145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived the House will now be in Session. We will be led in the invocation by Clerk Jack O'Brien."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Let us Pray. Lord Bless this House and all those who serve and work here. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amen. We will be led in the Pledge to the Flag
 by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of
 America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation
 under God, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all."
- Speaker Greiman: "Boll Call for Attendance. Mr. O'Brien may be the most popular of all the givers of prayer because of the brevity of his prayer and his understanding of the Members. Mr. Bowman."
- Bowman: "Yes, I think we should invite Mr. O'Brien, back more often to delivery the invocation for the House. I think we are very welcome."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk take the record. 116
 Members having answered to the call of the guorum, there is
 a quorum. Page three of the Calendar, on the order of
 Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1538. The
 Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that a Second

 Conference Committee be struck for the perusal of Senate

 Bill 1538."
- Speaker Greiman: "A Second Conference Committee will be appointed. On page four of the Calendar, on the Speakers Table appears House Resolution 364. Ms. Zwick. Ms. Zwick. Out of the Record. On the Speakers Table appears House Resolution 837, Mr. Giglio, 837."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 837, is a very simple Resolution.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

For those of you in the Chicago Area, if you recall the editoral we've seen on Channel 5, I believe it was, pertaining to the dangers of the wire glass in the schools in our... in our area. And there was quite a bit of investigation, and what this Resolution does is ask the Fire Marshall, Capital Development Board and the Board of Education to look into the School Code within the buildings and to advise up-dating the Building Construction Code for the health and safety of our children of public schools. That is all it does. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, has moved that the House do adopt House Resolution 837. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 837.' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Concurrence, on page two of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2649. Page
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2649, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Capitol Development Board together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2649 appropriates \$4,525,100 to the Capitol Development Board for its fiscal year '85 ordinary and contingent expenses. The original Bill had appropriated \$4,699,400 to CDB..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, let's take this out of the record for a little while. We will get back to you, Ms. Barnes. On the order of still photography a group of unindicted

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

co-conspirators appears to be on the floor. Returning to the Speakers Table on page four of the Calendar, House Resolution 906. Ms. Younge. Ms. Younge. Out of the record. On the Order of Speakers Table, on page four of the Calendar, appears House Resolution 961. Mr. Giglio: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 961 asks that the Illinois Board of Higher Education conduct a study to determine the need for additional Illinois State Engineering School. includes in the study of possible programs for minorities. especially programs located in universities with large minority enrollment. And it asks that the Board of Education report back by January 1st of next year. is going on, not only here in our State, but all over in our Country, the schools of engineering are just not available to those people who want to get in and who's marks are just about right there, but there is no room because there is not that many facilities. In my area a lot of the children that want to go to University of Illinois up in Chicago and also Champaign, they don't have enough room and they are forced to go to the engineering school out of state at Purdue. Also a lot of the students from the south side of the City of Chicago, and I talked to some downstaters throughout the whole State of Illinois. So what it does, it actually is going to them a job between now and the first of the year to look at the School of Engineering to see whether or not we need additional facilities to help provide the room for the students that want to go to Engineering School."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook has... Mr. Giglio has moved that the House do adopt House Resolution 961. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel."

145th Legislative Day

- July 1, 1984
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield to a question, please?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for a question."
- Piel: "Representative Giglio, I notice with the Amendment #1,
 You... the Amendment basically states that it is going to
 concentrate on schools in Illinois. Now, first of all, is
 this just universities?"
- Giorgi: "Well, the Illinois Board of Higher Education is going to conduct a study for all of the schools. Just universities. If you are thinking about like TCC, no."
- Piel: "No, the question is that I have though your Resolution, is this dealing just with universities, or is this grade schools, high schools."
- Giorgi: "No, no, just universities."
- Piel: "Just universities. Okay, then Amendment #1 states that
 the schools have to be predominatly minority. What
 universities in Illinois are predominate minority."
- Giorgi: "Well, I think if you look at the Chicago State at 95th and King Drive, that was one word we just changed at the bottom."
- Piel: "So basically the Resolution just deals with one school in the State of Illinois, correct?"
- Giorgi: "No, No, No. It is for... if we have to and they feel that additional space is needed and the School of Engineering should be at SIU or Western or Eastern, we will let the Board of Higher Ed determine that."
- Piel: "Well, that is the reason I am getting to. I was wondering
 why we went with Amendment #1 that brought in
 predominate... schools with predominate minorities, instead
 of a large minority populations. Large minority
 populations could cover a more broad spectrum than a just
 ones that are predominate minority."
- Giorgi: "Well, those that are minority seem to be the ones that

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

are not reaching that plateau of being right there with the so called extra point that they need to get in and the doors are closed. And they are forced to either change their curriculum or, like in our area, they are forced to go over in the State of Indiana to the University of Purdue."

- Piel: "I have no further questions."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, quickly to close."
- Giglio: "I would just ask that I have a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 961?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of the Speakers Table, page four of the Calendar, appears House Resolution 1159. Hr. Giorgi, 1159."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think that is now number 1176, is it not?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, I don't know. 1159 is next in the Order on the Calendar. Mr. Giorgi, Mr. Giorgi, do you have your staff person there? Proceed."
- Giorgi: Speaker. Resolution... it's now House Resolution 1176. 1159 was taken out at the request of the Republican Leadership who suggested the changes in 1176 that we have adopted. What this does is it asks the Department of Insurance, the House Revenue Committee and the State Treasurer to conduct a study as to maybe having an in-house Organization handle the annuities that we have to buy to pay off the millionaire winners of the lottery. Now, this is agreed upon by most of the people involved in this lottery endeavor, and I urge the adoption of this Resolution."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1159. And on that, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, that is what he did, but I think what he is trying to tell us is that we should not now be considering 1159. We should go to the Order of Motions and recognize Representative Bullock on House Resolution 1176. Isn't that what you're... Yeah. So, I think that is where we should be. It's on the same subject matter."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, well, Mr. Bullock is out of the chamber for a moment or two, so maybe we could take the whole thing out of the record and we will come back to you.

 Unless... Well, there is a Bullock in the chamber, but it is the wrong Bullock. Alright, we will return now to the Order of Concurrence, page two of the Calendar. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2649. Mr. Clerk.

 Wait, Mr. Giorgi, Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we table House Resolution 1159, because we are going to go, later on, with House Resolution 1176."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman moves... asks that..."
 Giorgi: "1159, be tabled."
- Speaker Greiman: "... House Resolution 1159 be tabled. Does the Gentleman have leave? He has leave, and House Resolution 1159 is tabled. Now, again, on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2649. 2649. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2649, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Capitol Development Board together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After some discussion, I have decided that I would

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

like to nonconcur in House Bill 2649 and would request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook moves that the House do nonconcur to Senate Amendments #1 thru 13 of House Bill 2649. All those signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in House Bill 20... in Amendments to House Bill 2649. Alright, on the Order of Speakers Table, page four of the Calendar, appears SJR 13. Mr. Terzich. Mr. Clerk, it is SJR. Mr. Terzich."

"Yes, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. SJR 13 creates a Special Joint Committee to recommend courses that bridge the gap in communications between young people and the seniors. Out in our area at the Curry School that we have a problem with the communication of youngsters, especially teenagers, not knowing what the problems are that are facing the senior citizens and this Resolution would go a long way to look into the area and see if we can gap the difference between the teen-agers and the seniors. We know that there is many fine teen-agers out in our communities and our schools and this would Special create a Joint Committee to recommended courses for young people and seniors to bridge communication gap between them. The Committee shall report it's recommendations to the General Assembly as soon as possible, and I think it is a certainly a worthwhile endeavor. And I would appreciate your support on SJR 13."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. Moves that the flouse do adopt Senate Joint Resolution 13. On that is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask a question, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for a question, Ms.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Pullen."

Pullen: "Are there any public members appointed to this or are they only Legislator Members."

Terzich: "I understand that the Special Joint Committee shall be six Members of the House of Representatives, three appointed by the Speaker and three appointed by the Minority Leader and also from the Senate in the same manner."

Pullen: "And that, that is the limitation to the Membership, right?"

Terzich: "Excuse me?"

Pullen: "That is the limitation of the Membership, that is all there are?"

Terzich: "That is correct."

Pullen: "Therefore, this is not a Commission by subterfuge? This
is a normal way of doing business, a Special Joint
Committee of the House and Senate?"

Terzich: "That is correct, under our new Bills that we passed.

This is simply a Joint Committee. There is no Commission involved."

Pullen: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that this is a joke. It couldn't possibly be an actual Resolution because it will be seen in the press as the creation of another Commission after we have just abolished a great number of them last night. Secondly, the subject of the study is one that this General Assembly can do absolutely nothing about communication between young people and older people is something that is of a personal nature and not something that needs any study whatsoever. I just have to believe

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

that this is a practical joke on July 1st."

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

Mr. Terzich, to close briefly."

Terzich: "Well, again this is not a Commission. It was intended. It is no joke and it is not subterfuge as some people think. It's amazing how ... what evil thoughts some people have. If you read the Resolution, it simply says a Joint Committee. There is no funds available that it would out of the funds, whatever is available in that Committee or in the Speaker's appropriation or in This is a certainly something that should be looked into. It has worked successfully out in our all it is is certainly a feasability to bridge a important gap between our seniors and our teen-agers have today. It is a good program. We simply want to look into it and see if there is some recommendations to further this program throughout the State of Illinois. And I would appreciate your approval."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate

Joint Resolution 13?' All those interested signify by

voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open.

This takes 60 votes. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr.

Ewing, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think all of us are somewhat uneasy about this type of Resolution. The Sponsor may very well have a good idea. It is a Joint Committee, not a Commission with public members. But I would certainly suggest, if you want to like that, that you clear it with this side of the aisle, particular when we have just gone through a agonizing time trying to rather ο£ do away with Commissions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Oblinger, one

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

minute to explain your vote."

- Oblinger: "It won't take me that long, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The gap does not exist between teen-agers and senior citizens. The gap exist between teen-agers and their parents age group. That is where you ought to be looking, not to us older people. We get along fine our grandchildren. It is the children and their parents that need to be examined."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, one minute to explain your vote."
- Terzich: "Well, it is unfortunate that when someone has certainly good intentions that they look at it as generating another Commission, that the Resolution simply is a Joint Committee which simply Nembers of the House and the Senate. study a course that is devoted to study all of the areas of inner generational and interaction which would be of great value to every citizen and youngster, young and old in the State of Illinois, and if that is a problem with this Legislature to look into such a worthy cause, then I feel sorry for all of the degenerates who think it is all another Commission. We went through that yesterday and I kind of resent the fact that you think that it is another Commission or anything. There is no money involved in this and it is certainly an area that we all should be concerned of, rather than taking a negative attitude."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 44 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' 16 voting 'present', and the House does not adopt Senate Joint Resolution 13. Mr. Clerk, is there a Sponsor for Senate Joint Resolution 51? How about 77? On the Speaker's Table, page five of the Calendar, appears Senate Joint Resolution 129. Mr. Curran, the Gentleman from Sangamon."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Curran: "This is Senator Davidson's Motion to congratulate Frank
 Matsler for his fine work in the field of education. I
 move for adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Curran, moves that the House do adopt Senate Joint Resolution 128. And on that is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 128?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no', and in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of the Speaker's Table on page five of the Calendar appears Senate Joint Resolution 130. Mr. Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Senate Joint Resolution 130 congratulates the good people
 of Palos Heights on their 25th anniversary of it
 incorporation. I would move for it's adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Do you have one for the bad people or just for the good people? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves that the House do adopt Senate Joint Resolution 130.

 On it is there any discussion? Mr. Eving, the Gentleman from Livingston."
- Ewing: "Just courious. These are both very innocous Resolutions, why they were not on the agreed list?"
- Terzich: "That is a good question. I didn't even know it was on this list, let alone on the agreed list. I really don't have any answer."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ewing, the reason is we never did the Agreed Resolutions. And so they have to go on the Calendar the next day."

Ewing: "I see. We did some yesterday."

Speaker Greiman: "These were filed later."

Ewing: "Please, include the Republicans in Palos also. I understand that there is quite a few of them."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "All in favor of the House adopting Senate Joint Resolution 130. Say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and SJR 130 is adopted. On the order of Speaker's Table appears S... Senate Joint Resolution 131. Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 1 would set up a Joint Intergration Maintenance Study Committee, consisting of twelve Legislative Members, three each by the Leadership. The Committee is directed to a study the effect and legality of intergration maintenance plans in Illinois, to conduct public hearings in order to accomplish its task and report findings and recommendations for the Legislative solutions to the General Assembly on or before January 1, 1985. There is no money involved in it. Basically this Senate Resolution was developed with the realtors and it's the Legislative way of looking at and hopefully solving some of the problem, a block by block resegregation, to look at the laws to make sure that we are in compliance with federal. local and fair housing laws and to review our law, relative to intergration maintenance programs and effect on the real estate industry. I would be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook has moved that the House do adopt Senate Joint Resolution 131. And on that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing." Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, This is very similar to 113, a different subject matter, but it does the same thing. It creates a Joint Committee and it does not have public members it has not been discussed with the Leadership on this side. I think until it is, until it is agreed to by the Leaders, we shouldn't be willy-nilly creating Committees... Joint Committees. And I would ask

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen, I am going to support this, but all I am going to say is I can see a trend developing in future Sessions. Now that we have eliminated Commissions, I can sense that we're going to have Special Joint Committees to study iust everything and I would hope the Leadership will start to look at that. Maybe we ought to adopt a rule that type of Resolutions ought to at least go through Bules Committees of both Houses or something because we are going to have a proliferation of study committees on just about everything. In the future we're going to another problem. Just because we got rid of Commissions, that is not going to solve all of our problems. So we had better, in the future, start looking at this type of procedure."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Lady from Kane, Ms. Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker would the Sponsor yield for a question, Please."

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Zwick: "May I ask you how this particular Committee differs from a... or what used to be known as Commission."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane, have you surrendered? I don't see
you back there Oh, Mr. Keane, okay. Mr. Keane, did you
hear the Lady's question?"

Keane: "No, would you please repeat it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Zwick, would you repeat your question?"

Zwick: "Certainly, I would be glad to. I was wondering how this particular issue or structure that is contained in Resolution 131, differs from what is or used to be known as

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Commissions."

Keane: "There is no money involved. We have a definite termination date, and the subject is such, if you read the Resolution, that it's... there is a set amount of things to do. There is a number of things to do. This, by the way, was cleared, to my knowledge, with Daniels, Lee Daniels last night."

Zwick: "Is it your intention for expenses of the Members to be paid? For meetings and whatnot."

Keane: "I am sorry. Would you repeat the question?"

Zwick: "When a Meeting of this Select Joint Committee, or what ever it is called is... takes place, do you intend to pay the expenses of the Members of this Joint Committee?"

Keane: "No, it will be down here and it will be done in the regular... regular course of events. There has been a number of these. Representative McGann had the High Risk Infants that cost, you know, no money. None of the Members were reimbursed or things like that. We took it out of... it was a regular staff time."

Zwick: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, or to the Resolution."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Ms. Zwick."

Zwick: "First of all, I contend that there is no such thing as any Committee or Commission that does not cost money. There are going to be expenses involved. There is going to be staff time involved. I believe that we set a precedent here yesterday, passing the Bill that we did reorganizing state government to a certain extent, and dealing with Commissions and with the abuses that were found therein. There is a milieu of Resolutions that is appearing on our desks suddenly creating all different kinds of entities to take the place of Commissions. I think that this something that has to be worked out between all of us and between

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

These ha ve Leadership. not been cleared through Leadership, and I would like to see this defeated. I think have to sit down and talk about some of these things. ¥e. cannot continue to qo on just alternatives. There may be a place within state government this function, but it is certainly not by introducing Resolutions on the floor of this House daily and debating the issue of Commissions. I think that we ought to accept the fact that Commissions are no more. The public has have gone along with their feelings and implemented what I believe is true reform, and let's get on something positive instead of just trying to continue them in another form. I would like a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three points about Senate Joint Resolution #131. The first point is..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Excuse me. Let us give the Gentleman our attention. Mr. Vinson, Proceed."

Vinson: "The first point is that what the Minority Leader said last night was that he would look at Senate Joint Resolution #131. The Second point is that earlier in General Assembly, in the first Session, the Minority Party, be the Majority Party in this General Assembly. offered a set of rules as alternatives to the Democra+ rules which would have strengthen the Committee System in this General Assembly and in this House particularly. There was a series of rules that would have had the affect of enormously strengthening the Committee system. that out of the philosophy that if we don't strength the Committee system, there is no way to keep control αf this government, no just the General Assembly, but this government at large. The third point is the reason why offered the Commission reform we did, and insisted on it,

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

was that Commissions have done great violence to the Committee system. Now, I finally want to summarize where we are on this Resolution by saying that if we do create trillion Joint Committees to study problems, you are doing every bit as much damage to the Committee System with Commissions, and you are creating a situation were there cannot be Systematic organized study of the problems facing government. You cannot have a General Assembly which is capable of operating as a functioning board of directors controlling the Executive and Judicial Branches that is the essence of our problem with Commissions. is the essence of our problem with the way the House operated, lo these many years, and that is why we against this Joint Committee. We believe that there is a Judiciary Committee in this House. And it could admirably study this problem. It could probably do it better with a Republican Chairman. For those reasons, we oppose Senate Joint Resolution #131 and other efforts to create Joint Committees where there is not a legitimate reason for a Joint Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Keane, Representative Keane, will he yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Huff: "Representative Keane, can you tell me, very succinctly and very candidly, what is this? This is suppose to be the replacement of the Commissions we just done a way with."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane."

Keane: "No, this is to address what some people feel is a pretty important problem, especially in the City of Chicago, where we have had block by block resegregation. We've had

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

neighborhoods going from white to black, from black to Hispanic and we have not had in, especially in Chicago and I am sure it is happening in other areas, we have not had..."

Keane: "Well, just a minute. Just a minute."

