you not?"

Vinson: "That's correct."

Mautino: "So, therefore, we are removing the position that we originally put the grain farmer in, are we not?"

Vinson: "You are correct."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Mautino: "And you are saying that that is acceptable to the grain farmers of the State of Illinois?"

Vinson: "Yes, sir, and the reason is quite simple. If you sacrifice credit, and most farmers understand this, if you sacrifice the flow of credit to elevators, you are going to completely paralyze the entire movement of grain in this country and in this state. If you cut off that credit, there is simply not going to be any ability of elevators to sell grain; and, if an elevator can't sell grain, it can't Parmers are going to be stuck with that grain at a time when you've got record amounts of that grain. there's one thing a farmer needs to be able to do if at this time, it's to have a sure market that he can sell And, if you cut off credit to the elevators, those grain. elevators aren't going to be buying any grain, Dick, and that's the reason that I believe most farmers support this."

Mautino: "Well, for the record, Sam, I just wanted your remarks on who supports it and what rationale we have. I would like to point out as well that the financial institutions that are making questionable loans to those elevators should restructure their evaluation at the same time. I don't think that you can blame a grain farmer for having concern about having his priority moved down, or have someone move into that category of first priority without having some concern. I'm sure you agree with that."

Vinson: "Yeah, I do, and I would pose this question to you. What a financial institution has to do, in determining where it's going to invest its money, make its loans, is look at the cost of making various kinds of loans; and, if the cost making one category of loans is substantially higher than the cost of making another category of loans, why then it's going to make the loans in the lower-cost category. Now,

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

when an individual comes into the bank for a car loans, let's take for example, you know, the collateral is very observable. You've got a system operated through the State of Illinois where it's totally recorded and everything, titles, license and so forth, and the financial institution has pretty secure collateral to rely on. It's very tempting for a financial institution to put all of its money into that kind of a loan. I don't think you want to make the cost of lending to elevators and the uncertainty of the collateral so great that you imperil that flow of credit, because I think your farmers want to sell to those elevators, Dick."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Peters: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Yes, Representative Vinson, in the definitional Section which is not new, it refers to a claimant being a person who is unable to secure satisfaction of a financial obligation due from a person subject to regulation by the Department under several Acts, including the Public Grain Warehouse and Warehouse Receipts Act, the Grain Elevator Act, I think. My question is whether it is your intention, when using the terminology "claimant" in all the new language, and it is used several different times, whether you intend... whether you intend to include within that of claimant those transactions that would definition normally not be within the regulation of the Department Agriculture, but do arise from a financial obligation due from a person which is subject to regulation by Department. I am referring, for example..."

Vinson: "Okay. Let me... Let me make... Let me respond to you in this fashion. Number one, the language defining claimant is unchanged in the proposed concurrence that we're

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

I no change in the... discussing. make in that The... As a result of that, litigation definition. that may currently be underway is going to determine what that is and what that definition is and whether that definition covers the particular categories you're talking about. I would not attempt to say that, when I'm not even addressing that definition, that this Bill will have any impact on that. My personal belief, my personal belief on reading the language in the Act is that where dealings are had with the collateral in question, whether those dealings are regulated or not, the collateral in question triggers the operation of the Act and the set of priorities."

Brummer: "Well, the... the statement that you're not... altering the definition kind of begs the question, because the word *claimant*, as defined there, is used repeatedly in the new language that is a part of this Bill. And my question specifically deals with the issue of whether or not, when grain is sold from one grain dealer to another, not involving a producer, to whether or not the priorities established under this Amendment #2 Cover transaction."

Vinson: "What I am saying to you is that that is a question that is fully litigable under the old Act, under the current language. That's... That issue would be litigated under the definition of claimant, and the definition of claimant is not being changed in this particular concurrence under consideration; and, for that reason, I don't believe that anything I can say can affect the legislative history, the legislative intent, so as to affect the issue that you're talking about. I am saying to you that it's my personal belief, after having read the language and based upon my understanding of the intent of the first Bill, not this Bill, but the first Bill, that the collateral in question

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

is what triggers the priorities, not whether or not the particular transaction in question is a regulated transaction.

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Brummer: "Yes, I would urge Members to examine this legislation very carefully, particularly those individuals that include within their constituency farmers. Without a doubt, we are decreasing the protection to farmers with regard to sale or storage of grain. I think no one will dispute that. We have had numerous problems arise as a result We've had the rather notorious grain elevator failures. Wayne 'Crites' case in Missouri which, of course, we cannot control, but which I think triggered this legislation, the original legislation, 2505, last spring in the first place. And now, that legislation has been the law for some number I know of no instance where a of months. institution has failed to extend credit to a grain elevator as a result of the passage of the original 2505. been a great deal of dispute within the legal community as to whether or not the financial security of the lending institutions was jeopardized in the manner that some small minority of the Bar feel that it was. In any event, credit has been continued to be extended to grain elevators, and I think it will continue to be extended. Some of the financial institutions have threatened to cut off their extension of credit, but I would suggest to you financial institutions, being very cautious, if they really felt their credit was... was a bad risk in the first place, would not have continued to lend to these grain elevators as they have had for the last number of months. additional thing I think is very important to point out and that is that we are giving greater status to the lending

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

institution who has a warehouse receipt, or maybe not even have a warehouse receipt but expects to get a warehouse receipt within 21 days, than we are to the farmer who simply goes to the elevator, sells his grain and receives a check for the sale at that time, but that check later turns out to be an NSP check with insufficient funds to pay that check. I think everyone will agree that that farmer ends up being a class 2 creditor behind the farmer who has grain stored and behind the financial institution which has lent money to that elevator and not even having received warehouse receipt yet, but expecting to receive a warehouse receipt within 21 days. We are putting the farmer in a poor condition. I would suggest, under this legislation, that any sense of fairness and equity would ever justify. In fact, I would suggest we are putting the farmer under a poor position who is selling grain. We are putting him in a poorer position than he ever was prior to the passage of the original 2505. I... I think this is a poor concept, a It jeopardizes, once again, the farmers in bad concept. relationship to elevators that fail, and we ought not to... we ought not to adopt a Conference Committee or ... we ought not to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Robbins. Yes, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I have the dubious distinction of being the Sponsor of 2505. One instance that they're speaking of — in Effingham County, 'Seamer Milling' Company had trouble getting a loan because of the misunderstanding of the Bill. An honest warehouse receipt is not changed by this Amendment. A fraudulent warehouse receipt is not covered by this Amendment. This is a clarifying Amendment. It was brought forth in Committee to mean these things by the Department of Agriculture, and I urge every one of you to vote 'yes

- 144th Legislative Day

 for this Bill; because, I am... I am now a full-time
 farmer, and it will not hurt me."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn.