Huff: "No, you asked the question and I am answering it. We have not had what you would call an integrated society. There are many federal, state, local laws which go to help or hurt that, and this was a thing that was worked out by the Illinois Board of Bealtors, who felt that if there should be a solution, we should have someone look at the laws that exist. See if they need to be modified, changed or whatever, left alone, and if there is something we can do,

it. If there is nothing, we wouldn't do anything." Huff: "Well, you lead me into something else. What do you I wanted to talk about the replacement of resegregation? the Commissions. You talking about resegregation... where we have we had an overwhelming, long-lasting all abiding sphere of neighborhood of integration that we have to be worried about resegregation? But, never mind. Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, for all we changed, for all the more we change, is amazing, Ladies and Gentlemen, how little we change at all. I wanted my esteemed colleague, Representative Vinson. pointed out three facts about this Resolution. just want to point out one. One is, like in the past when we had Commissions adopted, it was the Leadership in both Houses who selected the Memberships, who selected the amount of money and almost told us what the hell to do. notice at the end of this Resolution we haven't changed process at all. We still are going to rely on the Leadership to pick the participants. Let me ask you this, Representative Keane, are there going to be any Minorities

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

on this Commission that you are talking... I mean this Committee that you are talking about that is going to investigate resegregation?"

Keane: "The Besolution states that there will be twelve Legislative Members, three by each of the Leadership."

Huff: "Yes, right, see you cannot even answer that question because it is not in your purview to answer it. Ιt going to be the Leadership that is going to do the picking. Are they paing to pick Representative Huff οг Representative Brookins or Representative Berrios. I doubt I doubt that too. Ladies and Gentlemen, if really serious, and I agree with those that say we need to strengthen the Committee process. We do have a lot of problems in our neighborhoods, but this is just gossamer. This is smoke. It's not going to result in any tangible recommendations that we will subsequently act on. probably be kept in the Speakers drawer. If we are serious about strengthening the Committee process, we should do the way the Congress does. We should give that power to the Committee Chairmans with an adequate supply... I mean with a adequate reserve of funds and staff to go out investigate problems such as resegregation, if serious. I think we should vote this down and we a Committee, since we been in... I mean as a Committee of the Whole since we been involved as a Committee of the Whole, with this issue, we should come back here next Fall and certainly next year and give some serious consideration to the process of strengthening our Legislative Body."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Wolf: "Representative Keane, under Senate Joint Resolution 131,

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

would you say that rather than this being considered a Commission, that it would be considered along the lines of an ad hoc Committee, a process that we have used many times in the past and probably will continue to use many times in the future, to address a particular problem or a particular issue."

Keane: "Yes, I would. There is no... there is no... there is no staff involved. There is no hiring of staff. We will take the staff, as we do, out of our regular... our regular staff will staff the hearings. There is no money involved. It's not a kind of a thing... this kind of a Committee is not the kind of Committee that people want to get on simply because of travel or any other such thing. It is going to be a working Committee and therefore... and it is going to terminate at the end of this year. And it is very ad hoc."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Krska."

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

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question be put. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say 'nay', and in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Keane, to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer a few of the previous speakers, we presently have no mechanism for Joint Committees. If there is a major problem, according to some who spoke earlier, we are going have to go with our Committee system. Unfortunately, our Committee system does not have a... we don't have a Joint Committee system, and our Committee systems, if, in fact, they are going to replace ad hoc Committees such as this, have a long way to go before they do that. We have not had a tradition of doing that. It may develop, in terms of developing strong subcommittees, but I haven't seen it and until that time,

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

can't put important issues such as this on the back burner. There are a massive number of laws, federal, state and local. There are many, many real estate practices that are involved. The realtors have asked... have joined in this Resolution and hope that they can get a practice, that they can come out of this with some It is a very important... it's a very important that the Committee ... that this Committee would address and I don't think that we should get it involved are we going to look at ... what is more important? Is it more important for us to address important issues or is it more important for us to look at structure, which at this time does not exist. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate

Joint Resolution 131?' All in favor signify by voting
'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 60 votes. Voting
is now open. Mr. Ropp, the Gentleman from McLean, to
explain his vote, one minute."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. T think what we are really talking about here is a very important procedural matter now, as a result of legislation that we passed earlier today. The fact of the matter instead of having Joint Committees like this proposal is suggesting, it seems like any proposals like this ought specifically direct which Standing Committee to чe currently have within this chamber giving that Committee the direction in which to come forth with factual material. I think that would be much better because it really looks like we have turned on ourselves as a result of action we have taken earlier today to begin this same process all over. Certainly this chamber needs to knowledgeable of different concerns throughout the state,

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

and to set up a separate group again, certainly, does not even speed up the Legislative process, as if we would have a particular Committee that would study it and then could move it through the normal hearing process within that Committee. And I urge that this be redrafted so that we can still pursue it, but put it in a particular Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted a wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.

- wish? Have all voted a wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 30 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present', and the House does not adopt Senate Joint Resolution 131. On the Speaker's Table, Bills previously called, appears House Resolution 364. Ms. Zwick, 364. The Lady from Kane, Ms. Zwick."
- Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 364. is a recommendation that came successfully of Executive Committee dealing with into higher education practices, as far as hiring and employment of teaching staff at the colleges. What it does is request information being sent to the Commission on the Status of Women, as long as they exist, informing them of the numbers of women employed as teachers, as compared male employment as teachers, So that they can compute those figures and monitor them closely for equality and job employment. I would ask for your positive vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Kane has moved the House do adopt House Resolution 364. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 364? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. and the House does adopt House 364. On the Order of Motions, on page five of the Calendar, appears House Resolution 1176. 1176. the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. Alright, Mr.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Bullock."

- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On our Calendar is the Motion for the Body to consider House Joint Resolution (sic House Resolution) 1176. This Resolution was filed after some considerable debate yesterday regarding the possibility of having the Department of Insurance, in conjunction with the House Revenue Committee and the Treasurer of the State of Illinois, to undertake the study of the feasibility of investing lottery proceeds for lottery winners. I would like to have the matter considered by the full Body, and so the Motion would be to bring it before the floor for immediate consideration. I would urge an 'aye' yote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman... well, this... On the Order of Motions appears a Motion which Mr. Bullock now makes to move to bypass Committee and place this Resolution on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call?

 Leave is hereby granted. Now on the Resolution, Mr. Bullock, 1176."
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. As I indicated previously, House Joint (sic - House Resolution) 1176, would allow the Director of the Department Insurance, in conjunction State Treasurer's Office and the House Revenue the. Committee, which has already established the Subcommittee this purpose, to undertake a study, as to the for advisability and feasibility, of allowing proceeds, lottery proceeds to be invested for the winners in this particular know of no opposition. The Amendment was instance. I amended, at the request of the Minority Leader, to include the Director of Insurance and the Treasurer's Office. would urge adoption of Resolution HJR (sic -

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Resolution) 1176."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1176. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1176?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'... yes, Mr. Terzich. Were you seeking recognition?"

Terzich: "Yes, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, I am sorry. I didn't see you're seeking recognition. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "This does have the support of the Minority Leader, did you mention?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "The Minority Leader requested amendatory language and we included it and we would presume that he no longer has objections."

Terzich: "Well, this won't start another Commission, will it?"

Bullock: "No, Sir, there is a Subcommittee of the House, Revenue Committee, which I chair, which is on bingo, lottery and games and chance. That Committee could function and I don't think the Director of the Department of Insurance would need any additional expenditure in this regard, and I doubt seriously that the State Treasurer's Office would have any additional expenditure."

Terzich: "Oh, then in other words, there wouldn't cost any money
to make up any reports or take up any of our important
employees of the State of Illinois, their time or energy.

That costs money but..."

Bullock: "Well, I think there maybe a nominal or minimal cost, but it would be covered in the ordinary and contingent expense of the House operations, and, certainly, in those two code Departments... the code Department of Insurance and the Executive Office of the Treasurer."

Terzich: "Well, I was just wondering what vehicle the Minority

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Spokesman would have for, to set up new Commissions, so I guess if they are for it, we can support it."

Bullock: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I am sorry. I missed the purpose of this group."

Bullock: "Representative Brummer, the purpose of House Joint

Resolution (sic - House Resolution) 1176 as amended is to

establish a study through the House Revenue Committee, in

conjunction with the State Treasurer's Office, and the

Director of the Department of Insurance, to determine the

feasibility of providing payments to winners in the

Lottery..."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Bullock: "...Through the investments and other type of deferred compensation or distribution of funding apparatus."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, The question is, 'Shall the House... Oh, Mr. Ewing. Mr. Ewing, your light was not... Alright, now it is going. Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "It's blinking back here."

Speaker Greiman: "It is blinking on my console now. Proceed."

Ewing: "Thank you, thank you very much. I really believe that probably the reason for this special Subcommittee, the Revenue Committee, has some merit, but I wonder, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, why we elect a Speaker, why we have a Committee Chairman, if we are going to come in here and, by Resolution, set up our own organization for the operation of this House. Let us take this matter to the Speaker, to the Minority Leader. Let's have agreement. Let's have appointment of a Subcommittee by the Chairman of the Revenue Committee. Why should this Body take on itself, organizing itself, every subcommittee. Ladies and

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Gentlemen, we shouldn't pass these. As the wake of doing away with the Commissions, we should not be passing these. We should let the Leadership of the House, we should let the Committee Chairmans operate. I was Chairman of the Revenue Committee. I know that they have Subcommittees and that he can appoint Subcommittees, and he can do it with the agreement and the approval of the Speaker. And that is the way it ought to be done. And in that regard, I think we should put a 'no' vote on this Motion."

- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Ar. Bullock, you have already closed.

 Do you want to close again?"
- Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I would like to just bring to the distinguished Representative's attention. Representative Ewing, this Resolution does not, under-score does not create any additional Subcommittee. does not create any additional task force, does not any additional Commission. This Resolution authorizes the House Revenue Committee. the Directors Ωf the Department of Insurance, the State Treasurer's Office, undertake a study which can be done without additional or appreciable expenditure to come back and let us know of the advisability and feasability of deferred payments under some investment plan to lottery proceeds winners. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1176?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. On page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, appears Senate Bill 2400. Mr. Bowman... out of the record. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, page two, appears House Bill 2509. Mr. Clerk read the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2509, a Bill for an Act in relation to senior citizens and certain boards and commissions. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is House Bill 2509, which I think at this point has a record for the number of times it was taken out of the record. If you recall, it was sent to Conference Committee to remove the references to the three Legislative Commissions, which we have, since this went to Conference Committee, abolished. Those were the State Council on Nutrition, the Recreation Council and the Pension Law Commission. addition, the Conference Committee Report In makes a change with respect to the reference to consumer member on the ... in terms of the Illinois State Museum. That's all it does. Otherwise, it is the same as we the same way we sent it to Conference Committee. And I ask for the adoption of Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2509.

And on that, the Lady from DuPage, Ms. Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for question."

Karpiel: "Representative, in the Conference Committee Report #1,
is that what you are referring to?"

Levin: "Yes."

Rarpiel: "It says that it takes out the Recreation Council, the Pension Laws Commission and the Council on Nutrition. In the original Bill, there is a whole bunch of other boards and commissions and as the Bill passed Senate, the Violent Crimes Advisory Commission was also added to the Bill. Now, you are deleting only the Recreation Council, Pension

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Laws Commission and Council on Nutrition. Are all the rest of those Commissions and Boards still in the Bill?"

Levin: "Correct, the..."

Karpiel: "Well, if they are, are they still in existence?"

Levin: "Yes, these... the three that we took out in Conference Committee #1 were the three Legislative Commissions. of the others are either Executive Boards and Commissions or the Violent Crimes Commission is a Commission of the Attorney General. which we set up last year. appointments that are made by him. So what we... Leadership on both sides of the aisle ask that this Bill go to Conference Committee to remove the three Legislative Commissions which were about to abolished. All of the others are. as I say, either Executive Boards and Commissions or, in the one case, the Attorney General's Committee."

Karpiel: "Alright, thank you. One other question. Why was the Health Facility Planning Board eliminated from this Bill?"

Levin: "Okay. Well, that was done in the Senate. And that was done at the request of the Medical Society."

Karpiel: "Why was that, do you know?"

Levin: "The Medical Society has a great deal of expertise and many of us respect their views."

Karpiel: "And so do I. Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman for Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."

Hallock: "I see one of the Boards that you are amending is called the High Blood Pressure Control Advisory Board. That is a great title. What do they do?"

Levin: "They... you know, I assume they deal with the question with high blood pressure, and this is, of course, something which is of particular concern to senior citizens."

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

Hallock: "Well, it is probably of great concern to the General Assembly, but are you saying that this is the board that you call when you have High Blood Pressure."

Levin: "Pardon?"

Hallock: "Is this the Board that you call if you have high blood pressure."

Levin: "Yes."

Hallock: "There will probably be a lot of calls tomorrow, I
suppose. Thank you. "

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have permission of the Sponsor to interrupt on these deliberations to tell the Assembly about a couple of happenings that aren't accidental. I'd like to... the Assembly to recognize Ms. Doris Ray, up in the Speaker's Gallery, the woman that bakes all of those delicious cakes that you guys have been filching out of my office. I think that she has baked a couple of hundred cakes and she makes the... and I know that everyone in this chamber is probably had himself a piece and we want to thank you, and we really want to profoundly thank you, Doris, for all of your hard work. Thank you, Mr. Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to close briefly."

Levin: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just in closing, let me say this, of course, is the Bill which is the top priority of virtually every senior citizens organization in the state, and which many of us have received hundreds and hundreds of post cards. And just ask for the adoption, on behalf of the senior citizens, of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Keep those cards and letters coming. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2509?' All those in favor signify

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2509. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, page two of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2953. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunswold." Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2953, has removed all of the objectional material from the First Conference Committee Report. The original Bill was a forgein trade zone Bill and that is still there, specifying the... the original Bill specified Rock Island, Moline, East Moline, Silvas Milen as the foreign trade zone area. Senate Amendment #2 expanded that to cover any county, city or village or town in the State could apply for a foreign trade zone. The 2nd Amendment put a fifty miles restriction on it, which had to have approval by the federal government, and that passed out of the Senate with over fifty votes. The Second Conference Committee Report has just one Section in it, stating that if such an officer can have... specifies that no Mayor, Alderman, City Clerk, etc., can hold another office unless he have a granted... is granted leave of absence. Now that is the only Section that has been added, and I know of no objection to that. It has been signed by all Members of the Conference

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Committee Report. Senator Egan was not... had to check with aldermen on the situation and did sign the Report this morning, but his name does not appear. So, what I would move for the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2953."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island has moved that the House do adopt Conference Report #2 to House 2953. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 2953? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed yote 'no'. Voting is now open? And this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 102 voting 'ave', 6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 2953. this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Conference Committee... appears Senate Bill 1746. Mr. Hoffman, is Mr. Hoffman in the chamber? Out of the record. On the order of Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1923. Mr. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1928, a Bill for an Act relating to indemification of certain public employees in certain civil law suits. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1928. This Bill originally passed the House solely as a modification of the existing indemnity law under the state and indeminfication. Act and allows for immediate payment of settlements and judgements

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

out of the Central Management Services. which will new line item of \$200,000 for the coming appropriated a fiscal year. The Senate receded from its objections that issue. so that the Court of Claims oversight is no longer a part of the Bill. In Conference Committee. certain other provisions were added and they are the following: First, that not-for-profit organizations are expressly included as those parties which are a part of the indemnification Act under the Volunteer Amendment offered by the Attorney General and previously adopted by Mental Health Also. the Director ο£ Devlopmental Disabilities can now, for the first time. someone other than a psychiatrist. The qualification of Director has. in the past, been limited psychiatrist and now it would be modified to allow a If a layman were appointed Director thereof, there would be an Associate Director have to be appointed, and that person would have to be a psychiatrist. That person's salary would be determined by the Director of Central Management Services. I move for the ... Oh, and there a natural gas pricing Amendment, which included, which was previously under Senate Bill 1881. that would allow the purchase of natural gas by Agency were the price is less than that offered by a public utility to be exempt from bidding requirements, and that specifications for testing and balancing of heating and air conditioning systems, and for general contract work prepared for independent bidding. And that if the total construction cost thereof are less \$100,000. than independent bidding is not required. I move the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- 1928. And on that, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn, J.: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will."
- Dunn, J.: "Can you give me an example of a not-for-profit organization which would be entitled to indemnification if this Bill becomes law. I guess what I am really asking is who are these people who are..."
- McCracken: "Yes, this was suggested by the Medical Society.

 Apparently, the Medical Society does consultation work on a voluntary basis. Since we have changed the law recently to allow not-for-profit organizations to be sued in their group name, as opposed to the individuals, the Society thought that this was an important clarification of those parties which are covered under the Act."
- Dunn, J.: "I don't have the exact wording of the Conference
 Committee Report before me. All I have is an analysis. Is
 a volunteer defined somewhere to specifically exclude an
 organization like Blue Cross/Blue Shield, which I think is
 a not-for-profit organization, isn't it?"
- McCracken: "I don't know that... I am not sure what the definition of volunteer would be you are looking for in that situation. Volunteer I don't think is defined, however, it is limited to those person performing voluntary services under written contract with the state."
- Dunn, J.: "Is there some provision that expressly provides that
 the people providing these services are doing them without
 compensation?"
- McCracken: "I don't know if the word 'volunteer' is any further defined, but I don't see how volunteer and a person compensated could be ever consistant."
- Dunn, J.: "Well, there is nothing... no intent of yours or anyone
 you know in connection to this Legislation to indemnify
 doctors who perform services through... payed for by Blue

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Cross/Blue Shield, which has a contract with the state, is there?"

McCracken: "No, Sir."

Dunn, J.: "Okay, thank you."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for question."

Cullerton: "This, Representative McCracken, has to do with that portion of the Conference Committee that was embodied in Representative Bensel's Bill."

McCracken: "Which do you refer to, which part?"

Cullerton: "1881."

McCracken: "Yes okay."

Cullerton: with regard to the changes, as I understand it, current law says that there must be separate specifications prepared for labor and materials in connection with four subdivisions of work and those subdivisions plumbing is one, аге heating, piping, refrigeration, etc., is the second. Ventilation distributing systems is the third, and electrical wiring is And what these changes are... what the Law would change is to say that, first of all, they don't have have separate specifications. It changes must to shall and it adds a fifth subdivision of general contract work which appears to be very broad. Could you define for me what general contract work is, and since it is so broad, why do we need the other four categories to even be specified the law?"

mcCracken: "I don't know what general contract work refers to."

Cullerton: "Well, that should help the Appellate Court."

McCracken: "I don't know."

Cullerton: "Well, I guess we are going to pass it. I am not

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

opposed to the Bill. I just thought... if somebody else is opposed to the Bill, then fine, but I signed the report. There is other things in here which some people are in favor of. I just thought I would help the Appellate Court."

McCracken: "If I knew I would tell you I, I don't know."

Cullerton: "They are going to read what you are saying now so don't go too far. I have no further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook... from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Klemm: "Well, this seems to change the requirements that the Director be a psychiatrist, is that correct?"

McCracken: "Yes, Sir."