 Representative Sam Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Peters: "Question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?'. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Vinson, to close."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would simply move for a favorable Roll Call on this concurrence, because failure to do so may substantially impair the credit of elevators in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Peters: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2501? . Those in will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the Take the record. On this question there are 109 record. voting 'aye', 34 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ronan 'aye', aye. Order of Concurrence, House Bi11 2517, Who's screaming? Representative Representative Davis. Brummer. Yes, Sir."
- Brummer: "I have a deep suspicion the Chair will rule my request untimely, but I was calling for attention. I had my light on with regard to a verification on the last vote, and I would so request a verification."
- Speaker Peters: "Mr. Clerk, is the Bill in control of the House?

 It's gone? House Bill 2517, Representative Davis."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Davis: "Your suspicion was absolutely correct, Representative Brummer. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...ve have two Senate Amendments on House Bill 2517, noncontroversial. This was the conforming legislation to executive order #1 last year creating the Criminal Justice Information Authority that stalled itself in Senate Rules Committee and is now The two Amendments are very good. They are technical in nature, that add in the Administrative Procedure Act to the to the Criminal Justice Authority and change appropriations process for that organization. I recommend it to you as a noncontroversial 'aye' vote."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion?"

Davis: "And I would move for concurrence on Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Peters: "Any discussion? On this, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It has just come to my attention, I think we ought to at least clarify the record, that with regard to the prior Bill, that it was never declared by the Chair that it had passed, and I...I think at least it ought to be in the control of the House until it is passed. And since that declaration has not been made, I would request a verification with regard to the vote that was on the...on the Board concerning Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Peters: "The Clerk informs me the Bill was declared passed by 109 to 34. With the additions of Representatives Ronan and Catania it makes it 111 to 34. Senate Amendment \$2 to 2501 passed. Representative Davis, any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments \$1 and 2 to House Bill 2517?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, the voting is open. Have all voted who

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 153 voting "aye", 1 voting "nay", none voting "present", and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2517. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Do we have Krska's thing? Senate Bill 60 is now on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Krska."

Krska: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the appropriate rules so that we may immediately consider Senate Bill 60 on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Peters: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Peters: "Proceed, Sir."

Daniels: "How many votes does this take?"

Speaker Peters: "Parliamentarian advises the Chair it is 107 votes."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the Bill that has Amendment #2 which is a validation Amendment, and Amendment #3 which is a World's Fair Amendment, which Amendment as printed would give the taxing Authority for a state tax for the World's Fair. And without further explanation, I would oppose this Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative...Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk tell me the name of the Sponsor of Amendment #2?"

Speaker Peters: "Representative Krska."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman, I am sure that

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Mr. Krska, on the record, could state and pledge that he intends to withdraw Amendment #2, and then to offer Amendment #3, which provides the framework for the creation of a World's Fair in Chicago. Amendment #3 has been distributed and is available. It is a two page Amendment, very clearly provides that there shall be created authority for the purpose of conducting a World's Fair in Chicago in 1992 and provides for the method of appointments of the members of the Board. Twelve would be appointed by the Governor, 12 to be appointed by the Mayor, and a Chairman to be appointed jointly by the Mayor and the There is no provision for a taxing Authority to this autho...to this agency. There is no provision for There is even no provision as to the bonding Authority. powers that will be granted to the Authority. This was done so that we would give to the proponents of the World's Fair evidence to be used in Paris on behalf of the application of the Chicago World's Fair, that it is intention of the Illinois government, as expressed by the Legislature and the Governor, to provide for the legal framework to conduct the Fair. The promoters of the Fair feel that the passage of the Bill, signature by would be good evidence that could be used on behalf of the application for the Fair Authority. same time, by not providing for a taxing mechanism, by not providing for any mechanism for bonding Authority, or power of the Authority, we are mandating that the promoters of this fair return to this Assembly and the Governor sometime next year or the following year so that they can properly equip that Authority to move ahead with the Pair-I d like to state for the record that I was given a copy of a Bill that did provide for taxing Authority and bonding Authority, and I indicated that I

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

would not be willing to support that Bill at this time. As a matter of fact, I was unwilling to support the Bill as it is now. But, I was prevailed upon by Mr. "Ayres", Mr. Thomas 'Ayres', who is one of the Fair promoters, and Mr. Frank 'Considine', one of the Fair promoters, to support this legislation so as to facilitate the application before the International Fair Authority."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it would be a great thing for the State of Illinois to have the World's Fair in Chicago in 1992, and I think it is something that we certainly should work on and discuss, possible a Fair to all the people of the State of and if Illinois than to support the World's Pair. However, I want to take exception to the previous Gentleman's comments. \mathbf{If} you look at Amendment #3 and read Section 3, it sets up the Authority for the implementation of a state tax. Ιt creates the World's Fair Authority as a body corporate in politic and a political subdivision of the state. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, until more about what's involved here, how much it is going to cost the people of the State of Illinois, what kind Authority they are going to ask in their taxing, I, for one, am going to oppose this. And, I might also suggest reference in history, in history to the last World's Fair. In our research, we refer to 1932 when there was appropriation for \$350,000 for buildings, followed in 1934 by an appropriation for \$1,000 to investigate what happened to the money."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Further discussion?

Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "In explanation of my vote, Mr. Speaker, and anticipation that this Bill may not pass, my earlier

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

comments clearly reflect my position and role in this matter. And in conclusion, I would like the record to clearly show that I have supported this effort as an expression of the support that I will offer to the creation of a World's Fair, and I would hope that this record of my support can be helpful to the promoters of the Fair and their work in Paris. Thank you."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Representative Brunner."

I think the...the World Body that makes the decision about where the World's Pair is going to located is meeting right now, or going to be meeting before we come back here in January. In examination of this Amendment #3 - as Representative Daniels, as a lawyer, clearly knows. He has read this. - gives no authority to this body. It simply creates the body, and the body cannot act without further implementation of authority. It would to me that if we are interested in promoting seem additional business, addition tourism in Illinois, we safely do so with the enactment of this very simple Resolution, I mean this simple Amendment, creating Authority, and we can subsequently...subsequently give them the authorization to, and the powers, to do the things that we later decide to do, whether that is taxing, whether it is bonding, whether it is the expenditure of funds. Those items can all be resolved later. That decision is now being made. It will be made this month, as I understand in Paris, and we ought to express our indication of a desire that we have located in Illinois, the World's Pair, and we can do so here."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Rbbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote. I, too,
am one that would agree with Representative Daniels on

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

this...on this subject, and certainly nobody in this House or in the entire State of Illinois would want to diminish possibility of having a World's Fair in Chicago. It certainly would be a benefit to the State of Illinois, taxpayers and everything else the money would generate. But what's wrong with the... with which we can put together Resolutions, and Resolutions and Conference Committees? Let's have a Resolution stating, not in the statutes, but a Resolution stating that we support this to give these people over there negotiating in whatever it is, stating the backing of this Illinois House and the Illinois General Assembly, you know. And we've still got time, as rapidly as things can be put together in the Legislative Reference Bureau, let's have a Resolution to give these people to support this."

Speaker Peters: "Further discussion? Representative Jaffe." Jaffe: "You know, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it is sort All we hear from the other side is cries and of funny. whales about business being so bad in Illinois, and finally we go out, and we're going to get a World's Fair, which will bring a tremendous amount of commerce particular state. And all of a sudden, for partisan reasons, the new Leadership on the other side of the aisle suddenly wants to sit on his hands. I must tell you that that really is a hypocrisy really in its worst form. You if you're really interested about business know. in Illinois, and if you really want to bring commerce you ought to vote for something like this, and Illinois, you ought not sit on your hands and only vote for for the rich. It is about time we did bring some programs into Illinois, and it is about time the other side understood that particular aspect. Thank you very much." Speaker Peters: "Have all...Further discussion? Representative

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Ronan."

- Ronan: "Just, Mr. Speaker, to clarify a point. I just want to make sure everyone on the other side of the aisle realizes that if they do want to follow the Leadership on that side, they should follow their mayoral candidate, Bernie Epton, and put a big green vote on the Board so that when Bernie is Mayor next year, we can all support him and have a great World's Fair in 10 years."
- Speaker Peters: "Representative...no? Okay. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yes, I have carefully read this Amendment, and Section 3...thank you. Section 3 simply creates a Chicago World's Fair Authority as a body corporate in politic, a political subdivision of the state and a public instrumentality. This is not a home rule jurisdiction, clearly, and as a result, any powers it would have would have to be delegated to it by this Body. There are no such powers set forth. So, I see no authority here for this Body to tax or do anything at this point, and I think we should support this."
- Speaker Peters: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question...Representative Krska."

Krska: "I'd like to poll the absentees."

- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. The Gentleman asks a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson, Balanoff,
 Deuster, Garmisa, Huskey, Katz, Leinenweber, Macdonald,
 McBroom, E. G. Steele, Vitek and Winchester."
- Speaker Peters: "On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Representative Telcser."

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're going to have to wait, I understand, a few minutes for some more Conference Committee Reports to be printed and distributed before we can finish up the business of the evening. I think there are just two or perhaps three other matters in reference to this. So I wonder, Mr. Speaker, Members, if I could take just a few moments to express to you something which came to our minds just this afternoon."

Speaker Peters: "The Members...may I have your attention please?" "It came to our attention this afternoon that today will Telcser: probably be, unless there is a Special Session called for some reason yet unknown, or unless there is some sort of difference of legal opinion, but that today will be the last day that the Speaker of the House will be serving in the Assembly. It seems that...please note the affectionate cheer, George. Yes, I'm talking about you. I'm going to tell them everything you asked me to. It seems...it seems that the constitutional officers are to be sworn in two or three days prior to the adjournment sine die of the current General Assembly and the swearing in of the one which will serve for the next two years, the 83rd. So, Mr. and Members of the House, I wonder if I could just take a couple of moments to, first of all, wish George and Lynn well in their new life serving as constitutional officers in Illinois. Just as most of you, we have come to know George, to work with George, appreciate George, and develop a very, very great feeling of warm affection. I know that...George, please. I recall some ten years ago in Dick Ogilvie's campaign when I first met George. us were area Chairmen in that election, and we developed a very fond, warm friendship during that time period. just as most of you, it took a while to get to know George and to warm up to him, because as someone said in one of

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

the newspapers, 'When it is all said and done, George is really just a teddy bear. Where is Laura Lynn? Is she So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I simply here? want to add my personal congratulations to George and to and to say what a wonderful, wonderful Laura Lynn experience it has been for me, not only to serve with George in the House of Representatives, but to count George Ryan as one of my closest, dearest personal friends. I sincerely believe that this great institution benefitted greatly from George's two year term as Speaker, and indeed during the 10 years in which he has came to this House with a great deal of the House. Нe knowledge about government. Having served on a county board, having been a businessman, George came well equipped to represent his constituents in the Kankakee area. He rose to the great post of Speaker, and in handled a very, very difficult two year Session in a magnificent fashion. All of us are avare of the controversial issues which we faced. All of us are aware of the fiscal crisis which we faced. And in my view, George Ryan handled all of those issues commendably. handled them as an outstanding leader and as an outstanding friend. George, I think that each and every one of us will miss you greatly as a colleague in the House, but we're all delighted and pleased to know that you will still be with us as a constitutional officer. George, I personally want to thank you for your close personal friendship. I will treasure the ten years we have already had, and I hope that God gives us many, many years in the future. I think I speak on behalf of the Members of this Assembly, when thank you for your time, your effort, your friendship, and each and every one of us will be looking forward to many, many years of association with you both in and out of

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

government. So, George and Laura Lynn, God bless both of you. I hope that God gives you both the strength and energy to carry on with the wonderful, wonderful work which you're performing in the area of public service. George Ryan, we all thank you very, very much for everything you've done for us and for the people of Illinois."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak to the performance of George Ryan as a Legislator and as a Speaker, and then after that, I'd like to share privately with anyone my current thoughts on Representative Daniels."

Speaker Peters: "Let the record show that the House laughed heartily."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, George Ryan and I have certainly had our share of differences, especially during this last Session of the Assembly. But at the same time that we have differed greatly on issues and procedures, we have managed through 6 years to work with the Governor and with other officials interested in the great issues which face our state today and which impact upon all of the people that we represent. Many times, the resolution of those issues did not please everyone, many time, the resolution of those issues did not please many people at all. But, we have served here in We have served here when we have been difficult times. asked to solve great problems, great problems such as education funding, transportation funding, governmental reorganization. And this service has occurred at a point in time when there has been a deterioration in the lines of authority that exist in this Legislative Body. You all know that you cherish your right to serve here as individual, and you cherish your right to make YOUT

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

individual judgments on every piece of legislation that comes before you. But, you should understand that as each of us moves in the direction of individuality, it makes the job of Leadership that much more difficult, because it is much, much more difficult to develop and mill the concensus of thought on any particular issue. So during these turbulent times, I think that George Ryan has served Many times, he has been the only one who his Party well. attempted to serve his Party well. I think, and I sincerely. I'm not trying to be critical. I mean that sincerely. I think he has served his Governor And for all of the time I've known him, and I'm sure for all of his life he has served his family and his that constituents very well, and I wish to say to George now that I have no regrets at all concerning the relationship that I have had with him for the last six years. too, wish him the very, very best for both he and his family in their future life. Good luck, George."