Klemm: "And what is the rationale then for having the background,

I guess, of a psychiatrist being waived to allow, say,
let's quote, unquote 'a lay person' then to become the

Director? What is the rationale for doing that?"

McCracken: "Well, that the Director's functions are more in an administrative nature than a clinical or a... well, then a clinical nature. And that although there may be some value to having a familiarity with the processes, that it is not inherently necessary in order to do a good job as Director."

Klemm: "So, you are saying that an administrative person or Director can certainly fulfill it's obligations, even though he is not a psychiatrist, he or she is not a psychiatrist?"

McCracken: "And there is also the requirement that an assistant or Associate Director be appointed who is a psychiatrist." Klemm: "So, therefore, by implication, a person who is not a

- 145th Legislative Day

 psychiatrist cannot fully do the job that can be done by

 one person now?"
- McCracken: "No, I don't think that is the necessary implication.

 I think the fact of the matter is the Medical Society was interested in retaining a doctor's postion and the Associate Director will become a doctor."
- Klemm: "Well, but you are saying on the Conference Committee that in the first page of the unit that 'shall be performed on behalf of the Director exclusively by the Associate Director.' so, therefore, the Director really is not there to do it. He has to be there, but he is not going to be performing any of it. And then you go on to say on it that when any clinical or medical decision is required to be made by the Director that the Director can't make it. I mean, isn't that a conflict to say that it must be made by the Director but that the Director, by law, cannot make that decision? How is he going to be held responsible."
- McCracken: "Well, because his is the ultimate authority. He would have to act with the advice of the Assistant or Associate Director."
- Rlemm: "But it doesn't say that. It says that decision shall be made by the Assistant Director. It shall be made. It doesn't say that it has to have the approval of the Director or the Director has to even know anything about it, but he must maybe sign the paper. I mean he is required to put his stamp on it, whether he agrees or disagrees. Is that correct?"

McCracken: "Yes, Sir."

Klemm: "Then my next question then to find out how were going to compensate the Assistant Director. On page three of the Conference Committee Report, we do have some salaries, I understand, set out for that Director. Could you, perhaps, explain to the Body what salaries the Department of Central

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Management Services, the Director of that, could possibly set for this Associate Director, this assistant."

McCracken: "You mean the possible range?"

Klemm: "Yes."

McCracken: "I don't know that."

Klemm: "Well, the Director gets \$52,000 now, is that correct?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Klemm: "And it says that if and when this person is appointed shall receive such compensation as may be designated. Is there a cap in the law of what they can do?"

McCracken: "The appropriation must still... still must be approved by this Body."

Klemm: "But the appropriation doesn't enumerate the salaries itself, does it?"

McCracken: "I think it does."

Klemm: "Well, no, we don't, but are you saying that then the Director of the Central... Department of Central Management Services does have a cap that would prevent that person, the Director, of setting any salary they feel is appropriate, whether it is 52,000 or 72,000 or 22?"

McCracken: "It would have to be commensurate, with his duties, and I can't imagine that the Associate's duties would be considered greater to the extent they justify a greater salary than the Director."

When: "But if that Assistant Director is making decisions that only he can make, he may have more responsibility for the medical and clinical side of it. I am just curious. It seems like what we are doing is saying that, hey, we can get a qualified person who is a psychiatrist and they can do all of these things and it's a... and will be a great person. And I am speaking to the Bill now, Mr. Speaker. But then again, and because of administrative duties, hey, we can also find a very competent person who can do it and

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

I agree with that. But what we are throwing on as a hooker is saying that if we are going to end up having to somebody else, let's hire two of them. Now two isn't cheaper than one, regardless of whether it is review board or anything else trying to determine it, but it would just seem to me that that Director should just responsible, can appoint who they want to to assist them, use consultation by professionals, but the Director should have that responsibilty. And not ending up hiring more people, by law, making those decisions when we already have that done now. So it doesn't seem like to me that Conference Committee Report maybe addresses that point of You know, as much as I support all the provisions, and I support the change from the pure... being pure psychiatrist. I do think there is some provisions that maybe we should have a Second Conference Committee Report address. So I would ask that, perhaps, on this report, we don't support it and let it go back and clear up those points. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question. Representative McCracken, could you tell us what a Human Service Program is?"

McCracken: "No, I can't."

Jaffe: "Alright. To the Bill then. Gentlemen, the Sponsor this Bill tells us that he cannot tell us what a human service program is and yet we are going to make Administrator of ... the Director of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, it asks it be someone who has five years in a Human Service Program. I think the Gentleman is quite honest, as he always is, and I would suggest to you that a human service program could possibly be an employment agency or anything else. So

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

what we are saying is we have someone who just has to be in some program that deals with human beings in order to be the head of Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities and I think that is really bad. I think that if you are going to have somebody, I sort of agree Representative Klemm, that you ought to have somebody that is qualified to do something in this particular area. No one knows what a human service program is. McCracken doesn't know what it is. I don't know what it is. I doubt And based upon that, I think if anybody knows what it is. ought to send this back for a Second Conference Committee and clear the language up."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

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

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison moves the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. And In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Mr. McCracken, to close."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of The concept of whether the Director should be an House. administrator or a clinical psychiatrist is one which been debated for sometime, and I think it is time to make a You know, it is clear that there are two functions that this Administrator faces, one clinical and one of a more laymen's or administrative nature. Now, certainly, we have been having problems with the fact that psychiatrist running the Department lacks a certain degree of administrative ability, and I make no... aspersions. I am just saying that there are two So, it is time to recognize the fact functions here. while the clinical psychiatrist has a place at the head of the Department, it is important that we have well. That administator would be administrator there as

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

subject to confirmation by the Senate. That administrator would face those Senators with the knowledge of the person who is an Associate Director, and they would be judging him on that basis as well. The Associate Director isn't going to be payed more than the Director. That is just a red herring. That is not a valid argument. We are never going to see that happen. So, the guestion is do we want to improve our capabilities here and I think the answer has to be a yes. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is. Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1928?* A 1 1 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is now open. The Gentleman from Knox. Hawkinson, to explain his vote. This Bill will take 71 Mr. Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report for the reasons stated by Representatives Klemm and Jaffe. Part of what Representative McCracken says is true. We definitely need both administrative experience and clinical. but this Conference Committee Report has them backwards clear that we need the sensitivity to the mental health issues that has the concern for the patient, the worker and the families of the patients come first. And we should reject this Conference Committee Report, and send it back. The administrator ought to be the Associate Director."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite.

 One minute to explain your vote."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of House, for a the number of years, we used to require that the head of Department of Public Health be a medical doctor. We found that it was difficult to get a medical doctor who was willing to take that position and also had

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

administrative skills. We changed the law in regard to the Department of Public Health, and I believe that we have had better administration of that Department since that change. I think that this gives us the flexibility to decide who the best person is for the head of the Department of Mental Health. It can be a psychiatrist if we find one that has all of the necessary skills for administration, as well as the clinical needs, but if we don't, then we have the alternative of getting a good administrator instead. I think that a green vote is the appropriate one on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, we all know that Mike Belateer is the acting Director, and I believe that Mike Belateer is doing a very good job at this time. And I think we ought to change our statutes so that this Legislature can... because we have so many problems in the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities so that we can have a Director who doesn't administrate, as Nike Belateer has done. T think it's good law and gives the Governor and the Executive Department, and we in the Legislature too, so often with all of the agencies, the flexibility to have a good Department. I would urge the Members to this Conference Committee, and we will have a first rate Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lee, Mr. Olson. One minute to explain your vote."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join Representative Matijevich, in support of Michael Belateer as Director for Mental Health. In the three years I have been a Member of the General Assembly, I have gone through the trauma of the closing of the Dixon

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Developmental Center. I have had an opportunity to compare the leadership of both a psychiatrist and an administrator and, believe you me, this is a refreshing change. And I he is well worth the appointment. I would urge support for this appointment."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marzuki. One minute to explain your vote."
- Marzuki: "It is probably...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is probably unnecessary at this point, but being one of the individuals who has been burned by the Mental Health Department, it is very difficult to come up with a vote that is for the proper reform. I see that I don't have to urge enough green votes to get this through."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin. One minute to explain your vote."
- Levin: "Yeah, I would join in on this. Mike Belateer is a former constituent of mine. I remeber him when he was active in the uptown community, and I followed his career with the Department of Public Health and in his current position.

 And I think this is a good move."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane, one minute to explain your vote."
- Keane: "Yes, very briefly. Mr. Belateer has been an outstanding

 Director and I am happy to vote on his behalf."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this guestion there are 87 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no' 3, voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1928. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby... hereby declared passed. Conference Committee Reports, page three of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1746. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1746, amends the School Code.

Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the move that this Body adopt the contents of the House. Conference Committee Report, the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1746. The Conference Committee on 1746 is the same as 1746 went out of the House, with the exception that House Amendment #6, which dealt with policies at vocational schools was nonconcurred in with the Senate. That was left out of the Conference Committee Report. The addition to the Conference Committee was the clarification for those districts newly formed applying for supplemental state aid for consolidation, that the inclusion... we would include the working cash which was left out last year when we put this program in place because it is part of the operating fund that we figure state aid on. We also have added the proviso that the application of the new language would not become affective or would not affect those districts who had made... had filed a petition for a referendum to form a new district prior to the June 30th 1984. So that the old would be applicable to those districts and the laws that we change at this Session would be applicable to districts And I would move for the after that time. adoption of Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1746."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1746. on that, is there any discussion? There being none, And question is, *Shall the House adopt Conference Report #1 to Senate Bill 1746? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote This final action. 71 votes are necessary is for

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

effective... immediate effective date. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question thereare 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concurr in Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1746. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the order of Motions appears House Resolution 1153. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston."

- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I move to bypass Committee and place on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration House Resolution 1153. Which was introduced a rising in response to some statements that were made too late for it to be assigned to Committee, and I would ask for it's immediate consideration."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston moves that the House bypass Committee and place it on the Speaker's Table, House Resolution 1153, for immediate consideration. The Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Gentleman has leave and the Attendance Roll Call be used.

 Now, Mr. Preston, on House Resolution 1153. Mr. Preston, The Gentleman from Cook."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1153 was introduced in response to some statements that were recently made by minister Louis Fairecan, in referring to Adolf Hitler as a great man, though wicked, and referring to Judaism as a gutter religion, and to other statements. This... these kind of statements are the type that cannot be tolerated and what is the real tragedy with these statements, at least in the State of Illinois, are not the statements itself, because unfortunate statements, from time to time, are made. But

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

the silence that followed these unfortunate Was statements that was the real tragedy. Many veeks transpired after the first statements made by Mr. Fairecan anvone... any presidential candidate spoke out against those statements to renounce them, before any major political individual in the United States spoke out. Finally, Senator Ted Kennedy did speak out renouncing those statements, and indicating that those statements have place in American society. Following that, Jesse Jackson spoke out renouncing those statements and indicating that statements like that against Jews or against any Minority Group have no place in American society. The other day the United States Senate unanimously adopted a Resolution indicating that statements like those stated by Minister Fairecan have, indeed, no place in American society renouncing those statements. Ιn Illinois, however, no major political official or political body has yet seen fit to speak out in repudiation, in renunciation of statements like that. No where in the City of Chicago, no where in the County of Cook, no where in the State of Illinois been public outcry in renouncing those kind of statements. It is for that reason that I felt that Resolution sponsored by some sixty-three... cosponsored by sixty-three Members of the House of Representatives was, indeed, in order and I would ask for this Body to overwhelming pass that Resolution today."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, moves that the House do adopt House Resolution Anv discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1153? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the the Chair, the 'ayes' opinion of have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Yeah, that's not timely.

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

order of Motions appears Senate Joint Resolution 104. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the "Thank you, Mr. House. I nove to discharge Elementary and Education Committee and advance to the Order the Speaker's Table Senate Joint Resolution 104, so that it might be then I will move for immediate consideration. SJR 104 rescinds provisions of SJR 58, which requested that the School Problems Commission study merit pay and master teachers. matter of the fact that both of these concepts are of currently under the consideration and included in the of the Illinois Commission on report Improvement in Elementary and Secondary Education, and, therefore, would have been redundant and the Senator... and myself have Sponsored this Resolution, so I would move that the Committee be discharged so that I might move then for immediate consideration."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DuPage has moved that the House discharge the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee from further consideration of SJR 104, and for immediate consideration of this Resolution. Does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? The Gentleman has leave. Hr. Hoffman, on SJR 104."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move for the adoption of SJR 104."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House do adopt. Senate Joint Resolution 104. And on that is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House adopt SJR 104?' All in favor signify by say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and Senate Joint Resolution 104, is adopted. We will just stand at ease for awhile... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, asks that a Second

- 145th Legislative Day

 Conference Committee be appointed for House Bill 3177. And
 a Second Conference Committee will be appointed."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental House Calendar #1 is now being distributed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brummer, are you seeking attention of the Speaker? A page? Well, Mr. Brummer, I do have... I believe some things I won't do. I draw the line on some things. House will be back, House will be back in Session. On page two of the Calendar, on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1555. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1555, is a an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections, together with House Amendment #5."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recede from House Amendment #5 to the Department of Corrections appropriation. The reason for receding is that the substantive legislation is not passed and this appropriation is not necessary."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House do recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1555. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1555?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action, final action. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins."
- Brookins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, this Amendment would have financed a beautiful and a fine program called Probation Challenge. This program would have caught and saved millions of dollars for the State of Illinois. In the wise wisdom of this Assembly, did not see fit to pass it. I will continue and

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

not let this program die. I know that I do not have the substance and language in the Bill, and, therefore, the appropriation is out of order, but as we all know that in the General Assembly nothing ever dies. No idea never leaves, and as long as I am here, I will attempt to pass this legislation. Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. This takes 71 votes.

 On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no',

 4 voting 'present', and the House does recede from House

 Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1555. And this Bill, having

 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

 passed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill

 1557. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1557, is a an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency, together with House Amendment #4."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

money for the extra office."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1557 deals with the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services Disaster Agency. I move to recede from House Amendment \$4. The..."

 Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, moves that the..."

 Hastert: "The Department said that they don't need that extra
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman Kendall moves that the House recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1557. being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #4? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open? This is final action. Final action. 71 Have all voted who wish? votes. Mr. Clerk, take the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1557. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 1583. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1593 is an Act making appropriations to the Department on Aging, together with Senate... together with House Amendments #2 and 7."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... The Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Oblinger."
- Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to recede from Amendments #2 and 7... House Amendments #2 and 7 to Senate Bill 1583. This has been agreed upon by the Department, by Woods Bowman and by me."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Sangamon moves that the House recede from House Amendments #2 and 7 to Senate Bill 1583. being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from Senate Amendment... from House Amendments and 7? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is action, 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendments #2 and 7 to Senate Bill 1583, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Supplemental Calendar #2 is now being distributed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Supplemental Calendar #1, Conference Committee
 Reports. On that Order appears House Bill 2637. Mr.
 Clerk, read the Bill."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2637, is an Act making appropriations to the Department of Rehabilitation Services, Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt Conference Committee Report which is dealing with House Bill 2637, which is the of appropriation for the Department Rehabilitation Services. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and Senate Amendment #1 is a reduction in \$811,000. Senate Amendment #2 adds \$197,600 for Federal Rehabilitation funds. And Senate Amendment #3 adds \$86.800 for personal services and fringe benefits for the teachers, which was a Bill that we had before us in Jacksonville."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kendall moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2637. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2637?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2637. and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of... Supplemental Calendar #1 on the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2638. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2638 is an Act making appropriations to the Capitol Development Board and Southern Illinois University. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2638 appropriates money for new capitol projects and the final results of the Conference Committee is \$163,132,700."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2638. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference #1?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action, 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question there 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Report #1 to House Bill 2638. And this Bill. an Extraordinary Constitutional received Majority. hereby declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 2640. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2640, an Act making appropriations to
 the Department of Revenue, Conference Committee Report #1."

 Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 2640 deals with the Department of Revenue's budget for
 the fiscal year, ordinary and contingent expenses. As the
 final concurrence it was \$2,805.7 were added, which makes a
 total of \$1,510,204,000."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, Moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2640. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt... Oh, Mr. Wolf, I am sorry. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Wolf: "Representative Barnes, in this Bill, originally, as it went out of the House, there was an Amendment on there that provided funding for the Office of Appraisals. Could you tell me what happened to that Amendment?"

Barnes: "It has been eliminated."

Wolf: "It has been eliminated? Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Wolf: "When this Bill left the House and went to the Senate, was in the Bill in the sum of some 314,000 to fund the Office of Appraisals, an office that was created bу General Assembly four years ago to provide an appraisal service to local communities of government. assist them in making appraisals on large commercial risks that are now in the process of using the State Appeals to get assessments based on appraisals that are made under a fee basis, which is predicated on the amount tax savings that they get. Appraisals that are made under these circumstances are highly questionable, to say the least. It wasn't until recently that I discovered that the Office of Appraisals, that was created by this General Assembly, was never funded, and further than that, never requested. In talking to the Director of this he very emphatically indicated that philosophically opposed to the ideal of providing appraisal services to the local communities, because he thought it would be better for them if they paid for their own appraisal service, in order that they would have more of an interest in the assessment process going on in their local communities. The fact that he was ignoring the law, fact that he was ignoring the mandate of this General Assembly, together with the signature of the Governor

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

that particular Bill back in 1980, didn't seem to bother him in the least. Well now, when I came into this General Assembly, I was under the impression that the General Assembly, together with the Executive Branch, made the laws of this state and then handed those laws to the various agencies, and they were responsible for implementing those laws. Perhaps, before we pass any more laws pertaining to this particular Agency to implement, we should call the Director in and get his philosophical views before we that, because if he isn't in philosophical agreement with those laws, then, apparently, we're just spinning our I think the responsible vote on this Bill would be 1001 Send it to Conference Committee Report #2. Call that Director in and have him answer for his ignoring of the laws that was passed in this General Assembly."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Motion to adopt this Conference Committee Report. As to the suggestion by the last Speaker, if we have a Second Conference Committee Report on this particular budget, I think it will delay the departure from this House by at least six hours and I have a feeling that the people are anxious to get home. The Gentleman's point about calling the Director is well taken and I am sure that the appropriations process next year, that the Director will be held to account, and I urge at the moment I urge that we adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Wolf makes a valid point. I agree with him but I think that is something we ought to study and investigate at the start of Session and really

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

probably put the Director's feet right to the coals on the issue. And possibly next year, there are some other issues that this Department that we ought to study and find out how well our amnesty program is going to work, if it works, how well the STEP program is going to work. I think there will be some budding issues in this Department, but at this time, I would hope that we pass out this appropriations. But I want Bepresentative Wolf, to know even though I am going to support the appropriation, I agree with him."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none. the 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee question is. Report #1 to House Bill 2640? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now This is final action, 71 votes. open. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye', voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2640-And this Bill. having received an Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. order of Supplemental Calendar #1. Conference Committee appears House Bill 2564. Mr. Clerk, read the Mr... appears 2664, House Bill 2664."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2664, an Act making an appropriations to the Supreme Court. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is
the Bill to appropriate funds for the ordinary and
contingent expenses to the Supreme Court. The Conference
Committee Report concurred with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and
3. Senate Amendment ! reduced 1.5, million from the short
hand reporters salaries and reduced staff pay increases
from ten percent to five percent, a total reduction of 2.3

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

The Conference Committee concurs with that Amendment, however, adds back the 1.5 million in the shorthand reporters salary. Also concurs with Senate which adds 400,000 to the probation officers Amendment 2 salaries and 75,600 for permanent improvements in the Third Appellate Court. The Conference Committee Report brings the total budget to \$106,000,000 in General Revenue Funds. And I move the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2664."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake has moved the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2664. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he will yield for a question."