Speaker Peters: "Speaker Ryan."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, first of all, I would like to say thanks to each and every one of you. I understand that the reason that Telcser made the speech, he wants me to resign on the 10th, is that you will have to deal with him for two days, Mike. He assumes the duties of the Speaker, and now I know why he's in a hurry to get me out of here. I appreciate all of the kind things that have been said, and I am glad, Mike, that at the end of the Session, you've finally realized what it was really all about to sit in that Chair, because you're going to set there shortly. From everything I heard, I think that's probably going to be the case. Laura Lynn and I have had a great 10 years here. The State of Illinois, the people of this Assembly have been...and the people of our Legislative District have been more than

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

kind and good to us, and I hope that we have returned that in service to both the State of Illinois and to the...to the district. And so I leave with a bit of sadness, but certainly with a bit of joy knowing that I've had 10 years here, and that I'll still just be a stones throw away on the second floor, and I'll be back every year for appropriation and remind all of you people of the kind things that were said here this evening. Mike was gracious during the course of the day's negotiations, and we finally worked out the program, and that's why we're here at seven o'clock. But, Mike, you've got a big job ahead of you, and I certainly want to wish you the best and understand what you're talking about when you talk about the lines of Leadership and everybody wants to go their own And, you're absolutely right. That has probably way. deteriorated to a point that it shouldn't have, but I that with the forceful hand that you govern with that that will all gravitate right back to the Chair, like it did when you sat there for Redmond. And so I again say thanks to my colleagues, and friends, and both sides of the aisle. I've had some great relationships here, and both Laura Lynn and I thanks...to each and every one of you again, we'll be back to see you. Thanks very much."

Speaker Peters: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Leadership team on the Republican side would like to invite each and every one of you into the Speaker's Office immediately for a toast to the Speaker and Mrs. Ryan. We have approximately, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, about a half of an hour's time until the next Bill is ready to be placed before the Members. I also would like to personally thank the Speaker for the pins that we all received on the 82nd General Assembly. So if you all have a moment, you

- 144th Legislative Day

 can join us in the Speaker's Office for a toast to Speaker

 Ryan and Mrs. Ryan."
- Speaker Peters: "The House...the House will be at ease for little...less than...less than a half hour. I'd say 15, maybe, to 20 minutes, and then we will return for the concluding two or three pieces of business."
- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order, and the Members will be in their seats. On page two under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 730, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House accept the amendatory veto on Senate Bill 730. What it does, it amends the Personnel Code, where previously, if the Bill passed, that the Personnel Department would be able to determine the positions based on geographic area, job location, Department or other appropriate categories. The Governor felt that this was unduly...with unduly limit in which they were able to apply for jobs in the public sector, and that's all the Amendment does. And I move for its acceptance."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Collins.

 No, no? Is there any discussion? The guestion is, 'Shall
 the House accept the Governor's recommended changes with
 regard to Senate Bill 730?'. All in favor will signify by
 voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.
 Clerk. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 45
 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having
 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Representative Krska, would you come to the podium
 please? Sorry about that, Myron. Messages from the
 Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

*Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report and requests a Second Conference Committee Report to consist of five Members of each House to consider the differences of the two Houses in regards to Amendments #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1127, action taken by the Senate December 3, 1982, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti, would you come to the Clerk's well there a minute please?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while there is a lull in the House, I would like to ask leave. Yesterday we had a Resolution, House Joint Resolution 114 that was read. A Member of the House celebrated his golden anniversary. He happens to be here tonight. I would like to have the Clerk read it in full. Will the Clerk read the House...Senate Joint Resolution if there is no objections?" Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 114. Whereas the institution of marriage is one of the cornerstones upon which our society is built; and whereas, Mr. and Mrs. Walter McAvoy, 6033 South Richmond, Chicago, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary; and whereas,

this celebration of this joyous occasion included a dinner party with the members of their family at the Old Barn Restaurant in Burbank, Illinois. Whereas, Walter and Mary McAvoy were joined together in matrimony on November 19, 1932 at St. Rita Church, 63rd and Fairfield, Chicago, and together they have been pillars of their community in southwest Chicago where they have resided during their entire married life, including the past 19 years at their present address; and whereas, Mr. and Mrs. McAvoy have actively involved themselves on behalf of many worthwhile community, civic and humanitarian causes important to our

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Whereas, Mrs...Mr. McAvoy affectionately community. called Babe by his friends and acquaintances served for 31 years in the Legislature as a State Representative where he earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues and his outstanding work; and whereas, the McAvoys are proud of their daughter, Patricia, and son, Tom, who followed his father's footsteps bу being elected the State Representative from the 27th District earlier this vear: and whereas, the attainment of this honorable milestone attests to the endurance...strength of their marriage and is properly a joyous occasion worthy of note by the State of Illinois. Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 82nd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that we extend our heartiest and most sincere congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Walter McAvoy on the celebration of their wedding anniversary, and that we wish them well for a marriage long continued in happiness and peace. And be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. and Mrs. McAvoy with the respect and regard of the people of the State of Illinois and the Members of the General Assembly."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Ryan: "The Gentleman for the adoption Speaker noves of the...Senate Joint Resolution...Senate Joint Resolution All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is The Senate has refused to adopt Conference adopted. Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1127, and the following Members are appointed to the Conference Committee on Senate 1127. For the Second Conference Committee, Representative

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

McAuliffe, Representative Telcser, Representative Terzich, Representative Getty and Representative Stanley. Republican side, former Representative John Hirschfeld from Champaign County. John, welcome back. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, if I may. I understand we are totally at ease, and that we do have a few moments, so I would like to, if I may, kind of bid a farewell to the 10 years that I served in the Illinois General Assembly. I first came down here, served under Bob Blair, as the Speaker of the House. Since then, we've had two more Speakers, had four Governor's election. Things have changed a lot. I can seriously tell you that 1972, we packed for five days when we left home. We didn't know whether we were going to be in Session two days, three days, four days, or through the weekend, and we did all of it. I was here when Dick Hart put the Amendment to the House rules that said that the best thing we could do was to put all of our Amendments on toilet paper so we could recycle them. I was here when Don Deuster said we should change the rules for congeral visits, but I do have a few suggestions that I think might be...might help this House become a little more efficient, and I would like to go through a few of those points, if I may. First of all, I would like to salaries set at about \$60,000. Now, that's the good news. The bad news is I think that we would be much efficient in doing the business of this House if we reduced it by about \$250 a day for every day we're in Session. think that would reduce it a little bit. I might also help if we took about \$1,000 off of that salary for every you introduced, and I'm sure the Committees wouldn't nearly