Priedrich: "Are we reappropriating the money that they are collecting from attorney's in the Attorney Disciplinary Fund."

Matijevich: "I imagined we are. In this Session I haven't delved into that issue I thought there was some alternative plan but I am not sure, Dwight. I..."

Friedrich: "Well, on the ... "

Matijevich: "I know you would like to speak to that issue, so we might as well give you a little time."

Friedrich: "Well, I am not going to be wild about it. I just want to point out that the Body that the Supreme Court of this State has, from time to time contended that the money they collected from attorneys is not public funds, that they have a right to do with them as they please, they are not subject to audit. The reason they are not subject to audit is because they said so. No other reason, just because they said so. No wthe money a plumber pays in is State Funds; the money a real estate broker pays in is

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

State Funds; but the money a lawyer pays in is not state funds, because the Supreme Court of this State said so."

- discussion? Being none, the question Speaker Greiman: "Further is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2664? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. is final action, 71 votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2664. this Bill, And having received an Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin, in the Chair."
- Breslin: "House Bill 2785, Representative Leverenz. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2785, an Act making appropriations to the Attorney General. Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Office of the Attorney General, the original Bill passed the House at 25,679,000. We added funds of 2,000,000 for the Regional Offices. We have lumped those in a Senate Amendment that would provide for all of the offices under one. They are not identified. I will answer any questions that you might have. I ask for your green vote to pass the budget."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2785. And on that question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor please yield?"

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "Did I understand, Representative, that the Attorney General's regional offices were all lumped in one figure now? And if so, could you tell me how many of those Offices there are now in..."

Leverenz: "Surely, I would be very happy to read them to you also, the ones that are identified and agreed to. Rock Island County, Lake County, LaSalle County, Mount Vernon, Macon County, Franklin, Jackson and Granite City, Kankakee County. And also the Conference Committee Report... there is only one reason for the Conference Committee Report, and that is in the Senate, drafting error on Amendment #2. We dropped the effective date from the Bill and in essence what we have done with the Conference Committee Report is put the effective date back in the Bill."

Ropp: "Okay, Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2785? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2785. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill... that is a Constitutional Three-Pifths Majority. House Bill 15, excuse me, Senate Bill 1548, Representative Leverenz. Senate Bill 1548. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1548, an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies and legislative commissions. Conference Committee Report #1."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This coincides with now the plan for \$27,000 district office expense in the House, \$37,000 in the Senate, and I would move that we adopt the First Conference Committee Report with your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1548. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Pierce: "What are you doing for the employees that last night found out, after midnight, that their jobs were abolished on minus one hours notice. Are you going to pay them three months to keep them alive or cut them out or tell them to go home or what?"

Leverenz: "Well, if they were employed by you, which the Bill or Conference Committee Report addresses only district office expense, and you did not renew their contract or extend it, you would have to tell them to go home. If you employed them in your district office and this Conference Committee does not report to any... does not elude to anything other than district office expense."

Pierce: "Well, the Conference Committee..."

Leverenz: "You are on something else."

Pierce: "Oh, this is not 1541? This is 1548, right?"

Leverenz: "No, but we will be here shortly with it."

Pierce: "Alright, what do you do on home offices here, July 1st?

Home Office expense increase?"

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir. You are in it now."

Pierce: "Okay, thank you."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1549, an Act making appropriations for certain expenses of the General Assembly Conference Committee #1."

Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Speaker House Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1548?4 A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no', voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1548. And the Bill. having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1541, Representative Leverenz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1541, an Act making appropriations to the various legislative support agencies and legislative commissions. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The First Conference Committee Report on Senate 1541 would provide as follows... that agrees to the substantive language that we agreed to last evening: Conference Committee Report recedes from House Amendments #1 and 3, and is replaced with the following items; \$9,106,000 represents one year funding for the following Commissions: Joint Committee on Administrative Rules: Economic and Piscal: Inter-Governmental: Legislative Audit: Legislative Council, which is the Research and Printing Arms: Legislative Information Reference and Space Needs \$1,117,000 for eight month funding on the Commission on Children: Economic Development: Resources; Commission on Mental Health and Development

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Disabilities; Commission the Status of Women; Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid; and School Problems. The Conference Committee, I understand, all people have signed-it I would ask that we adopt it with your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Conference

Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1541. And on that

question, the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative

Ewing."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this legislation has been approved on both sides. It handles... has in it the funds for the phase out of the Commissions to September 30th. And I would suggest an 'aye', vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Will the Gentleman answer a question seriously or is he going to joke around?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Pierce: "Answer a question? Alright. Now you say you fund Commissions for three months. Commissions that Were abolished. even those that the Senate wanted to continue like Legislative Investigating Committee and who's employees were told they would be kept on until after midnight last night. You say for three months. Is that ... at which level, at which year's level."

Leverenz: "At what year's level, what was your..."

Pierce: "Yeah, you say three months, three months at what?"

Leverenz: "At last year's level."

Pierce: "At the Fiscal '84 level."

Leverenz: "We just... Their '84 estimated expenditures for a phase out of three months have been prorated. Yes."

Pierce: "So you are telling me it is 25 percent of the Piscal *84

145th Legislative Day
appropriation."

July 1, 1984

Leverenz: "No."

- Pierce: "So it is less than three months, so you are not telling the truth?"
- Leverenz: "No, Sir. And let me explain to you, FY estimated expenditures are different than what was appropriated.

 That is why."
- Pierce: "We've... we've been that and it is apparently not correct that you are funding for three months. You are funding much less than three months, much less than 25 percent. We won't be able to keep on and pay three months salary to those employees, who were fired after midnight last night, because you are not funding a full three months. You are not funding 25 percent of last years appropriation, which the Conference Committee fails to..."
- Leverenz: "Did you have a question or was that a statement?"
- Pierce: "What percentage of last year's appropriation are you funding, 5 percent 10 percent?"
- Leverenz: "We prorate an estimated expenditure on the Commission and that is what is in the Conference Committee."
- Pierce: "Well, how did you estimate the expenditure? You certainly didn't talk to the Chairmen of the Commissions."
- Leverenz: "That is on your ISL Forms. The Subcommittees met,
 which I chaired, and we do have those, in terms of
 estimated expenditures. They do not always meet estimated
 or what we have appropriated for each Commission. As a
 matter of fact, you will find that two or three Commissions
 had to lay people off in March because they over-spent.
 That is the Commission's responsibility. But we know all
 of that... that information. Is there one specific that
 you are interested in?"
- Pierce: "Yeah, I don't think you prorated 25 percent of any Commission, but how about the Sunset Commission? Did you

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

appropriate 25 percent of the Fiscal '84 for them like you indicated initially, or did you not?"

Leverenz: "25 percent of their estimated expenditures has been included in the Conference Committee Report."

Pierce: "How much is that?"

Leverenz: "Pardon me."

Pierce: "Now, of course, that includes the vacation pay they have coming, I suppose, or did you deny them vacation?"

Leverenz: "That was considered, that is correct."

Pierce: "And you didn't deny them of vacation pay. How about sick pay, did you take that away from them?"

Leverenz: "Due to the fact that none of the Commissions operate under any Personnel rules or general Personnel rules, each Commission ends up hiring people, as you well know, at what ever the whim of the Chairman is occasionally. There is no way to do that which you suggest."

Pierce: "Well, this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying it bad Bill, but it is based on the phony and false assumption is something wrong with each and every there Commission. There are Commissions that have professional people working for them who weren't given the courtesy and notice that they wouldn't be working for the State who, are being denied enough money appropriated to pay them three months. They will get no termination pay. They will be lucky if they have enough money for vacations that they have coming. No one seems to give a damn. They are only state employees. They are not unionized. They have no big ability to contribute of funds to anybody. So the Legislature says, 'Goodbye, Charlie. Thanks for nothing.'"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Brummer: "Last night when we were considering the so-called Commission reform Bill, I had asked the Sponsor... Minority Leader if the Sunset Act had, in fact, been He had indicated that the abolished. Sunset Act upon closer examination of the Conference abolished. but Committee Report, it appears that the Sunset Act itself was not abolished. What was abolished was the Commission. However, in the Conference Committee Report that we adopted there appeared to be no transfer of the Sunset functions to other entity, some Joint Committee or something of and my question, I quess, is nature, have vou funds for the professional staff in this appropriation to carry out those functions in some manner, someplace. because we partially abolished the Sunset Act partially did not. What we. really abolished. apparently, was the Commission and not the Act, and the Act still requires that the various agencies and various amounts of licensing that we do in the State of Illinois still have to be examined. And we need to determine, on a cycle, whether or not they are going to continue to be licensed and if so, how and whether they are changed. Who is going to carry that function out and do you appropriation in here for personnel to carry out that function?"

Leverenz: "That is a very good question. You are addressing the Conference Committee Report on 3128, which was a substantive. This Conference Committee Report deals only funding of those Commissions. with That is, one to be phased out has nothing to do with the Sunset Law that With that Commission, we have funded it based on 25 percent of the current fiscal year's expenditure estimate rather than what it was appropriated. That figure for Sunset for the next three months will be \$109,000. It has

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

nothing to do, however, with the function, but I will try to help you address your concern."

- Brummer: "No, I understand that. I understand what is going to occur with regard to the Sunset Commission staff as a Commission staff. However, the functions of the Sunset Act still need to be carried out under the Conference Committee Report, the substantive Bill that we passed last night. However, it appears to be silent with regards to the issue as to who is going to carry that out. My question is, in the one million or the one million two or whatever, have you comtemplated personnel for the remaining nine months to carry out those functions that the Sunset Commission staff is currently doing?"
- Leverenz: "You are correct. I would love to help you address that. It is simply impossible to put the substative language in an appropriation Bill. The funding will have to be carried out for those functions under the new created umbrella Legislative operation."
- Brummer: "Well, right, and my question simply is, under that umbrella, have you, in the budgeting process here, allowed sufficient funds for personnel to carry out those functions?"
- Leverenz: "At this point we do not, unless it would be under the
 Committees there is a bulk amount for Standing House
 Committees that would then have to be picked up and I am
 sure Leadership will address your concern under Standing
 Committee appropriations in the OCE."

Brummer: "Very briefly, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Brummer: "The... you know, I don't know that I... obviously,
whoever puts this appropriation Conference Committee Report
together it is in real quandary, and they weren't involved
in the... probably in the omnibus so-call Commission reform

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

legislation last night. But I think our haste in acting on that last night, on a Conference Committee Report that was on our desk for less than one hour, and in which we really did not have an opportunity to examine in detail. illustrates exactly why we ought not to act with that type of haste. It appears, specifically, with regard to Sunset. what occurrs is that we abolished the Commission, and that is fine with me, as far as I am concerned, as long as we the function someplace, but we abolish the transfer Commission. We kept the Sunset Act, but we don't anybody... there is no transfer of authority in the Sunset Act to designate who shall carry out the functions of the existing Sunset Act. It seems to be a technical problem, which upon careful consideration and examination. probably could have addressed, but because doing so in haste we passed, very carelessly, some legislation that does not address that problem, and now we have the problem of what we do with the appropriation because we don't know going to occur and who is going to carry forward these functions regarding the Sunset. I would urge 'aye' vote on this, not because it addresses that but because this Bill did not create the issue problem in first place."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, first of all, we have made a policy decision last night, so now we have to fund at the three months that is part of that policy decision. Secondly, I would say that after that three months, there are some of these agencies which we call Commissions, that I believe the Leadership will be able to review and in a different manner, through the Service Bureau, keep some of these professional employees at work. They may have a different

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

name, but they will still be able to work. So, I would hope now that that policy decision has been made, that we now go right to the matter of funding the decision that we made and get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Sponsor is recognized to close. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have taken, as Representative Matijevich, explained, and funded those things that are to be funded for a year. We have taken care of those with a month's funding rather than a 30 day or a 60 day phase-out on the Commissions that exist now. That has been extended, and the law that Representative Brummer has so adequately out, will be picked up by the Standing Committees, that is why we have a little more than 2 million dollars in the OCE for the General Assembly, to pick up those functions. The function will stand. The Commissions will die as we agreed to the Conference Committee Report of I would ask for your green vote to adopt Conference 3128-Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1541."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1541? A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 1541. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Matijevich is recognized for the purposes of a Motion."

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

27(a). I move to discharge the House, pursuant to Rule Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 113 and advance that Bill to the that Resolution to the Order of Second Reading. The purpose for this Motion, and I would ask leave of Attendance Roll Call. because it is agreed. This Resolution will be amended, when we do put it on Second the Condominium Study Committee Reading. to extend reporting deadline to 9/30 of this year. That is when, have done by our Policy decision, Committee will be out of business. The Resolution has extending deadline of 1/9/85 and they won't be in business So I would ask leave and the use of the Attendance. Roll Call for that Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 27(a) and discharge the Executive Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 113, and put the Resolution on the Speaker's Table. And on that question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative, did you say that they are going to change the... or bend this Resolution and change the Reporting date or the end of the... the reporting date for the Committee from January 9th, '85 to September 30th, '84?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "That is correct."

Karpiel: "What is the reporting date now?"

Matijevich: "January 9th, 1985."

Karpiel: "Well, on the Resolution it says that you are changing the... you are changing the reporting date to January 9th, but what is it before the Besolution? What is it now without the Besolution?"

Matijevich: "The Resolution, itself, has a reporting date of

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

January 9th. 1985. The ... "

Karpiel: "I don't want to know about the Resolution. I want to know, under present law, what is the reporting date for the Joint Condominium Study Committee? Under present law, with not talking about this Resolution."

Matijevich: "July of '84. I believe."

Karpiel: "So, the report is due now and this Resolution would have pushed it back?"

Matijevich: "Probably today."

Karpiel: "Yeah, and this report would have pushed it back to

January 9th, and now you say you want to take this...

discharge Committee so that you can amend it for September

30th."

Matijevich: "That is correct."

Karpiel: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ewing: "Representative you indicated that you were, by this action, you want to amend to have the reporting date September 30th, of 1984?"

Matijevich: "Yes, I didn't think it would make sense to have a January 9th, '85 reporting date because they won't be in, if you will pardon the expression, in commission by then."

Ewing: "Is this the only Amendment that you plan to put on?"

Matijevich: "That's the only one that I know about."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this matter has been cleared, in regard to Commission. The Commissions have a phase-out period which is September 30th, 1984, and this merely brings this Commission into line with that expiration date."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is, 'Shall

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

the House suspend Rule 27(a) and discharge the Executive Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 113 and put it on the Speakers Calendar, using the Attendance Roll Call?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries. Representative Cullerton is recognized on Senate Joint Resolution 113."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have an Amendment to the Senate Joint Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, read the Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Cullerton, amends Senate Joint Resolution 113, on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This amendment simply does change the reporting date for this Joint Resolution to September 30th, 1984. And says that the Condominium Study Commission is continued until that date, September 30th, 1984. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Joint Resolution 113. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion the question is, 'Shall the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill... to Senate Joint Resolution 113 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "On the Resolution, Representative Cullerton."
Cullerton: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Breslin: "Would you like to present the Resolution now?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I move that we adopt Senate Joint Resolution

113, which has the effect of extending the Condominium

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Study Commission until September 30th, 1984."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 113. And on that question. there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 113 adopted?! All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed sav 'nav'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' it, and Senate Joint Resolution 113 is adopted. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate excuse ne, 1554. Representative Barnes. Ts Representative Barnes in the chamber? Out of the record. On Conference Committee Report #1 appears also Senate Bill 1558-Representative Barnes. Out of the record. same Conference Committee Report appears Senate Bill 1599. Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1599, an Act making appropriations for the retirement purposes of higher education institutions and agencies. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill, in it's original form, provided 74.3 million to the university retirements systems for ordinary and contingent expenses for Fiscal *84. House Amendment #2 decreased the state contribution to the university systems to reflect a 60 percent level of payout, and added appropriations for the General Assembly and Judicial Retirement Systems to also reflect a 60 percent The Senate concurs with the House Amendment to appropriate a 60 percent level of payout to the university system, but removes appropriations to the Judicial and General Assembly Retirement Systems because the Bills that fund these Systems have passed both Houses. I would point out that the Bills funding the General Assembly and Judicial

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Retirement Systems passed at a 66 and two-thirds percentage level payout. However, it is the legislative intent Systems be funded at the same level. The Senate refused to concur in our Amendment, not because thev that we should be funded at a different level from other systems, but simply because the Bills had already passed and they felt that we should not pass two Bills on the same subject to the Governor and it seemed like a wise decision. However. we do wish to clarify for the record that the Governor should be invited to use his amendatory veto in this instance, to achieve consistency among the various systems because the level that we have selected for all the retirement systems, not just the university systems contained in this Bill, but all the remainder is the percent level. I would point out, in conclusion, that this 8 million dollar increase or a 14 percent increase over Piscal Year '84, And the reason that sounds very large is that I point out to you that in 1983 we funded the pension systems at a much lower level, about 54 percent, and so, although there is some unhappiness about the 60 percent level, I understand, we are nevertheless making progress, marching towards the goal of full funding. you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1599. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur in the comments that the Gentleman made that part of the agreement that was made is that we would fund the pension systems at 60 percent pay-out and those that we could accomplish here, we would, and those that we couldn't, the Governor would do so by an amendatory

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

veto. And for that reason, I rise in the support of the Gentleman's Motion."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1599? All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. 71 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... excuse me. We have to take that Roll The question is, 'Shall Conference Committee Report again. #1 to Senate Bill 1599, be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will the record. On this question there are 84 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', and 7 voting 'present. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill and the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies Gentlemen, on your regular Calendar on page two, under the Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 1570. Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1570, an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals, together with House Amendments #1, 2 and 4."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to recede from Amendments #1, 2 and 4 which is the appropriations for the Department of Mines and Minerals."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to recede from Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1570. And on that question, is

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

there any discussion? The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester. $^{\prime\prime}$

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Winchester: "Senate... House Amendment #1 restored \$260,000.