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

meet so long. Perhaps our system of electing Leadership could be improved if we said the Speaker of the House would be drawn at random from everybody in their sophomore year. Now, that way you'd know a little bit about the system, but you wouldn't owe anybody anything just yet. Maybe the Majority and Minority Leader might be the same thing, only random from the freshman class, because they don't need to owe anybody yet. Third for reform I think might help a little bit would be a special order business every morning about 7:30, and we'll just entitle it explanation of vote. everybody would start at 7:30, and we'd quit at 8:00, and you had to explain your vote simultaneously. that might cut down a little bit on our overall workload. Number four, I would think that if the newspapers were prohibited from making any direct quote from any one person, we probably would get out of here much sooner. Now, they could say it was said, but they just couldn't say who said it. I have served down here for 10 years. I've served with Clarence Neff, the guy that sits on that side the aisle, and my brothers buy all the John Deere machinery and finance his campaign every time. I've served 10 years with Tom McMaster, one of the finest Gentlemen this House, who, frankly, marries all the Democrats or has his daughters do it and turn them into Republicans and wins elections that way. I've grown to really love this place, and I mean that sincerely. We oftentimes say that it is one of our greatest experiences. But the first time I ever voted in a Democratic primary, I won it. I've been enough to be here ever since that time, until now, and I have sincerely enjoyed the relationship with every man woman that served in this Body. The finest group of people that have ever set foot in one organization, I feel, have been in the Illinois General Assembly. It is with a

144th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1982
- deal of pride, and humility and a lot of mixed emotions that I go. But I tell you, I thank you, and I would like to make one very special request and I see that Zeke is looking at me Zeke, I'd like to come down here next Session and lobby to see you finally legalize the neighborhood card game for sure. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move to reconsider the vote by which Mr. Krska's Motion, in regard to immediate consideration of Senate Bill 60, was defeated."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves...the Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 60 failed. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion prevails. Representative Krska. Turn on...Just a minute, Representative. Just a minute. Okay now, start over."
- Krska: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move to withdraw Amendment #2 and to adopt Amendments 3 and 4."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the immediate consideration of Senate Bill 60...expend and ex...suspend the appropriate rules. 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 146 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 60, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to amend Sections of an Act to legalize and validate the appropriation Bills and tax levy ordinances.

 Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 lost in

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Committee."

Speaker Ryan: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Krska, amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Krska on Amendment #2."

Krska: "I withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Ryan: "Withdraw #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Krska, amends Senate Bill..."

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

Krska: "I move to adopt Amendment #3."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 60. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Krska, amends Senate Bill 60 as amended."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? Representative Krska on Amendment #4."

Krska: "I now move to adopt Amendment #4."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #4? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor will signify by saying "aye", all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Ryan: "Third Reading. Representative Krska."

Krska: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to suspend the appropriate rules so that we may immediately consider Senate Bill 60 on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman now moves to suspend the appropriate rules for the immediate consideration of Senate Bill #60.

Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave granted. Senate Bill #60, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 60, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

of an Act to legalize and validate the appropriation Bills and tax levy ordinances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Krska on Senate Bill #60."

Krska: "Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate a favorable vote.

Let's get it across."

- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall...Representative Daniels on Senate Bill #60."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as stated before, many of us support the creation of the Chicago World's Fair in 1992 and support that facility in the great City of Chicago. We, of course, had concern and objections to the reference to the potential taxing authority and the creation of a political subdivision. That language has been removed. We believe the Bill, as presented to you, represents our affirmation of the concept of the World's Fair in Chicago that can be placed before the people in Paris for their consideration, and we certainly hope that it is successful, and I would support this legislation."
- Speaker Ryan: "Now, is there any further discussion?

 Representative Krska to close."
- Krska: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know this is a lengthy night, and I appreciate everything that has been done for this Bill. I'd greatly appreciate a favorable vote from all. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 60 pass?'.

 All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Isn't democracy wonderful? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 157 voting 'aye', 1 lost soul...Representative Smith, do you seek recognition? 157 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

- December 3, 1982 144th Legislative Day passed. Great job, Representative Krska, nice job. I • m explanation that did it. Tired. was your Representative? The Clerks are in the process o.£ distributing the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill give you a few minutes to look it over. 1678. We can There are 25 copies available to each side. It is 100 and odd pages long, and...you ready to go? Conference Committee #....Supplemental...on House Calendar under the Order of Conference Committee Supplemental #2, appears Senate Bill1678, Reports Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1678, I'd first ask leave that the rule be suspended that they have to be on the desk one hour...is it...one day rather."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman asks for leave to suspend the appropriate rules..."
- Matijevich: "It seems like June 30th. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a supplemental appropriation Bill of various appropriations and reappropriations and transfers which total out to 5.1 million in GRF, 42...869.8 thousand in federal funds, and \$114,648,000 in other funds totalling out to \$162,648,400 and some dollars. I would move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1678."
- Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."
- Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this
 Bill was explained in particular in conference, so that the
 Members know that three items have been added, which were

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

not explained in conference, and those three items are as follows: to the Capital Development Board to complete the Chicago office building and the revenue center here in Springfield; secondly, funds to make emergency structural repairs for the vocational center here at the capital; and finally, a federal fund transfer for the Department of Human Rights as a supplemental to continue helping and reducing the backlog of cases. Those three items were items that were included since it was all explained in the Conference Committee, and I would join my colleague, Representative Matijevich, in urging support for this appropriation measure."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative

Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With fear...with fear repidation at this late hour, I want to address the Section 3 on page two there. We thought with the mayor and our county...with the mayor, and our county board and our planners and everything, that we've made a real pitch for the prison in Joliet, and I'd like to have somebody explain to me any rationale at all for the 2.5 hundred...2.5 dollars in Section 3 for...from million the Capital Development Board for the planning, and land acquisition, and utilities and state improvements for the corrections...facilities at Danville. Now in Joliet, ¥е already have a couple of facilities. We have the sewer. electricity. ¥е have the And even more have the land. We're talking importantly, we land...land acquisition in the Chicago area, and by the Governor's own criteria, he said it should be...are you listening, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Ryan: "No."

Van Duyne: "Is anybody else? Well, I feel it is my duty as a

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Representative..."

Speaker Ryan: "Proceed, Representative."

Van Duyne: "I feel it is my duty, as Representative Davis also—

I know he believes in the same thing — that it is my duty
to point out this. Harry would too, if he was here. But,
we have a duty to perform here in this House, that we have
2,100 acres of absolute prime land already owned by the
State of Illinois, which would cost in our neighborhood,
and even closer to Chicago, 10, 15, 20, 30,000 dollars an
acre. We would not be incumbered by this 2.5 hundred...2.
million...2.5 million dollars if the Governor would have
chosen Joliet as the site for the new prison. And so
therefore, if you won't listen to me, and if you don't
care, at least I am going to put it on the record I am
going to vote against this, and I think Matijevich ought to
help me out."

Speaker Ryan: "I'd like to take a moment for a personal privilege and introduce on the Republican side, Betty Giorgi, in the chamber. Welcome...Zeke's daughter. On the Republican side. Nice to have you with us. Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. understand that in this supplemental appropriation are some \$60,000 for the operation of a new Commission in the Governor's office. \$60,000 is a small piece of change, especially when we're looking at cuts that will 164,000,000 over the next seven months. But \$60,000, I think, is an important symbol, a symbol that this should not, at this time, support the Governor's proposal to create a new Commission to study the problems facing problems of discrimination in the private sector in the state is one that he is well within his rights to make. But to ask at this most inopportune time to create a new

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

bureaucracy, to create a new agency, when we're talking this same week, this same day, about major cuts government services, seems to me as to be a slap not only at the legislative prerogative, but also a slap at all the people State Government is supposed to serve. presently a Commission on the Status of Women, a Commission 20 years old, a Commission that knows how to investigate the problems that face women in the state, a Commission that has a proud record in this Legislature and in finding support from the Governor's Office for his proposals. Commission is already in place. If we need further study, that Commission was the appropriate place to put extra dollars, were we able to find them. In fact, this House passed an appropriation of \$50,000 to do a study of comparable worth to find out why women are paid so much less than men in State Government employment. That \$50,000 ends up finally being 10, \$10,000, not 50, because we couldn't afford the additional 40. I think for the Governor to decide to expand his budget by \$60,000 duplicate the work of the Commission on the Status of Women, to find these extra dollars when we're taking dollars right now out of the hides of people who are recipients of public aid, of the children in our school systems, is a slap at the people of the State of Illinois, and I hope this House will say 'no'."

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

Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. All of you with whom I have been privileged to serve during the last ten years will remember the efforts that we have made on this House floor and over in the Senate to be sure that we had adequate funds for our Legislative Commission on the Status of Women. If we have \$60,000 to spend to address

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

the needs of the women of the State of Illinois, I think it should be appropriately be spent in that Commission. leaving that Commission in January when I leave the Legislature, so it is not money that I would hope to be able to spend. But that Commission would know how to spend it and would do it well. This is a Pirst Conference If we are coming back on January 12th, Committee Report. we can do a Second. We should take out that and some other items that I know others of you here object to. It is not fair to try to railroad the 177 Members of this Body into voting for something that they don't want to vote for, just because the hour is late, when we know we shouldn't vote for it. The Governor should live within his means, just as he says all the rest of us should. He wants to reduce the agencies of State Government by 2%, but he doesn't want to live within the budget that he said he needed last spring. I think he ought to be asked to do that. But if we do have \$60,000 to look into women's problems, let's give it to the existing Commission on the Status of Women, our Legislative Commission, that will do the job right."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I have been around the Legislative Body here long enough to know when the wheels are greased, and when a Conference Committee Report is going to be adopted regardless of objections that may be stated here on the House floor. But, I suggest to Governor Thompson that he has a way of redeeming himself with this Conference Committee Report, since we have earlier today given him the authority in the Emergency Budget Act of 1983, to make reductions and appropriations within state agencies that he should follow his own best example and decide that a good portion of that

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

cut should come from his own gubernatorial budget. The item that has been mentioned to you is one that should not be there at this time. And that, I think, would be his way of showing the citizens of the State of Illinois his good intentions to keep the cost of government under control. I feel sure that this Amendment...or this Bill is going to pass, but the Governor can still make the remedy by deleting the funds for this duplicative Board that has been set up under his office, and I hope he will take that advise."

- Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's Motion prevails.

 Representative Matijevich to close."
- Matijevich: "...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope, too, the Governor takes your advise after we adopt this Conference Committee Report. I would move for the adoption of the Report. There comes a time, as they say, when you got to do what you got to do. So, I would urge that we put the 107 votes on the Board. Thank you."
- Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1678. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'.

 Representative Chapman to explain her vote."
- Chapman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier this day we voted for emergency powers for the Governor which he asked for, because, thank goodness, he has recognized the serious fiscal condition of this state. I think it is a very poor example, at this time, for the Governor to be asking for \$85,000 additional

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

dollars for his office, and for the Lieutenant Governor's Office to be provided with \$105,000 additional dollars, all from the General Revenue Pund. This is the kind of example that is not appropriate in these days when we are asking the school children to tighten their belts, the health providers to provide less services, when mothers with little children are being limited in their ability to take care of those children through a lack of needed day care services. I believe the appropriate vote is to vote 'no'."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Levin to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, because I have a direct conflict of interest with respect to one of the provisions in this Bill, I will be voting 'present'."

Speaker Ryan: "Anybody else like to explain their vote? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 129 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and this...Yes, having received a Constitutional Majority, the House does accept Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1678. On House Calendar...Supplemental Calendar #3 under the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 889, Representative Irv Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill does a couple of things. It provides the reciprocal arrangement to allow employees to maintain their seniority after being transferred from one statutory merit system to another, and it allows employees going from a position not under the Personnel Code to a Code Department to retain all accrued vacation, sick leave, overtime, compensatory time and personal days. I move the adoption."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative, for the purpose of indicating legislative intent, the question of seniority is not directly addressed in there. I assume it is not your intention to confer any seniority status on a person who would be transferred from a non-Code Department into a Code Department. Is that not correct?"

Smith: "That is correct. The answer is no."

Getty: "Thank you."

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

Smith: "This will clear up some of the ambiguities that we have in our Personnel Code. I think it is a good thing, and I move the adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 889. 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 134 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 10 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 889 prevails. Senate Bill 1127, Representative Terzich. Supplemental Calendar #3, Conference Committee Report."

Terzich: "Hey, sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker...one more time on Senate Bill 1127. This was the Bill that we previously passed amending the Chicago Policemen's Pension Fund and also the Chicago Firemen's Pension Fund. This just passed the Senate by a Majority vote, and I would urge your support in adopting the Second Conference Committee Report. I went over the Bill a previous time, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he will."