That was a tremendous cut that was made by the... by the Senate in the operations money for the Department. There is some serious concern that they are going to be able to continue their full functions in the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council. Was there any discussion among the Conferees about the possibility of a supplemental appropriation?"

Hastert: "There was a great deal of discussion about what the effect would be upon the operations in coal mining and oil wells and etc. It was a concern of all Conferees, and I will... it was also discussed that we would be able to come back, if necessary, in the fall, this Fall, for an additional appropriation?"

Winchester: "There was a... there was an Amendment for a oil well inspector and a mine inspector. I notice that the Senate refused to concur in House Amendments 1, 3 and 4. Then, I think, they refused to concur with any of the House Amendments. Do you know if Amendment #2 is still in the Bill... in the Bill?"

Hastert: "The Motion... 1, 2 and 4 is the Motion to recede

Representative?"

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1570?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

question there are 99 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the House does recede from Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1570. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Nonconcurrences, again, on page two in your Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1484. Representative Greiman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman."

together with House Amendments #2 and 3."

"Yes, thank you. Madam Speaker, I... leave to have Clerk's records indicate me as, again, being the Sponsor of... the Senate Sponsor has indicated that I am continue sponsorship of this Bill. It was Amendments #2 and 3, from which I am going to move to recede. attempt to make this Bill the vehicle emmissions Bill. Then the ... is a notion about making it a vehicle for something else, and, apparently, it will, hopefully, live to see the Governor's desk in it's pure and pristine form. Accordingly, the Bill, the underlying Bill is a Bill that makes it a Class IV felony to drive a school bus children are present in the bus. And so, accordingly, I would move that the House... recede from House from Amendments #1 and... I am sorry, House Amendments #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1484."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from

Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1484. And on
that question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative

Nelson."

Nelson: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield to a question."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I believe that I, perhaps, did not hear you correctly, Representative

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Greiman. Did you say it now becomes a Class IV Felony to drive a school bus while there are children in the bus?"

Greiman: "And the driver is intoxicated or under the influence of drugs."

Nelson: "Oh, very well. I support this good Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Now, do we have auto emmissions on this Bill now?"

Greiman: "No."

Vinson: "Is there..."

Greiman: "Well, we will ... as soon as we recede, we won't."

Vinson: "Okay, is there anything on this Bill that relates to that problem that... you had some Vehicle Code Bill were if people... if the mail service didn't deliver people's mail in three days, they would be felons? Is that on here?"

Greiman: "It was in my Bill, and I didn't have... and that isn't on here either."

Vinson: "That's not here, so we are just... it is just a felony to drive a Bus while you are drunk."

Greiman: "No. This is just a special interest Bill for drunken bus driver's."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Well, Mr. Madam Speaker, I didn't have the benefit of all the wonderful discussion about this Conference Committee Report. What else is in this besides this drunken bus driver provision?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Nothing."

Dunn, J .: "Nothing, well I'll drink ... "

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Greiman: "Blank paper."

Dunn: "I'll drink to that."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendments 2 to Senate Bill 1484?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is action, and requires 60 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'ave'. none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the House does recede from Senate Amendments... House Amendments #2 and And the Bill, having received a Senate Bill 1484. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. and Gentlemen. on page two on your Calendar, under Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 2400, Representative Bowman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate (sic - House) Bill 2400 amends the School
Code. Conference Committee Report \$2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Madam Speaker, before I begin to address the substance,
I believe... I'd like to correct the record. It is not
Senate Bill 2400. It is House Bill 2400."

Speaker Breslin: "Correct, Mr... Representative Bowman. Proceed on House Bill 2400."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2400, embodied in this Second Conference Committee Report, which has, by the way, already been adopted by the Senate, consists basically of the merit or academic scholarship program as the Senate passed it. It is, indeed, quite different from the House version. You may recall that the House version awarded the top five percent of the high school graduates in the state, who remain in the state to go to college, an award up to \$1,000

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

based on need. This particular proposal, however, is a flat grant. The ... I believe ... I am personally not happy this particular alternative because I do not believe it gives adequate recognition to need. Nevertheless. does give recognition to achievement and performance, and it is. I believe, desirable in one other respect. It... This award would be on top of tuition fees, so that a poor... a student from a poor family, who goes to a university, would receive an award in addition to their monetary award. This additional award, this merit award, could be used for books or room and board or other expenses of that student's college education. I believe that this is a good proposal, because it permits the student to be identified or recognized within his or her own high school environment, so that it provides a target that student and every high school throughout the state can shoot for. I move the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2400."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2400. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hoffman: "There is no demonstration of need required now under this program, is that correct?"

Bowman: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "In other words, a person whose father was a millionaire would be treated no differently than a student whose father was making \$20,000 or on public aid."

Bowman: "That is correct, Representative Hoffman. I would point out one thing to you, however, that the Scholarship Commission definition of need does, in fact, ration the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

scarce scholarship dollars, to the extent that persons who have demonstrable need under something called the uniform methodology, which is a national standard, may not get any scholarship award at all. So, I would beg you not to focus your attention on the millionaires, of which there are quite few in this state, but focus your attention on the middle class student who now is deprived of scholarship aid because of the application of these rationing devices."

- Hoffman: "Second question. According to my analysis, it would be possible for a student to renew this for a second year. Is that a second year only?"
- Bowman: "Yes. In other words, just to make sure I understand your question correctly, let me describe precisely what it does. And, by the way, in this respect, it is the version that the Senate originally preferred. The... First, the student comes out of high school, gets a \$500 award and then, in his or her sophomore year, if the child has maintained a grade point average above C+, they have it renewed for one more year, but that's all. Ιt is a freshman and a sophomore year program. And in upper class years, when they have better access to other financial aids, then this scholarship ceases."
- Hoffman: "Alright. You have chosen the top five percent in high school graduating... high school graduating class. That will... Do you estimate that that will expend or would require the expenditure of somewhere in the neighborhood of three million... the estimate is on the basis of three million dollars. Is that on the assumption that all students in this category will participate?"
- Bowman: "Well, Representative Hoffman, I haven't been privileged to see the Republican staff analysis. Our staff analysis suggests more like two million dollars. And I think probably the... 2.2, million by the way, which is the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

figure we obtained from the Scholarship Commission. believe the higher figure might be accounted for by an assumption that every single student in the top five percent will remain in Illinois to go to school for I think, a very extreme assumption, college. That is, because, in fact. at the present time, a very percentage of our state scholars, which is, of course, another program I'm sure you're familiar with, do go out of state to school. And so, although we are trying to attract more of our own students to remain in the state. it's unrealistic to expect a hundred percent of them to remain in the state. I personally believe that the 2.2 million dollar first year cost is more reasonable."

Hoffman: "Alright. Then we can assume that, let's say that 2.2 is an estimate of what would cover those proportion of the top five percent in their high school class attending an Illinois college. Is that a safe statement?"

Bowman: "Yes, Sir. That's exactly right."

Hoffman: "Okay. Fine. I appreciate the work and the effort that the Gentleman has put in on this particular program. would only point out to you that the median family income for FY '84 state scholars was 49,500 dollars. And I think the question we have to ask ourselves is, you know, can afford a program which awards \$500 grants to a student whose family's income is above average? Now, I recognize that's not always the case, but you will find, I think, that that is generally the case, and probably don't have as much difficulty attending college as other students do. although there are some quarantees built in here, in terms of the funding level for the need based program. still some reservations about this particular have program."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Preston."

Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Preston: "Thank you, the House. Firstly, I'd like to commend the Sponsor of Bill, who I know has worked very, very hard and diligently in trying to address all the concerns criticisms that have come from many different directions. I know he's sincere. I know he has every good intention. I'm a Cosponsor of this Bill, and when this Bill left the House Higher Education Committee, it was, indeed, We took out of the Bill, in Committee, the flat based funding so that in Committee this grant, non-need Bill had a \$250 award not based on need and an additional thousand dollar award that could be gotten by a student in the upper ten percent of their high school class had need. As this Bill comes back to us, in this Conference Committee Report from the Senate, this is an entirely different Bill. The Bill now has \$500 in it as a flat grant, regardless of whether or not the student in the upper ten percent of his or her high school class has any need whatsoever. There are high schools in my area in Chicago in the northern suburbs north of Chicago where would be very hard pressed and hard put to find a single high school student who comes from a family that is not millionaire family, whether that family be... have that student in the top ten percent, the bottom ten percent or somewhere in the middle. There are suburbs such as Glenco, River Forest, Lake Forest in the western suburbs, Oak Brook, that are filled with the children of millionaire fathers and millionaire mothers and yet, we, the taxpayers would be giving \$500 awards to of this state. children. That makes absolutely no sense. I can't find any defense whatsoever for doing that, even knowing there are also, at the same time, other schools where there

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

would be poor children who are also getting a monetary award. And in those poor schools, those students have the need. We should make this scholarship program a need based scholarship program, even if we give more than 500 dollars to a family, to a student with need. But there is no excuse whatsoever for giving this kind a monetary award to a Rockefeller, to a McCormick, to a Clarence Neff, even, God forbid, to an Al Ronan, because they have all the money in the world, and they don't need our taxpayers' money."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to join with Representative Bowman in urging that we support... excuse me, this Bill. We signed off in it in the Conference Committee... Excuse me. I'm for the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental 3 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Dunn, J.: "At one point in time, this concept was proposed to be funded from a separate line item so that, if it did become law, it would not impact upon the funding for the regular scholarship program. And I wonder if you can tell me at this posture whether or not the program advanced in this piece of legislation will be funded from a separate line item, or whether it will be funded out of the regular state scholarship awards funding line."

Bowman: "Representative Dunn, we are investigating the Senate

Amendment. Hang on a second. Yes. Subsection (h) - it

says 'subject to a separate appropriation for such

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

purposes, payment of any scholarships awarded to a qualified student under this Section shall be determined by the Commission. Your concern is taken care of in this report, Sir."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the previous question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Thank Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the you, House. Let me assure you that there is no segment of higher education community that is opposed to legislation. We took care of their concerns in the Second Conference Committee Report. I would simply like to say in closing that I share some οf the CONCETES αf Representatives Hoffman and Preston who spoke very eloquently on the subject of need based scholarships. However, I would point out to them and to this if there is nothing else in this Bill that justifies its existence, it is the recognition of merit within context of the students own high school environment. In other words, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is quite different from the current state scholar program, which is based on a statewide test or statewide comparison. In other words, it's quite... it's entirely possible that... that 40 percent of the high school graduating class in New Trier is state scholars, whereas, other high schools may have no state scholars. But this program, Ladies and Gentlemen, absolutely guarantees that five percent of the graduating

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

class of every high school in this state, every single high school, will receive a merit scholarship award. And let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, this includes a lot of very... children from poor families and from middle class And I would remind the Assembly once again families. the present scholarship awards, although we say that they are determined by need, are nonetheless rationed in such a way that many middle class and lower middle class children do not qualify for aid. In fact, it is possible that Member of this General Assembly making 28,000 dollars a year may not qualify if ... their child may not qualify for a monetary award program depending upon special family circumstances such as the number of children in school like. So, let me tell you, we're talking about getting money to kids who need it and to the achievers and performers who deserve the recognition that this state has to bestow. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 2400?' All
those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. This is final action. 60 votes are
required for passage. The Lady from DuPage, Representative
Karpiel, one minute to explain your vote."

Rarpiel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of this Bill. As I see, I don't really have to. I think that the whole idea of scholarships has just gotten out of whack lately. I think if you look in the definition of scholarship in a dictionary, you won't find anything about being able to be very tall, and play basketball, or play football, or basket... or baseball, or be in the band program or even be poor. I think you find that scholarship means something about being bright, and working hard, and getting good grades, and studying and learning. And I think

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

that it's about time we had a merit scholarship program in the State of Illinois. Any of you that represent middle class districts, this is for your district."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brookins."
- Brookins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and fellow Members of this Assembly. I stand in support of this district (sic Bill). I know that we have to encourage folks not only to play basketball and football, but to study hard so that they may qualify to do other things in life. This is a step in that direction."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 2400, and the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page five on your Calendar, under the Order of Motions, with leave of the Assembly, we would like to go to Representative McGann's Resolution 1104 which was skipped over earlier this morning. Representative McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill (sic Resolution)."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1104. Motion. 'I moved to Table... I move to discharge Human Services Committee and advance to the Order of the Speaker's Table.'"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - madam speaker) and Members of the Assembly. In House Resolution 1104, I am asking for an extension of the filing date to January 1, 1985, for the report on the High Risk Infants Newborn Committee. This has been agreed upon by both sides of the aisle and also the Chairman of Human Services, Chairman Jesse White. I would appreciate an affirmative vote.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1104. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the guestion is, 'Shall House Resolution 1104, be adopted?' All those favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Greiman is recognized for an announcement. Excuse me, excuse me, excuse Representative Greiman. We... I understand that we just acted on Representative McGann's Motion. That Motion was adopted to discharge Committee and advance the Bill to the Order of the Speaker's Table. Now we must move to adopt the Resolution. Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I
 would appreciate an affirmative vote in adopting this
 Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1104,

 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those
 opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

 have it and the Resolution is adopted. And now,
 Representative Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Least any of you believe that our work goes unnoticed, at 12:03 today Judge Nicholas 'Booa' issued a temporary restraining order, restraining the operation of House Bill 1399, which was the abortion Bill that we over... this House overrode the Governor's veto on. That has been enjoined on the grounds that it has a likelihood of being unconstitutional."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook... Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise? Excuse me, Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "I would just like to point out that the Gentleman did

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

say temporary, and that is exactly what that restraining order is."

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order... Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1541. Excuse me, this is on Supplemental #1. Senate Bill 1546. Representative Nash. Representative Nash. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1546, an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims and the State Comptroller. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash."

- Nash: "Thank you, Mr. (sic Madam) Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546. This is the appropriations for the Court of Claims."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546. and that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546? A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This requires 71 votes for passage. all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546. And the Bill. having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same Order of Business. Conference Committee Reports, Supplemental #1 appears Senate Bill 1547, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1547, is an Act to provide for the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly.

Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen эf The Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate t.he House. Bill 1547 would provide that the House recedes from Amendment #1 and further amend the Bill as follows: It. would add 405,000 dollars to each, the Senate Leader for their OCE and Staff; increases the President and Senate Minority Leader's allowance by 15,000 dollars 590,000 dollars from Senate Operations eliminates commissions: it adds 150,000 to Senate Standing Committees for technical assistance; it provides 1,500,000 to the House for House Speaker of the Standing Committees, legislative reorganization of 1984. pursuant to move for the adoption, by your green vote, of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1547."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1547. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. 51 ... 71 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no' and voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1547. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. ' Ladies and Gentlemen, Supplemental #2 appears House Bill 2740. Representative Giorgi, 2740. Clerk read the Bill.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2740, amends the County Home Act.

Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."

2740 is the Bill that has to do with Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, county government. I move that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2740. And the gist of the report is that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Senate Amendment 1 is the Amendment that allows, in a special service area, to allow farm not to be included. #2, it authorizes certain counties to make local improvements and that's localized to one County, DuPage County. Then it requests that the Senate recede Senate Amendment #3, and that's the language pertaining to county audit that is out of the Conference And then the Bill is further amended to allow that county government, with two thirds vote of the county board members, can consolidate their levies, and the only levy that is sacred is the nursing home levy. I think many of the Members of the General Assembly are aware of this Bill. It's been worked on quite comprehensively, and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2740. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Klemm: "Representative, perhaps you could explain, very briefly, consolidated tax levy system. Is that the combination of all the various taxes that are allowed by law that a county board can levy to be combined? Is that what you mean by that, Sir?"

145th Legislative Day

- July 1, 1984
- Giorgi: "Except for the nursing home levy."
- Klemm: "And could you tell the Body how many approximate separate levies a county board can now levy individually?"
- Giorgi: "It depends from county to county, but I would guess in the neighborhood of eight or ten levies."
- Klemm: "And these various levies, besides the corporate levy that
 we are aware of that usually has a limit of about .12,
 these special levies were enacted by the General Assembly
 to assist county boards in particular and specific
 activities of the Board?"
- Giorgi: "That is correct, that is why we require that two-thirds of the county board members agree in this type of an action."
- Klemm: "So, if a county doesn't need all its money, say for the conduct of elections, you are saying that, under your proposal, it could shift that extra levy money and spend it on highways, even though this chamber and everybody thought that was suppose to be spent for elections, is that what could happen?"
- Giorgi: "That's only though... it has to do with the wisdom of two-thirds of the county board members."
- Klemm: "But could that happen?"
- Giorgi: "If the county feels that they need to do that type of an action, and they get two-thirds of the members to agree, I would say that is the kind of intent that the General Assembly might have in mind."
- Klemm: "So, why did we, do you think, in the General Assembly, enact all these levies for specific reasons if, in fact, it's your concept that they can do anything they want with the money now, under your proposal?"
- Giorgi: "Would you please repeat the question?"
- Klemm: "Why do you think the General Assembly specifically said that these extra levies are for specific reasons? Because

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

under your concept they can do anything they want with it." Giorgi: "I think the only time the General Assembly would legislate levies for county boards is at the request of the county boards. This is at the request of various counties throughout the state that are having trouble balancing their budgets, having to cut back and retrench. And there are some funds that have money, and some funds that don't have money. They don't have the authority to transfer funds. We gave that authority to the townships. municipalities in Illinois have that authority. The County of Cook has that authority. We are not talking suburbas (sic - suburbs), we are talking about county board members from our local neighborhoods."

Klemm: "Well, surely you know the respect I have for county board members and particularly county chairmen, but in your page lines 8 to 12. two. on it really says consolidated tax levy system authorized by this Section shall be sufficient basis and law for the use of general levies without reference to and dependence upon the state statutes establishing that individual levy. So, in other words, they may not even have needed a program that was... they were able to levy a tax for, but under this. they can say whoopy let's tax it and throw it general fund, even though they had no intension in the first place of ever using that because some counties all of the dozen separate levies they perhaps didn't use could add. Couldn't that happen, Representative?"

Giorgi: "You're suggesting that the General Assembly gives the county board these authorities, and all of a sudden, two-thirds of the county board members throughout the State of Illinois have lost their minds. Is that what you are suggesting?"

Klemm: "I am just saying that perhaps..."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Giorgi: "Yes. You are suggesting that two-thirds the majority county board members throughout the 101 counties all of a sudden have lost their minds. Is that what you are saving?"

Klemm: "Well."

Giorgi: "Being a county board member you ought to be an authority on that."

Well, apparently, you wish not to answer my question. I would be delighted to answer your questions if I were the Sponsor of this Bill. I can understand what you are do trying to do, Representative, and I commend you for that. There is no problem there. I sat in that chair where I have had problems of balancing budgets for a number of years in McHenry County, and you are aware of that. But really what this does, and to the question, and to the Bill..."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Klemm: "Or Committee Report, Madam Speaker, is that... really what we are saying here is that we can take a two-thirds vote of a county and they can create and do all they want on the various levies that the County Board has authorized by this General Assembly, in which, I might add, specific legislation to do a specific job that the counties needed extra funds for, not to do their general levy, but to specifically help them out for elections, specifically help them out on highways, specifically help them out on the supervisor of assessment, perhaps, to modernize their programs. So, what your saying is that they can take that levy, even if they didnot need it, consolidate it and add it all up and go to the very maximum without any voter say whatsoever, irrespectable what this chamber has done in previous years, and I think that would be a very poor precedent, even if two-thirds of the county board were to

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

do that. This is certainly a tax increase. There is no doubt about it. It's another way of calling it, because, obviously, my county could have certainly increase a heck of a lot of taxes by looking for levies that it didn't necessarily need, or that didn't need that full amount. So, I would stand in opposition to this type of language, even though I do commend and support the Sponsor of trying to help the counties because I do see they do need help. But this is not the approach, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of Assembly. I rise in opposition to this proposal. I think Members ought to know a couple of things. Number one. the Illinois Association of Realtors is opposed to this. The Illinois Taxpayers Federation is opposed to this. The Illinois Farm Bureau is opposed to this. I was iust provided a list of the funds that could potentially be consolidated on this, and I have count ... I don't know that I have counted accurately, but I have counted about They include such current tax levies ач ambulance service; the bridge fund; the burial ground sailors and soldiers; the cancer and tumor relief fund; the child welfare fund; the cemetery restoration fund; the detention home fund; the election fund; the health county health department fund; the county highway fund: the hospital fund: the library fund: the police protection fund: the noxious weed control fund: the senior citizens social service fund; the supervisor of the assessment fund; the TB care and treatment fund; the TB sanitarium fund; the veterans assistance fund; the water works and sewerage system fund, and that is only a portion of those.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

not read all ... I have not read the entire list of those that would potentially be consolidated under this. That t ha t those particular services would have nο quarantee that the monies would be spent for purposes. Under the existing law, if there is a tax levied for senior citizens purposes, it needs to be spent for senior citizens purpose under this, they would he consolidated and we would have no assurance that they would be spent for that purpose. With a consolidated levy, we could not even determine for what purpose they are being... they are being levied, and the county could ship those away from the senior citizens, or away from the TB sanitarium, away from the police protection, or away from the airport, or away from the county health department, or away from the child welfare department, or away from cemetery restoration, or the ambulance service, or the burial grounds for soldiers and sailors, or the cancer and tumor relief fund. This is a bad policy. It is opposed by the Illinois Taxpayers Federation, the Illinois Association Realtors, the Illinois Farm Bureau. I am sure if additional groups had an opportunity to exam this. that is concerned about the taxpayers and about real estate taxes in their county ought to be voting a resounding 'no' with regard to this proposal."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is 'Shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Giorgi is recognized to close."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, the last Speaker implied that there is a

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

tax increase in this legislation. There is no tax increase in this legislation. The last speaker also implied that county board members are insensative to the needs of their By his vote on the pay raise and a couple of other things last night, he realizes that people are sensitive to the votes their elected Leaders take. County governments have had a tough time of it. We did this for township A hundred communities in Illinois under the qovernment. home rule granted by the Constitution have this power. County board members are very sensitive to the needs of their people. They wouldn't be taking money from one or another fund if that fund needed it, and one the reasons why we took the nursing home levy out of this is because of the sensitivity to that issue. That has cause a lot of I think this type of legislation is long overdue not withstanding the remarks of the last speaker, who did make some erroneous remarks, I urge the support of this General Assembly."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is 'Shall the House adopt
Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 2740?' All
those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. This is final action. 71 votes are
required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Excuse me,
Representative Steczo, one minute to explain your vote."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to clear up a few misconceptions, which I... which I, heard during the debate on House Bill 2740. First of all, regarding the various funds that Representative Brummer named, I am not so sure if those are only funds, but I am not sure of how many of those receive actual levies. This Bill concerns those funds that have the actual levies and, while it would take two-thirds of the county board vote to ship these funds from one area or another to the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

consolidated system, anything other than that, any increased authority that these county boards would have, would have to be by front door referendum. In addition. yesterday, a great deal of discussion took place with regard to the sliding scale that was based on That is no longer in this report. So. I believe that this is a means by which to assist county governments. I think that we've taking the protection by providing the two-thirds vote and the front door referendum in other cases. And I would urge the House to support this Conference Committee Report."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 23 voting 'aye', 79 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present', and the House does not adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2740. On Supplemental 2 also appears Senate Bill 1933, Representative Kulas."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1933, amends the law regarding special funds in the State Treasury and related matters.

 Conference Committee Report #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Kulas, on that last
 Bill, where we did not accept the Second Conference
 Committee Report, the Bill has thus failed, Representative
 Giorgi. House Bill 2740 has failed. Now, proceed,
 Representative Kulas."
- Rulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I would move that the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1933. The First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1933 eliminated the enacting clause and it is a whole new Bill. What the First Conference Committee does now, it creates the Illinois Ethnic Council. The Council would consist of 16 members who would be appointed by the Legislative Leaders.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

The purpose of the Illinois Ethnic Council is to stimulate public understanding and recognition of the importance of cultural and ethnic institutions in Illinois, and to encourage the use of local resources for the development and support of cultural and ethnic endeavors. The Council would also be responsible for the Heritage Festival, in conjunction with the Illinois State Fair. The Council would report to the Governor and to the General Assembly bi-annually. There is no public money involved legislation. What we are asking for here is for a forum for the ethnics in the State of Illinois where they can private funding so they would have a forum in the State of Illinois for their Ethnic projects. 1 solicitate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the
First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1933, and
on that question, the Gentleman from Livingston,
Representative Ewing."

"Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think Ewing: this is one of the more serious matters that will come before this Body today, and it is a matter of principal. first of all, I want to correct the Sponsor's admonition that there is no public money in this There is an appropriation in the Ag budget, which is now on the Governor's desk for over 100,000 dollars. This is the substantive legislation. Ladies and Gentleman, we have spent how many months dealing with the Commission problem and reorganization of Government. In your districts, people have demanded this reorganization. You have said that you were going to do it. Now is the time. This will tell about your resolve to really do away with the single issue Commissions. This is the biggest in-run to the Commission reform Bill that we have had and it will

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

certainly open the door to every one of the single issue Commissions being recreated as a Council. Certainly, you won't want to take that action today, less than 24 after we have passed the reform Bill for Commissions. the issue here is not whether we want any Ethnic activities in our State, but whether it should be done with a legislative body, such as a Commission or a Council. When this idea was orginally approached, we agreed, number of people agreed that this could be an activity under this Ag budget in the State Fair. But that wasn't We had to recreate it, like the Arts Council, and we had to pursue it, so that it was just as bad original Commission. And Ladies and Gentleman, there is a 100,000 dollars of tax money here. People back watching your activities and your vote in regard to this issue. If you want government reform and if you want to carry out what we did last night, in regard to Commissions, you will not vote for this Conference Committee Report. And I would solicit a resounding 'no' vote and send it back to the Senate."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Representative Kulas. 1 believe. is I am a Croatian. Ukrainian. Bob, here is Polish. We ve got an Irishman back there Mulcahey. My seatmate is Italian. My other seatmate is Black. And ¥е have the Staple Singers here. You know, just because we made a policy decision with regards to the Commissions, that not mean that we should scuttle a good idea. And the Ethnic Heritage Festival is a good idea that was brought And I don't care forth by the Ethnic Heritage Commission. who in my district is watching me, Representative Ewing, we do have a good idea. It was brought forth in the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Legislature and we should continue it. The Ethnic Heritage Pestival at the State Fair brings forth many. different ethnic backgrounds to the State Fair and Everybody is of some ethnic origin. everybody is somebody. I don't know who could oppose this. It has nothing to do with the Commissions. We are saying that we are making a policy decision that the Ethnic Heritage Festival should continue. It does good for all ethnic backgrounds. don't care what your background is. As I said, we saw the Staple Singers here the other day. They were brought here, understand, by the Ethnic Heritage Commission. all to the good we have a Norwegian here, Joe Brunsvold. know there is some Swedes here that are going to vote for Whatever your background is, stand firm and continue Bthnic Heritage Pestival. It is good for all of us." Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. previous Gentleman knows full well that this Conference Committee Report does much more than continue an Ethnic Heritage Festival at the State Fair. That can done, certainly, without this legislation. This Conference Committee Report recreates the Ethnic Heritage Commission and changes it to a council, but it is exactly the thing as the Commission. Someone said earlier, I believe, I thought I heard, that this isn't going to cost any money. I am not sure how they are going to be payed but Section 6 specifically provides the Council may employee an Executive Director, a Secretary, and such clerical, technical and other employees and the assistance as it considers necessary for the proper transaction of it's business. of course, the members of the Ethnic Heritage Council may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their, duties, so, of course, it is going to cost money.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

No there isn't any appropriation in this Bill, but we all know that is because you can't have substantive language in an appropriation Bill. This is the substantive Bill from which an appropriation will later spring in all it's glory. This is the Ethnic Heritage Commission renamed the Illinois Ethnic Council. It is a sham and we should be defeating it right now. Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise to speak on behalf of the WASP faction of the General Assembly. And if it were not for the Ethnic Heritage Festival at the State Pair that is contemplated in this legislation, we might have to have our very Fest in a telephone booth somewhere, and I think that would be a terrible tragedy. I think we ought to draw strength from one another and to join together in celebrating the diversity of our backgrounds. And so, I just wanted to remind Representative Matijevich, that us WASPS are ethnics too, John."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker ... Madam Speaker, Members of House. I think I must also remind you that some of us who are in favor of true reform are also of varying ethnic This is simply another attempt to recreate a Commission in another form. It has got to be exposed for is-You can't what it justify it in any way, and I am certainly not discrediting what you are seeking to as a purpose of this Commission or Council or whatever you want to call it. When we held all those ο£ hearings investigating Commissions and interviewing Executive Directors, we exposed all kinds of practices that do not belong in state government, all kinds

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

ο£ abuses, lack of control, certain things that concluded were issues that were... we pointed out issues that were being dealt with by state government that may be excellent issues and things that need to be addressed, simply did not fall under governmental control, things that did not belong within government or being funded government, but simply were things that should be addressed in other ways. Perhaps this is one of those. Perhaps this is one that had abuses within it. I can't ramble off this time exactly what was going on in the Ethnic Heritage Commission when we interviewed them. However. know that we cannot continue to drive these things underground into our budgets and hide them. The media find them, I hope, and that is kind of a wish of mine that I call to your attention. We can't continue do this. Let's make it true reform. Let's not show ourselves for being something that we really shouldn't Let's end the Commissions now. Let's evaluate some of the findings that we found at the Policy Committee hearings and in all of the hours that the Leaders spent debating that we have much information to base a reorganization on. Let's not undermine it by attempts at creating other ways of having Commissions buried somewhere within the budget. This is a 106.000 the Department of Agriculture that I think could be better spent, and we are dealing with an issue that needs to addressed, but not in this way. I urge your 'no' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you. I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne moves the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

put? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the main question is put. Representative Kulas is recognized to close."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In response to some of my previous speakers, one of the Gentleman mentioned the 106,000 dollar appropriation in the Department of Agriculture. That is specifically appropriated to the Agriculture Department for the purpose of the cultural and ethnic event at the State Fair. That money is strictly used for travel, for lodging for the performers, for printing up the brochures, et cetera. Нe also there was... the first initial Bill created advisory board in the Department of Agriculture. Well. he opposed to that too, because that smelled like a commission, he said. Well, I opposed that because it the ethnics with the hogs and the cows in the Department of Agriculture. Ladies and Gentlemen, one of the great things about the State of Illinois is the diversity of cultures and the different ethnic groups that make up segment of our population. One of the good Commissions which was abolished by the meat are approach Assembly was the Ethnic Heritage Commission. This left a large segment of our population without where these people could turn to. The Illinois Ethnic Council would provide that forum. We are not asking for any monies. These people are willing to put up their own monies in order to keep such a forum. They want to involved in the State Fairs. They want to get involved with the World's Pair, if that ever comes to a fruition, and these people deserve a forum. And I would solicit your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1933. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. This is final action. 71 votes are required for passage. Representative Nash is recognized to explain his vote."

Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the I rise in support of this fine piece of legislation House. and in reference to the 106,000 that you are talking about in Department ο£ Agriculture, this Commission, in operation, Commission, when it was never paid anv salaries for performers for ten days at the State Pair. They perform free of charge. Think all we paid for their transportation down. We didn't pay hundreds of thousands for them to perform for one night, and this is a fine piece of legislation. I urge your 'ave' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 56 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no' and 5 voting there are the 'present'. And House does not adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1933. And the Sponsor requests a Second Conference Committee. Is that Representative? That is correct. Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have not yet completed Supplemental # 1 on the budget. On the back page appears Senate Bill 1549. Representative Barnes, Senate Bill 1549. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1549, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1549 addresses the '85 Fiscal Year appropriation for

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

the Department of Agriculture. When the Bill started out, it was 14,705,000.4. After Committee action, it was 15,129,000.9 which made a change of 424.5 dollars."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1549. And on that question, the Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Yes, Madam Speaker. The Lady yield for a question please?"
- Speaker Breslin: "She will."
- Hicks: "Yes, Representative Barnes, in on the Conference Committee Report, I see that Amendment #2 was deleted from the Conference Committee Report. Is that correct?"
- Barnes: "Well, Representative Hicks, when we were in the Conference Committee, you had several Amendments that were on the Agricultural Bill, and since you were so interested in the rabbit breeders we left the rabbit breeders, in.

 The reason that the tractor Amendment was eliminated because it was discussed that they already had 37,000 dollars. Does that answer your question?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Ma'am it does. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. I
 would oppose the Motion to accept the Conference Committee
 Report, ask for a 'present' vote on the Bill. I think that
 there are several problems with the Conference Committee
 Report. Would ask for that 'present' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

McNamara: "In this particular Bill, is this the Bill where... and the last discussion, I heard that there were dollars in there for a Commission?"

Barnes: "Yes. You are right. Every year... it's not really a

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Commission. Every year the Ethnic Heritage Festival takes care... takes place at the Fair. And people from all over the State of Illinois come for the Festival, and that was left in the Bill, and it was an agreed Amendment."
- McNamara: "Then based on this last vote that we took on the Motion before, should that Bill be amended then to take out those funds?"
- Barnes: "The appropriation... Could you, Representative McNamara, Would you please ask your question again?"
- McNamara: "In light of the situation that the dollars are in there for that Commission, and in light of the last issue which was defeated on this floor, should there be an amendment to take out these funds that were disallowed by the last Motion?"
- Barnes: "Well, it is my understanding that the Governor is going to line item veto, or we are going to ask him to do that."
- McNamara: "And how much money is that that is going to be taken out of that budget?"
- Barnes: "It's approximately something like a 105,000 dollars."
- McNamara: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."
- Brummer: "Yes, There had been a Amendment, two Amendments placed on this with regards to rehabilitation of bleachers or grandstands at county fairs, one with regard to Marion County, and one with regard to Lawrence County. I was specifically interest in one with regard Lawrence County. Is that still in there?"
- Barnes: "Yes, Representative Brummer. That is your Amendment. I made the Democratcs aware of that. It was House Amendment #14. It remains in the Bill."
- Brummer: "Well, the report says the House recedes from House

 Amendment #14."

145th Legislative Day

- July 1, 1984
- Barnes: "I beg your pardon. It's in the Capitol Development

 Board Bill."
- Brummer: "Okay. And is the... is the one regarding the Marion County Pairground in here?"
- Barnes: "That Marion County Fair is in Senate Bill 1549 That we are discussing right now."
- Brummer: "Okay, what was the reason for eliminating from the Ag
 Bill, which is where the county fair rehabilitation
 appropriations usually go, the one with regards to Lawrence
 County."
- Barnes: "You had had it on several Bills, and it was a Capitol

 Development..."
- Brummer: "Why not strike it from the Capitol Development Bill and leave it all here with the Galatian County Fair, the Wayne County Fair, the Marion County Fair?"
- Barnes: "Because construction is a capitol project and,

 Representative Brummer, if I were you I would feel very

 fortunate that it is still in. There are many Members

 sitting on this floor that are going back with nothing for
 their districts."
- Brummer: "Thank you very much. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Representative Barnes, would you yield for a question."
- Speaker Breslin: "She will."
- Cullerton: "Did you say, under questioning by Representative McNamara, that this money is a 100 and some thousand dollars that is used, that was designed to be used at the State Fair, is going to be vetoed out."
- Barnes: "I said that I think that there will be a request made to have it vetoed out. We never know what is going to happen once we leave Springfield."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Cullerton: "A request made by whom?"

Barnes: "Well, there are some people that are on this side of the aisle, not me, that are not for Commissions and they think this sounds like a Commission. I would almost suspect they would be the ones that would make that request."

Cullerton: "Well, who put it in the Bill?"

Barnes: "Leverenz."

Cullerton: "Well, who agreed on your side to put it in the Bill?

Who signed the Conference Committee Report?"

Barnes: "She, I am for, I am for Commissions, didn't you know that? I am the female Al Ronan."

Cullerton: "He is my roommate."

Barnes: "Well, I'll take that, I'll take that under consideration for the next General Assembly."

Cullerton: "And the next Bill. Alright, well, I just find that ironic that the last Bill was defeated because this is a Commission, which it clearly isn't."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, I was a 'yes' on the last Bill.

Did you notice that?"