- Catania: "Representative Terzich, is here...is it your intention that this Bill would apply equally to widowers as well as widows?"
- Terzich: "The...the Bill provides the post-retirement benefit is for the retiree, and the...the hospitalization benefit is provided to the annuitant, that they do have...you know, whether it be male or female, so it...the hospitalization benefit is applied to the annuitant."
- Catania: "Alright, that Section applies equally, and I would hope that Section 5-147.1 also would apply equally, according to your intent. That's not what it says in the Bill. It says, 'widows double annuity. If any widow receives any annuity from the fund' and so forth. Is it your intention that it also applies to widowers?"
- Terzich: "That's correct. It's genetic, and, Representative

 Catania, you know I've always been a supporter for the

 generic or genetic or whatever the hell it is, but I'm for

 you. Just like Jill, generic."
- Catania: "Well, you know, in accord with the Equal Rights

 Provision in the Illinois Constitution, it's not

 constitutional unless it applies equally to both. So, you

 do intend that it apply equally to both."

Terzich: "It certainly does apply to both."

Catania: "Marvelous, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "You have my word that applies to both, Representative Catania."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

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

I know this is the Second Conference Committee Report.

It's really no better now than it was in the First, as far

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

as I'm concerned at least, and I just want to remind the Members that they're voting on here in terms of this \$55.00 and \$21.00, 60...whether you're age65 or whatever. will remind the Membership that the funded percentage this particular pension system is 42% without the impact of this, which I think is something like 1.5 or 1.6 million dollars, that police and firemen can retire at the age 50. I want to tell you the two most important aspects of this Bill. It is the forerunner. When you do Chicago, or Dekalb or anything, any downstate police and fire, once you do this in the pension system, you can rest assured that within the next two years, it is going to apply or the effort will be made for every pension system. Now, we are talking about millions and millions of dollars out of General Revenue Fund. And if you look at page ten, look at page 10, it says the basic monthly premium for each annuitant shall be contributed by the city - in this case, I guess we're talking about Chicago - from the tax levy prescribed in Section 6165 up to a maximum of going on about the \$55 and the \$21 contribution. But I want to read out of the Constitution of this state Article XIII, General Provisions, Section 5. It says, *Pension and retirement If you'll bear with me, there's four lines. rights. *Membership in any pension or retirement system of the state, any unit of local government, or school district, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, shall be...shall be enforceable...an enforceable contractual relationship, the benefits of which shall not be diminished or impaired. you vote for this, you're looking out there in the next two years applying to every pension system in this state of which there are five where the state has responsibility, and 400...between 4 and 500 downstate local police and You're talking about millions and millions of fire.

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

dollars. The young people out there, my vote is still 'no'. It is because you're going to be...when all these people that retire step across the threshold, I don't know where those dollars are going to come from, but I'm going to vote 'no', and I hope some of you will join with me."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion? Representative Van Duyne, you want to try again?"

Van Duyne: "Well, nobody...nobody wants to give the General Assembly credit for anything, so I keep trying, George, all the time. Representative Terzich, could you just give me a succinct answer as to the net effect...what you took out of the Bill...out of the First Conference Committee Report is?"

Terzich: "No, not really."

Van Duyne: "What?"

Terzich: "No, I couldn't."

Van Duyne: "Well, then take it out of the record till you and I could have about a two hour conversation if everybody wants to stand around. I think that you took out the General Assembly one more time. It seems to me like we're always — if you'll allow me this comment — it seems to me like we're always put in the position for voting for everybody's pension, and whenever there's a mention of the General Assembly being included in that pension, why we get in a real big hassle. Then we go back to another Conference Committee Report, and we always come out with the General Assembly out. Am I fairly accurate?"

Terzich: "Well, Representative Van Duyne, being that I am sort of an advocate of certain pension benefits, I have introduced General Assembly retirement benefits, changes and so forth, but the General Assembly saw fit not to adopt those Bills."

Van Duyne: "On page two..."

Terzich: "I am a...I am a Member of the General Assembly

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

retirement system."

Van Duyne: "But you're also the Sponsor of this Bill."

Terzich: "I am the House Sponsor. It was a Senate Bill."

- Van Duyne: "Alright, well, you're the guy explaining the Bill, so

 I want you to answer me. Why did you take out page two?"

 Terzich: "I did not take it out."
- Van Duyne: "Well, the Committee or...the Conference Committee took out the whole thing from page one starting with Sec...line 30, Section 2-110 starting with service...quote, service, end quote. All the way..."
- Terzich: "I believe that...I believe that was the problem with the Bill, and the Conference Committee wanted to take it out."
- Van Duyne: "That's all I'm asking you, and I want everybody to see that there was a provision in there to allow Legislators and General Assembly Members to perpetuate..."
- Speaker Ryan: "Representative Van Duyne, I believe that your questioning is probably out of order. We're not talking about Conference Committee Report #1. Direct your questions to Conference Committee Report #2."
- Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, that's not true. I asked him what the difference was between the Conference Report 1 and Conference Report 2, but he won't answer. And I am trying to point that out, and I think pointedly...I am being pointedly honest about it, and he won't answer. And I'm trying to make a point to everybody within earshot that we are not getting zero, or I should say we are getting zero out of this. And I think that was the whole idea, and I resent it myself. I think we're entitled as well as any policeman, any fireman, any conservation authority or whatever. Thank you. And by the way, I am going to vote 'no', and I hope about 100 more do, too."

Speaker Ryan: "Further discussion?"

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "Well, in turn, Representative Van Duyne, you are more than welcome to submit that Bill yourself, and I will certainly vote for you. So...and I will vote for that, Representative Van Duyne. But in conclusion, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did mention to the...the Bill to you before that these are benefits. The three percent is a benefit that the...every system in the State of Illinois, except the Chicago police and fire, have received the three percent post retirement benefit. This is limited. It is only limited to the people who were born before January 1, 1930. The hospitalization was agreed by the Pension Board. It is simply the City of Chicago's pension system. They have adopted this concept that is limited to the 55 and \$21, and I would certainly urge your support of Senate Bill 1127 by adopting the Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Ryan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2 on Senate Bill 1127. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'.

Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to explain my vote in favor of Senate Bill 1127. Now, I don't think there's a Member on this floor who has been as concerned as I have been about others who participate one way or another in certain pension systems and about salary levels for anyone who serves in government, including ourselves. And I fully wholeheartedly supported this Conference Committee Report the first time around, and I am very disappointed that there is nothing in there for Members of the General Assembly. And I, in fact, have supported over the years every reasonable proposal that would help Members who are in our system, but I don't...if

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

we failed to adopt the First Conference Committee Report, and we lost, and we lost. And why should we let someone else who needs the benefit fail to receive that benefit simply because someone else in another system wasn't able to gain something at this same time? I don't think that's fair. I think that the reason this Bill passed...this Conference Committee passed the first time around was principally because we wanted to do the right thing for policemen and firemen and the people who are participating in that system. And I still feel that way; and therefore, I'm still supporting this Conference Committee Report, even though I am indeed disappointed that General Assembly Members may be out."