Cullerton: "Fine, I just wanted to clarify that the event is still planned at the State Fair."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "And the money is in this Bill to fund it."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like this side of the aisle now, and I don't speak personally, I am speaking now in my position in Leadership that this side of the aisle vote 'present' on this Bill. I thought I distinctly heard the Lady on that side of the aisle say we are going to ask the Governor to

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

item veto this Ethnic Heritage Festival out. I don't have a farmer in my District, I don't have one single farmer in my district. and I have supported the Department Adriculture for years. And I will continue to support them, but when I see how narrow-minded somebody can be not support a program that has been very good for many, many ethnic backgrounds, it has instilled, I think, a new appreciation of many of the Ethnic backgrounds, and that is I think, for all of the State of Illinois. I really believe that we can send this back to the Conference. that and Representative Kulas* Bill. and come to an agreement. It has been done time and time again. т would urge this side of the aisle and some on that side of the aisle, who feel as I do, that we should continue Heritage Festival this year and in the following years to vote 'present' on this appropriation. Ιt can bе done. believe me. Don't follow your Leadership when it is That is not right. If you really believe that this Heritage Festival should be continued vote 'present' and. believe me, it will be continued. We will put it together tonight. So vote 'present'."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Clerk is recognized for Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #4 is being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative
 Friedrich."
- Priedrich, D: "Well, I have been listening to this conversation and I don't think there is that relationship between Representative Kulas' proposal and this. The 100,000 dollars in this Bill is to be used to the State Pair for this Ethnic Group Festival. It does not have anything to do with the Commission or anything else. It is just one of the events at the State Fair should be funded out of this.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

think anything that's on this Bill has a chance of getting the Governor's approval or not, and I. for one. think this is a good activity at the State Pair. It brings groups of all kinds and I would, personally, encourage the Governor to approve this expenditure. But it does not have anything to do with Representative Kulas' measure. T think that Representative Ewing was wrong when he said the 100,000 dollars would fund the Commission because it doesn't. So I, personally, think this is a good activity State Fair, and I think it is on there and the way to keep it on there is just vote the Bill out with a 100,000 dollars on there. Not turn it back, because it could get cut off next time."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Plinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay', and
in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the
main question is put. Representative Barnes is recognized
to close."

Barnes: "Well, Madam Speaker, I would like to make something clear. When I first saw the funding for this Pestival, I questioned whether it was a Commission or not and I was informed that it is not a Commission. Because I felt if we are going to have one Commission, we should have all Commissions. So I would like to set Representative Mati jevich fears at rest. I do feel that at the Springfield Fair we will have a Ethnic Heritage Festival. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is 'Shall the House adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1549?'

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open. 71 votes are required for adoption.

 Representative Leverenz is recognized to explain his vote.
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen House. The money in question is General Revenue Funds the appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of the Ethnic Festival at the Fair. The fact is that the Department of Agriculture is going to control the apparent spending of that dollar rather than an Advisory Council. So the money is going to be spent for the purpose for which it was put in by the Members of the Conference Committee. So I would hope that this would the sufficient number of votes to pass."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you rise."
- Matijevich: "Yes, I was embroiled in a conversation in here and I have been told that there is a commitment that there be... this will not be vetoed out and I think the Governor is standing back there. He can iust nod yes or Governor, I know you are here for other reasons, but I know you always support us Ethnics, but he really can nod yes or But I did hear Jane Barnes say that and the Republican Leadership has nodded to me that the Ethnic Heritage Festival will go on this year, and based on that, T going to change to 'ave'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer, would you change my vote to 'aye', please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino asks to be voted 'aye'. Representative Ropp, do you still want to explain your vote? Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "No. Madam Speaker, I really wanted to talk in debate."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1549. And the Bill, having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same Order of Business appears Senate Bill 1554, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1554, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, with First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate
Bill 1554 is the money that is appropriated for the Fiscal
Year '85 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department
of Commerce and Community Affairs. In the... after the
Conference Committee Report, the money is 424 million 368.1
dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1554. And on that question, the Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Deuchler: "It was my understanding that some 150,000 dollars was going to be included in this budget for the Mass Science Academy that the Governor and many other of us have been very interested in in the Fox Valley. Are you finding that amount in your budget?"

Barnes: "Representative, no, I am not. The President of the Senate, who was a Democrat and has a lot of clout around here, was against it and it is out of the Bill."

Deuchler: "Can you tell me what the issues were that were discussed in that regard?"

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Barnes: "Representative, all I know is when I sat around the table, I heard it was out and why it was out and we didn't want to lose this entire Bill when we know we were fighting a losing battle. The vote was 6 to 4. You did have the Republicans within the room with you on your Amendment."

Deuchler: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "A question of the Sponsor' Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield."

Mulcahey: "Is the Chicago Symphony Orchestra going to go some where this year?"

Barnes: "They are going to Europe, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "I see. How are they going to get there? Who is going to pay their way?"

Barnes: "We are paying 25 percent from the DCCA budget and 75 percent will be payed by the Chicago Symphony."

Mulcahey: "Okay. How much, how much is the State going to pick up to send the Chicago Symphony Orchestra to Europe."

Barnes: "250,000."

Mulcahey: "Just a quarter of a mil, not bad."

Barnes: "Amendment #37."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Let's see. Is Bolingbrook High School going somewhere this year?"

Barnes: "Representative you know, it would make it so much easier if you would refer to the Amendment."

Mulcahey: "Number eleven."

Barnes: "Thank you. I know that they are going and just a second while I get to the Amendment. They are going to the Fiesta Bowl."

Mulcahey: "And we are going to pay for that, too, I understand.

Is that correct, or part of it?"

Barnes: "Representative, that is not the first time that we have

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

sent a band somewhere."

Mulcahey: "I don't care if it is the first time or not. We are going to pay for it though, right?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Mulcahey: "Okay. How about the... we got a Civic Center some place in Orland Park."

Barnes: "Oh, I hope so, Representative,"

Mulcahey: "And how much is that going to come to this year."

Barnes: "1.7 million. It's a one time grant. They will never need anymore funding."

Mulcahey: "And or let's see or Falon High School is bound for the Orange Bowl, is that correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Mulcahey: "And that is going to... what is that, a couple thousand or what?"

Barnes: "You didn't tell me what Amendment."

Mulcahey: "25, Well it is not an Amendment."

Barnes: "25,000 Representative."

Mulcahey: "Oh, 25,000, okay, you see we're funding elementary and secondary education at 38 percent. Thank you very much, very interesting."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "I have a question for the Sponsor about Amendment #

27."

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Dunn, J.: "And the question is my analysis indicates that the line item for the payment of the state's share of state's attorneys salaries is reduced by... I can not tell, but it looks like 263,000, is that correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct, and the money has been added to the Department of Corrections budget, Representative."

Dunn, J.: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Lady

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

- Barnes: "I would merely, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House ask for an 'aye' vote on this appropriation."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 155424 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. 71 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. question there are 86 voting 'aye'. 18 voting 'no' voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference... the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill the Bill. having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1558, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1558 addresses the appropriation for the fiscal year ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. The total amount, final amount is 75,806,511 dollars. There was a change of 30,300 dollars after the Conference Committee. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the First Conference Committee Report of Senate Bill 1558 be adopted?' All

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1558. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1574, Representative Hastert. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1574, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Public Aid. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Madam Speaker),

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Conference Committee

Report on 1574, which is the appropriation for the

Department of Public Aid, moved to accept the First

Conference Committee Report. The total changes brings the

Department's budget to approximately, well, to exactly

2,204,920,000 dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House The Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1574, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is 'Shall the House adopt the Pirst Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1574? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. voted who wish? This is final action. all Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this... the House does

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1574. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental #4, there are Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 2837, Representative Madigan - Ronan - Stuffle. Representative Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2837, a Bill for an Act in relation to a Local Government Infrastructure Assistance Progam. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, on behalf of Speaker Madigan and Representative Ronan, the cosponsors on this Bill, the Conference Committee Report scales back the initial version of the Bill to a maximum 90 million dollar revenue bond authority program. It limits the scope of the Bill to cities and other units of government, 25,000 and under, and it provides a method by which we can attempt to pool the sales of bonds of small units of government SO that they can be marketed and so they can make infrastructure improvements, which аге essential to economic development and job creation. The Bill continues to provide, as we indicated on the floor before. exemption, as do several other bond issues and several others types of authorities. It has been worked Senate, as we have scaled it back. It has been worked out in conversation with the Governor's Office and worked out with DCCA. And I would ask for your affirmative vote on this important economic development and recovery Speaker Madigan has put together. I think it is essential to small units of government. it also contains a basic provision that says there shall be an evaluation of the ability of units of local government to market their bonds, and it says that that evaluation provision, that

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

those who look at the sales must decide that without the state's help that bonds otherwise would not be marketed, and small units of government would be unable to make bond sales. I ask for your affirmative vote, along with the Speaker and Representative Ronan, on the Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 2837."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2837. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2837? those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. This Bill Mr. Clerk, take the record. for passage. this question there are 109 voting 'ave', none voting and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2837, and the Bill, having received a Three - Pifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to public utilities. Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. would urge the House to adopt Conference Committee Report 2987. #2 to House Bill As you will remember, Conference Committee Report was debated last night. There was one objectionable area in the report. That has been deleted for Conference Committee Report #2. This Bill was one that was amended in the Senate with regard to changing definition of public TV stations, and the regarding CUB that were kept in this particular

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

provisions that were contained in House Bill 2553, which passed this House by a vote of 92 to 16. They extend the date of election for the permanent Board of Directors of the Citizens' Utility Board until December 31, 1984. allow public employees of public utility companies, who are not in the supervisory or managerial capacity, eligible to serve on the CUB Board. It sets standards which prevent a quorum of the Board from being smaller than one-third of the members of the Board of Directors and adds specific language to provide for the availability of membership applications and nominating petitions This Bill is important, especially with the CUB provisions that are contained in the Conference Committee The original Bill contained energy conservation Report. programs by the Commerce Commission. In order for the CUB elections to proceed smoothly, these provisions must pass, and I would ask for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that this House adopt
the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2987.
And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry,
Representative Klemm."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want clarification that Klemm: it does change the election of the Board of Directors from December 31, '84, until no later than April 30, 1985. And I just wanted to clarify that. I have no opposition to the Conference Committee Report and do ask for its adoption." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin." Levin: "The Sponsor is absolutely correct. The provision was in Conference Committee Report #1 that caused 69 persons to vote against the first report has been deleted. Everything in this Bill now is good. There are provisions in here that CUB very badly needs. I think there are

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

reforms that are left over from the original Bill which are also very, very necessary. So, I urge the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2. I think we got our message across when we defeated Report #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Stuffle: "Representative Steczo, I can't find the Report in the piles of them on my desk. All of the provisions from 2553, as it went out of here, are in this Report?"

Stezco: "They are in the Report, Representative Stuffle, yes."

Stuffle: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2987? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for is final action. Have all voted who wish? This Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On question, there are 102 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2987, and the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental #1 appears House Bill 2546, Representative Matijevich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Board of Education. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2546 is one of the two Bills for education of the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

State of Illinois. This is for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the State Board of Education, and for State Board for reimbursements. The Bill, on the Conference Committee Report, provides for funding 60 percent of pay-out level. It provides for 95 percent proration of districts. claims in special education. private tuition, special ed extraordinary services, special ed personnel reimbursement, special transportation. regular pupil transportation and school funds. Provides for a hundred percent funding of education orphanage tuition and it deletes the Governor's master training program and the 200,000 for the alcohol and abuse program. Provides for 837,300 for noneducational special education, Henry Horner Program. Increases funding in the truant alternative program 600,000 in FY *84 to 1,600,000 in FY '85. The computer consortia, which we no longer have federal funding for has increased from 500,000 to the... thousand figure. The adult ed basic has increased from 6 million to 6 the State, has increased from million 5. Adult ed. 3,675,000 to 4,000,000. The... Academy at а 100.000 dollars and Marion repair grant at 40,000. MathScience Scholarship at 75,000 dollars. The Members Conference Committee went over all with this Bill and the next Bill. which Representative Stuffle will give of. And I would now move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2546 and add personal comments that over all I believe we're 20,000,000 past what we had been. None of us are happy with what doing with education this year, but we are strive... that we are going to do more in the future. I sense there was some battles between those. for example, who want to help the poor and those who want to

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

help education. It's a battle that we should never be involved in because we want to help both the poor and we want to help fund education at the best level that we can. So I would urge the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2546.

 And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn, J.: "Thank you. Ms. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman listened carefully to the House. 1 what the Sponsor indicated is in this Conference Committee Report. there are good things and there are bad things in the Conference Committee Report. One thing that at least, most of us that are downstate Democrats, did this spring is to tell our school teacher friends that didn't think it was right that retirement system pay-outs be paid at anything less than 100 percent. And now we're asked to approve a Conference Committee Report which provides for funding of teacher retirement at 60 percent of pay-out level. We all know that there is not much do to stop this. This provision has been inserted in all of the retirement programs, but if you want to keep the teachers that you probably had breakfast with or talked to at the hot dog tent when you told them that were opposed to pay-out of teacher retirement funds at anything less than a 100 percent, you shouldn't vote this Conference Committee Report. Just because your Leadership cut a deal which adversely affected vour teachers, doesn't you have to, and it doesn't mean mean that the world will end or state government will come to a If enough people rise up and support the school teachers of this state, we will go back and we will

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

this and we will do what's right and what's responsible, and what we have a moral obligation to do, and that is to fund the teacher's retirement programs at 100 percent of pay-outs and go on about the orderly assignment of priorities in state government so that we can fund the things which ought to be funded and delete the things which aren't supposed to be funded and do what the taxpayers want us to do. So I would urge a 'no' vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative...

Excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

Hoffman. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk needs to make a report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #5 is being distributed."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman."

you very much. Mr. (sic - Madam) Speaker Ladies Hoffman: "Thank and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Motion on House Bill 2546. In regard to the last speaker. I will share with anyone in the House who isn't aware of it that I make my living as a school teacher. The fact of the matter is that I, for one, am not concerned about the funding level at the present time of the retirement system. That retirement system is better funded, the liability assets, than it has ever been before. When I came to Assembly 18 years ago, we were somewhere like 28 percent. We are now over 50. There is a legitimate debate in the community that studies these kinds of issues to what level should a public pension system be funded and tie up public's money. The fact of the matter is that those schools need dollars in their program today. And in order to balance out those needs and the pension needs, we put this particular program together. I rise in support of the program and encourage all of you to give this an vote."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, the point is well taken by, I quess, both Gentlemen, Representative Dunn and Representative Hoffman. No one wants to see under-fund the public pension systems of the state. No one wants to see us be below a 100 percent of pay-out. The problem is that we are, but the opposite of that problem is have been able to move the Governor and to move that others from a level in these two Bills of only 27 million less than 2 percent even in general state aid, to a level of 75 million dollars in categorical... in state aid just within the last several days. And not until 4:00 in the morning was this hammered out to everyone's satisfaction. It's not perfect. Representative Matijevich and I and others tried to get a hundred million or instead of the 75 here. We thought that was possible, but we were glad to be able to get this much money out of this particular Bill and the next one. We regret the situation with the teachers pension system. I have been up here as anyone else, so has Jean, so has John, to attempt to get more money for pensions, but it is simply not there is not going to be there this year. We put on the Governor's desk a reform that provides, beginning in fiscal year to ensue, a new program that ought to be funded in terms of pension funding. We need to put this Bill on the Governor's desk now before we run into the situation that a subsequent report may reduce rather than enhance the amounts in this Bill and the one that follows."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative

Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Madam Speaker), Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We certainly have a very

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

important piece of legislation before us. It is a piece of legislation that has been hammered out. Sometimes it is a long, long process, the appropriation process. It starts Committee and starts with a lot of different positions and a lot of different ideas. We have moved from a where we were at a per pupil funding of approximately \$1,753.00 per pupil we have increased that this year to \$1,845.00 per pupil which is almost a 5.2 percent increase, better than any increase that we have given, across the the board, to any agency or any type of cost increase. I think that is something that you can you can talk to people about. With this Bill and the next Bill that we are going to have that will bring levels for the categoricals up to very good levels, I think this is a very good accommodation of some very dire positions and ask for support."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2546?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. This is final action. It requires 71 votes for adoption. Representative Bowman is recognized to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just briefly for the record, we are prorating the categoricals at 3 percentage points above where they left the House. And we do have money in for some of the serious problems that were created in the Computer Consortium area and the Truance Alternatives. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2546, and the Bill, having received the Three-Fifths

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2547, Representative Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2547, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, this is the Second Bill in the education program that has been worked out between the two Houses and both sides of the aisle. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on it. I think it equitably distributes the money that is available to the general state aid formula. It provides an increase of some 39 million dollars in the general state aid formula, and the compares to only 9 that we started with at the Governor's level and only 19 at the House level, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote on the Conference Committee on House Bill 2547."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt
the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2547.

And on that question, is there any discussion? The
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Gentleman indicated. this level is 20 dollars over the level as it left the House. And as we indicated, when the Bill was being debated in that were we able to identify additional revenues. House. this is where we would put them. We have passed the tax amnesty program, I am very pleased to say. That tax amnesty program is projected to gather in an additional 20 million dollars worth of revenues and this is where we are putting them."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marzuki."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Marzuki: "Yes. I would reluctantly support this appropriation.

I think, again, we have not sufficiently funded the schools."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... The Gentleman from Kendall. Representative Hastert. The Gentleman indicates does not wish to speak. The question is. 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bi 11 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed 2547?* vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Ιt 71 votes for adoption. requires Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the recordthis question there are 111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2547. Anā the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to Supplemental #3. The First item of business there is incorrectly marked 'Nonconcurrence' **i** + 'Concurrences', and under that Order of should be marked Concurrences appears House Bill 2913, Representative Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2913, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code, together with Senate Amendment #1."
Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Rea."

Rea: "Thank Madam Speaker and Members of the House. you, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2913 only has to do with the effective date and makes it become effective upon the signing of the Bill. And this was an oversight that we had that the Senate has corrected, having to ОĎ with persons do have a perfect driving record for the past 4 years. that if there is an accident and it is not their fault. this does not count against them in terms of not having to take the drivers test. And I would move at this

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

concurrence of Amendment #1."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt... House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to rather that the House Bill 2913. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2913?* A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage, requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion there are 112 voting 'ave'. none voting 'no'. and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2913, and the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1870, Representative Barnes. Is the Lady in the Chamber? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1870, a Bill for an Act to release highway easements and to restore access rights in certain described lands. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, could I ask when you intend to go to my busing Bill, House Bill 3136? A lot of my Members are around here and they would like to know."
- Speaker Breslin: "We are following the Order on the Calendar and
 we are going to complete the Supplementals, Representative
 Barnes."
- Barnes: "Well, a lot of people are waiting and I just certainly hope we are going to get to that Order of Business."
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed on Senate Bill 1870, Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Senate Bill 1870, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is an act to release highway easements and to

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

restore access rights to certain described lands. I would request an 'aye', vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved that the House accept...

adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill

1870. And on that question, is there any discussion? The

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will yield for a question."