Speaker Ryan: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House adopts Conference Committee Report #2 on Senate Bill 1127. No. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the Bills of the following titles: Senate Bill 1248 together with House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1248. Action taken by the December 3, 1982.4 Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Further Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House passage of Bills, the following titles to wit: House Bill 1047 together with attached Amendments hereto, an which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Amendment #1 to Bill 1047, passed the Senate as amended December 3, 1982.

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Further Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted attached Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1652, adopted by the Senate December 3, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption...Amendment...Bill, the following title: Senate Bill 1324 with House Amendment \$1 to Senate Bill 1324, action taken by the Senate December 3, 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

- Speaker Ryan: "We'll have to stand at ease for a couple of minutes till we get a message from the Senate. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1315, Hannig; 1316, Yourell; 1317, Zito; 1319, Pechous; 1320, Braun et al; 1321, Smith Oblinger; 1323, Sam Wolf."
- Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1315 by Hannig, Greenville Comets football team experienced their greatest football season in the history House Resolution 1316 by of Greenville High School. It ... the Oak Lawn Fire Prevention Bureau, led by Yourell. Chief Fire Inspector Lieutenant Ron Murray, who was honored on November 2, 1982 by the Illinois Fire Inspectors' Association as having the most outstanding fire prevention program in the State of Illinois. House Resolution 1317 by Zito. On November 1982, the family of Dave and Ellie Stachura received a new member, six pound, nine ounce, 20 1/2 inch tall baby daughter named Crystal. Resolution 1319 by Pechous. It has come to the attention of this Body that a festive Christmas party will be conducted at the Cabin Restaurant in Berwyn, and we commend

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

and congratulate the attendees for the yuletide spirit of caring for their fellow men which they exhibit every day of the year. House Resolution 1320, Braun and all Members, Samuel A. Goldsmith will celebrate his 90th birthday on December 13, 1982. House Resolution 1322 by Smith and Oblinger, that Phil Schmidt, Principal of Lanphier High School dedicated his life in service to his community, and we express our sincere thanks to Phil Schmidt for the service and leadership he has provided at Lanphier High School and its students. House Resolution 1323, Sam Wolf. On Saturday, August 7, 1982, George Musso, the son of a Collinsville coal miner was inducted in the National Pootball League Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Wolf on the Agreed Resolutions."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With...in regard to House Resolution 1323, which recognizes the induction of George Musso into football's Hall of Pame, I would simply request leave of the House to have all House Members added as Cosponsors of the Resolution and move for its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, if you'll wait, we'll get it adopted. Leave is granted to add all Members. Are there any objections?

Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Conti.

Representative Conti moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Conti: "I move...I move for adoption."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Conti moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On the Calendar on page two under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears

144th Legislative Day December 3, 1982

Senate Bill 1180 for the children. Representative

Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 1180 allowed the Chicago City the House. Council to levy a pension contribution liability tax for the purposes of making a pension contribution on behalf of employees of the Chicago Board of Education. And when we passed it, it was limited to not exceed .48% of the equalized assessed value...value of tax property in City of Chicago. The Governor's recommendations are that the Chicago Board of Education may levy the pension contribution liability tax in an amount that is equal to or less than the total amount abated from taxes levied by the Chicago School Finance Authority. And the Governor has limited this pension contribution liability tax to the fiscal '83 budget. And as...this is for the education of the children in the City of Chicago, and as the late Mayor Daley said when he came down here to address us on the same issue, he said, *Please vote for that Bill, because it was for the kids. And this Bill is for the kids. I would ask a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any discussion? The guestion is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1180 by adoption of the All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', Amendment?*. all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 129 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', and 8 voting 'present'. having received Constitutional Majority, a prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 1180 by adoption of the Amendment. Death Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1322, in respect to the memory of

Delores Rivera, sponsored by Representative Kelly - et al.

Rouse Resolution 1318, Topinka, in respect to the memory of

Robert Boharic."

- Speaker Ryan: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, 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 Resolution is...are adopted. Further Resolutions? Adjournment Resolution. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution #117, 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, December 3, 1982, they stand adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1983 at 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Ryan: "The House will now stand at ease until we get a Message from the Senate. I would suggest that most people stand at ease for just a minute. We may be back in here in the morning. The House will be in order and the Members will be in their chairs. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, first I'd like to move to adopt the Adjournment Resolution, which was read just prior to our recess."
- Speaker Ryan: "Read the Resolution again, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution #117, 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, December 3, 1982, they stand adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1983 at 10:00 a.m."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I now offer and move the adoption of the Resolution."
- Speaker Ryan: "Hold on. I have the President of the Senate

144th Legislative Day

December 3, 1982

here."

- Telcser: "That's okay. We're not going to adjourn now. Just adopt it."
- Speaker Ryan: "The President of the Senate wishes everybody a safe journey home and a happy holiday. How's that? He apologizes for the delay. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let me first, on behalf of Speaker Ryan and Representative Madigan wish all of you a very happy, joyous holiday season and hope that the New Year brings all of you good luck, health and prosperity. And, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand adjourned until Monday, January 10 at 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Ryan: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned until January the 10th."

01/10/83 09:53

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

IPTION OF DEBATE INDEX PAGE

1

DECEMBER 03, 1982

HB-0900	CONCURRENCE	E	PAG	E 26
HB-2501	CONCURRENC	Ė	PAG	E 29
HB-2517	CONCURRENC	E	PAG	E 39
SB-0060	SECOND REAL	DING	PAG	E 57
SB-0060	MOTION		PAG:	E 25
SB-0060	MOTION		PAG	E 41
SB-0501	THIRD READ	ING	PAG	E 3
SB-0730	HOTION		PAG	E 52
SB-0889	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 66
SB-1028	MOTION		PAG	E 7
SB-1127	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 10
SB-1127	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 67
SB-1180	MOTION		PAG	E 75
SB-1267	MOTION		PAG	E 4
SB-1539	MOTION		PAG	E 5
SB-1614	MOTION		PAG	в 6
SB-1652	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 18
SB-1678	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 60
SJR-0107	ADOPTED		PAG	B 2
SJR-0114	ADOPTED		PAG	E 54
SJR-0114	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	B 53
SJR-0117	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	E 77

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER PETERS	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR PAUL PLESNER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS IN CHAIR	PAGE	3
RECESS	PAGE	8
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	8
RECESS	PAGE	9
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER BYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	9
REPRESENTATIVE PETERS IN CHAIR	PAGE	10
RECESS	PAGE	52
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	52
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	52
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	73
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	74
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	76
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	78