Leverenz: "Who are we giving access to what?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes, there has been a question raised by Representative Leverenz. Who are we giving access to what."

Barnes: "Well, as we discussed in Committee, Representative
Leverenz, there were many counties downstate and would you
like me to get out the file and name all the Counties?
There have been appraisals on all of the land and it seems
like we all signed off on it in Committee, but would you
like me to get the file?"

Leverenz: "Am I on the Conference Committee?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Leverenz: "I was?"

Barnes: "Never moved without you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion?"

Leverenz: "Well, the Lady didn't answer who are we giving access to what, and...

Speaker Breslin: "Can you... Can you answer that?"

Leverenz: "I did a lot, but I didn't think I signed a Conference

Committee that I don't remember attending. Was I there?"

Barnes: "Well, it is quit a lengthly Bill, but I will be glad to read every line of it, Representative, because I am not in a hurry."

Leverenz: "Just tell me."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Barnes: "Parcel 5x34602 a part of the south half of Section 12
and the north half of Section 13. Township 11 North, range
12 West Second Principal... Meridian, Clark County,
Illinois and also a part of the lands aguired is tract #346
recorded in Book 4 of the Recorders Office in Clark County,
Illinois. Commensing at the intersection of the surveyed
center line of Federal Aid Route 12, said surveyed line
between 32 southerly of the center line and the existing
pavement of US Route 40 and the west property line of CCC
and St. L Railroad measure north, 1 degree, 18 minutes west
along the west property line of said railroad.

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Excuse me."

Barnes: "A 122.2 feet..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Barnes. Mr.
Leverenz, do you wish to know anymore about this."

Leverenz: "I simply asked who are we giving access to what? But if the Lady would like to help to explain that by reading the legal description of the land in Galesburg that is okay. Who's Legislative District is this in?"

Barnes: "All I knew of it is that it wasn't mine, Representative,

Clark County, Clark County. Let me see Fayette County,

maybe the Representatives would stand up as I call their

counties."

Leverenz: "Well, Madam Speaker, to the Conference Committee
Report. The Lady indicated that we were giving access to
someone for something and we can't find out what that be.
The Lady also indicated that I was at the Conference
Committee. I have the Conference Committee Report before
me and the only Ted that served on the Conference Committee
was our good friend Senator Lechowicz. That's Big Ted, as
compared to me, so I wasn't there."

Barnes: "You all look alike."

Leverenz: "Pardon me."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Barnes: "You all look alike, Representative."

- Leverenz: "I wouldn't get into that just now. I hope that we just get a lot of yellow's. Maybe we can help get an answer."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Karpiel.

 Can you enlighten us on this."
- Karpiel: "Well, I 'm sorry. I was on the telephone and I didn't here the beginning of this, so if they could please repeat the question. I was on the Conference Committee on this."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is who are we giving easements to.

Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you rise now?"

- Leverenz: "I guess I am going to rise on a point of personal priviledge. I don't think we own the land on which the prison is going to be built, if I am correct, and that is a hig contention. It's Santa Fe Railroad property and I think that it might include that, and it is about 2 million dollars worth of property that might be given away one way or the other. That is why I asked the question."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative Hawkinson, can you enlighten us, Sir?"
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, this does not affect the prison property in any way. This is the Mental property, which is being phased out, unfortunately. No, the prison is not being built on the Mental Center property. The prison is a separate parcel on a separate piece of property which has been given to the state. That is an entirely different piece of property. This provision, as it applies to the City of Galesburg, not deeding the property to the City of Galesburg. It only authorizes the negotiation between the Department and the City for a price. It authorizes that in 1986 it is not.... not giving the property in anyway and it does not affect the prison property in anyway."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Leverenz: "That sounds better. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, I would merely ask for an 'aye' wote to Senate Bill 1870."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has... The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1970? All those in favor vote 'ave', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have a 1 1 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. and 11 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1870. Bill. having received Three-Fifths Constitutional a Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen. on the Order of Supplemental #5 appears Senate Bill 1612. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1612, a Bill for an Act in relation to civic centers. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The effect of the Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1612 is that the Senate concurred in the Amendments 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10, and I would move that we adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1612."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House accept... adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1612, and on that question, the Gentleman Effingham, Representative Brummer. The Gentleman indicates does not wish to speak on the Bill. Is there any further discussion? There being пo discussion, the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1612?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed for 'no'. Voting is open. The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick, one minute to explain her vote."

Zwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd simply like to explain that the reason that I am voting 'no' is that House Bill 1612 is... or I 'm sorry, Senate Bill 1612 is really a duplication of House Bill 2732, which I voted 'yes' on, and is out of here, and I believe is on the Governor's desk. If I am mistaken, I wish I would be corrected, but I think that we have already voted this out of here other than perhaps one or two additional civic centers which have been added in this Bill. Other than that, it is the same as the other Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? will take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 34 'ave'. voting 'no' and 8 voting 'present'. Representative Hoffman. Do you wish to poll the absentees."

Hoffman: "Please."

Speaker Breslin: "Would you Poll the Absentees, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Bullock. Huff. Jaffe.

Pierce. Taylor. Tuerk and Wincherster."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any further votes on this Bill?

Representative Ralph Dunn asked to vote from 'present' to
'aye'. Does anyone else... Representative Satterthwaite.

Representative Satterthwaite asks leave to be changed from
'no' to 'aye'. There are 71 votes... Representative

Marzuki. Representative Marzuki wants to go from 'present'

to 'aye'. Representative Mautino wants to go from 'no' to
'aye'. Representative Hallock, wants to go from 'no' to

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- 'aye'. Representative Olson wants to go... we have plenty of votes for passage, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's take our time. Representative Olson asks to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Flinn asks to go from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, how many... what is the count on this Bill? On this Bill there are 76 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1612. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Nash on Senate Bill 1546."
- Nash: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Senate Bill 1546 the Senate did not accept the First Conference Committee Report, so I request Second Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen asks for a Second Conference
 Committee on Senate Bill 1546. Hearing no objections, the
 Second Conference Committee will be assigned.
 Representative McPike is recognized on the Adjournment
 Resolution."
- McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Clerk read the Resolution?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 180, resolved by the House of Representative of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when both Houses adjourn on Sunday July 1, 1984, they stand adjourned until Wednesday November 14, 1984, at 12:00 noon."
- McPike: "I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

 Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative McPike has moved for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Now, we still have some

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

business to do, Ladies and Gentlemen, so don't leave the chamber. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to go to page two on your Calendar, Senate Bills Third Reading, Senate Bill 1609, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask leave of the House To move this back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
 the order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
 Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave.
 Nr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
 Hastert Bowman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Madam Speaker). Amendment #4... Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic - Madam Speaker). Amendment #4 is for a problem that we ran with the Department of Public Aid. What that did was that deleted approximately... we had cut 4,362,700 What we needed to do... we added those on and the Senate took them off. What we have to do is put those people back on because there is about 144 positions were cutting that are the people out in the field offices. So this Amendment restores those cuts that were inadvertently taken off by mistake by Democratic Senate."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's motion. Yes, this was inadvertent and we did

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

not catch it until the Conference Committee Report was drafted and so this was our only recourse. I would point out that this brings the lines back to the budget book level, so the budget remains balanced."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1609, and there being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1609?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
 Hastert and Bowman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic Madam Speaker). #5 is a clean-up of 10,000 dollars that was for the Illinois State Board of Education. Ask for its positive adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1609, and on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1609 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay' and in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative

 Braun Shaw."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 appropriates 75,000 dollars to the State Board of Education, for a program for the education of high school youth and a transitional program for them to go to college. I just want to say, on a personal note and

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

I will be real brief, that I have seen the results of this program and they have been able to make successes out of kids who would otherwise be failures. And they have been in the budget before. This money is needed to keep the program operational."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1609, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1609 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative

 Barnes Hastert."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Amendment #7 is for a total of 70,000 dollars 70,200
 dollars for operations. For personal services, 63,700.
 For State contributions to Social Security 4,500 dollars
 and for contractural services 2,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1609. And on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Just to indicate that I am in agreement with the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 to Senate
 Bill 1609 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
 those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
 any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Bowman now asks

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1609.

Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying Bill provides a grant of dollars to the Department of Public Aid to do a study of hospital cost containment, and that was deleted by House Amendment #4, which appropriates the monies that we have just considered today with respect to the field service operations and the contractual services for food stamps. And then, we, of course, added Amendment #5 for the Youth in Government: Amendment #6, 75,000 for the Transitional Program for High School Youth; and Amendment #7 for Bureau of the Budget operations. These Amendments were all agreed to, to take care of last minute problems that developed in the appropriations process. It seemed the easiest thing to do would be to put it on the Senate Bill, rather than to dip into the existing Conference Committee Reports So I now ask the which had already been put to bed. for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 1609."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of Senate Bill 1609, and on that question, is there discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1609 pass?' All those in vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. 71 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', and 19 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

And this Bill, having received the... a Three-Pifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental 1 for Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2649, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2649, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, have you decided when you're going to go
to my busing Bill yet, because some of our Republican votes
are kind of anxious to know, such as Roger McAuliffe."

Speaker Breslin: "We will do it as soon as we can. We are trying to reach everyone's Bill, Representative. We have all waited a long time, and we will wait for yours. Would you care to present House Bill 2649?"

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2649 appropriates the Fiscal Year '85 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. After the Conference Committee Reports, the final totals were 1,000,897,586.6 dollars."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 20... or rather the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2649, and on that question, the Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Never mind, Madam Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen indicates that he does not wish to speak on the Bill. Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2649?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill... and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2649. And the Bill, having received a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Agreed Resolutions.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1179, Levin et al. And 1181, offered by Representative Younge."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not the end. We still have a few more things to deal with, but while we have the time, we wanted to adopt the Agreed Resolutions.

 Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, 1179 by Levin, asks that a hot line be established for an AIDS line; Younge's 1181 honors Laura Younge and Tangerine Younge on their recent graduation. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Agreed Resolutions be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1178, by Madigan and DeJaegher;
 House Joint Resolution 171, Davis and Hastert; and House
 Resolution 1180, Panayotovich and Vinson; and Senate Joint
 Resolution 122, by Representative Vinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignment. For what reason does
 the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, arise?
 For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative McNamara, arise."
- McNamara: "I didn't hear that last Motion, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "The last Motion was for the General Resolutions, and they were sent to the Assignment

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Committee."

McNamara: "What numbers were those?"

Speaker Breslin: "Would you repeat the numbers, Mr. Clerk?

Excuse me. We just sent them upstairs. They are General

Resolutions, and they will be reviewed by Committee. The

Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Madam Speaker, what were the numbers?"

Speaker Breslin: "We will get them back. We had already..."

Davis: "Was House Joint Resolution 171 one of those?"

Speaker Breslin: "I don't know. We will have them brought back down."

Davis: "Was House Joint Resolution 122 one of those?"

Speaker Breslin: "We will have them brought back down."

Davis: "When would that be, Madam Speaker? They were all discharged to the Speaker's Table last night."

Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, Bepresentative McNamara, for bringing that to our attention. The Resolutions were: House Resolution 1178, 1180; House Joint Besolution 171; and Senate Joint Resolution 122. On all four of these, this was done an error, and on all four of these, we would like leave to return these Bills from the Committee on Assignment to the Speaker's Table. Does the Body give leave? Hearing no objection, there is leave. General Besolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1178, offered by Speaker Madigan and Representative DeJaegher."

Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignments, House Resolution 1180, Representative Panayotovich. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would remind you, while we have a moment, that the television camera light is on, so be aware of that. The TV light is on. Representative Panayotovich, on House Resolution 1180. Representative Panayotovich."

Panayotavich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the

- 145th Legislative Day

 General Assembly. I move for immediate consideration of
 House Resolution 1180."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration of House Resolution 1180 and asks leave for the use of the Attendance Roll Call for that Resolution.

 Hearing no objections, there is leave for ...Excuse me.

 Representative Vinson?"
- Vinson: "Is this the Resolution that we discussed last night?"
 Panayotovich: "Yes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hearing no objection, there is leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1180. Whereas, the House of
 Representatives finds that the Calumet Skyway Toll Bridge
 is an important part of the highway system in the State of
 Illinois; and whereas, the House of Representatives finds
 that it is in the best interest..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Excuse me. Mr. Clerk.

 Representative Panayotovich, on the Resolution."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1180 is asking for a feasibility study on the Chicago Skyway as far as the possibilities of what can be done with it - repairs, improvements, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1180, and on that question, the Gentlemen from DeWitt, Representative Vinson. Okay. Excuse me. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

 Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."
- Ropp: "Is there any ... Who is going to do this study feasibility study?"
- Panayotovich: "The Department of Transportation."
- Ropp: "Is there any money involved, or is this a part of their

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

appropriations already?"

Panayotovich: "It's part of their appropriations already, from my understanding."

Ropp: "How much do you think it would cost?"

Panayotovich: "I have no idea."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman's Resolution is a simple study Resolution, so that the Department shall analyze the feasibilty of either making the Skyway a freeway or making the Skyway part of the Tollway - what the cost would be, what the impact would be and what the traffic flows would be. I believe it is an equitable and reasonable compromise to the problem that he brought to our attention earlier in the Session, and it does not mandate any final solution, or any final costs for this matter, and I would urge 'aye' votes on the Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1180?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Resolution, there are 97 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt House Resolution 1180. Representative Greiman in the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Greiman in the Chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

DiPrima: "Well, I just wanted to make the last announcement to pick up your speeches, any of you people that are giving 4th of July speeches. I've got copies here, if you want

145th Legislative Day

- July 1. 1984
- them. Can I announce the winner of the adjournment pool?

 Oh, there ain't nobody going to come near this guy. He is from here until tomorrow night. Gary Strell, anyway."
- Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Speaker's Table appears House Joint Resolution 171, Mr. Davis."
- Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 171 authorizes the Department of Transportation and the Tollway Authority to do a feasibility study on the southern terminus leg of the purposed tollway in DuPage County. The southern terminus is in Will County, and that is about all it does except identify the corridor and authorize..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Davis, I wonder if you would take that out of the record for a moment. We will be with you. Thank you, Mr. Davis, for your courtesy. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, Supplemental Calendar."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #6 is being distributed."

 Speaker Greiman: "On the Order of Speaker's Table appears Senate

 Joint Resolution 122. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr.

 Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mr. Assembly. This Resolution is the final formality in the ... tollway project. Ιt authorizes the construction. This Resolution. in effect. permits approximately one hundred million dollars in state federal highway money to be reprogrammed into other So I would move for than this. favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution #122."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentlemen from DeWitt moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 122. And on that, Mr. Madigan, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Resolution. Last night we passed the basic authorization for the toll road.

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

The law requires that this Resolution also be adopted. I think that since we are already on record in favor of the construction of the toll road, that we should comply with all of the procedural requirements and adopt this Resolution."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake moves the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, to close. Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I urge 'aye' votes because this
will liberate a great deal of highway money for other
counties in the state."

Speaker Greiman: "This Bill takes... There seems to be a lot of people who wanted to talk on this Bill. We couldn't extend the courtesy because there was such a short time, but we have closed the debate. Mr. McNamara, you seem to be concerned about voting... about speaking. Proceed, Sir."

McNamara: "Yes. I would like a Roll Call vote on this Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, you'll get a Roll Call. It's 60 votes."

McNamara: "And also to verify. I wish to verify that vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Well, we will see when we get to that

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Well, we will see when we get to that point. Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to reserve the right to verify this votes if it gets a requisite number of votes. I would like to ask the Sponsor - is this the Resolution without which there cannot be a Dupage County toll road?"

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. It takes ... Mr. Vinson has closed.

It takes 60 votes. The question is, 'Shall the House Adopt Senate Joint Resolution 122?' All those in favor signify by

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. It takes 60 votes. 60 votes. Mr. McNamara, you spoke in debate, more or less. Mr. Keane, one minute to explain your vote, Sir."

Keane: "Yes, let me just repeat for the record, this is the Bill that is going to bring the defeasance of existing toll road bonds, and we are going to take what I have referred to as the 'Skyway of DuPage', because it will probably be the safest road in Illinois, because there won't be that people using it. And we are going to use funds from the Tri-State and the Northwest Expressway to fund it so we defease bonds and we do that. We also are going to do a tremendous amount of environmental damage, especially in Morton Arboretum area. If you can vote for that, then keep voting green. If you are concerned about the welfare of the toll road system, and if you are concerned about the environmental beauty, especially the Arboretum that we have in this state, vote 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Levin, you are seeking to explain your vote? I believe you spoke in debate."

Levin: "I wanted to ask for a verification."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, we will get back to you. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote. One minute, Sir."

Dunn, J.: "Just to make the record clear, if this receives the requiste Majority, I request a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, there is a lot of redundancy here today.

Alright, Mr. Clerk take the record. Ready? On this

Bill... On this Resolution, there are 65 voting 'aye', 34

voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Resolution... Mr.

McNamara has requested a verification of the Affirmative

Roll Call, and we are going to give it to him. Mr. Vinson

- 145th Legislative Day

 asks a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Alexander. Berrios.

 Braun. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Doyle. Harris.

 Huff. Jaffe. Krska. Leverenz. Mautino. Pierce.

 Richmond. Taylor. Terzich and Younge."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed to verify the Affirmative Roll Call."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Barnes. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Didrickson. DiPrima. Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Dwight Friedrich. Giglio. Hallock. Hannig. Hastert. Hawkinson. Hensel. Hoffman. Homer. Karpiel. Kirkland. Klemm. Koehler. Kulas. Laurino. Matijevich."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Preston, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Preston goes from 'aye' to 'no'.

 Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Nash asks leave to be verified.

 Mr. Clerk, proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Mays. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McMaster. McPike. Nash. Neff. Oblinger. Olson. Panayotovich. B. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Piel. Pullen. Rea_ Ronan. Ropp. Ryder. Steczo. Stuffle. Tate. Topinka. Vinson. Van Duyne. Vitek. Wait. Winchester. Woodyard. Zwick. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McNamara, guestions of the Affirmative Roll."

McNamara: "Kirkland."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Kirkland. Mr. Kirland. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Kirkland."

McNamara: "Domico."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Domico. Mr. Domico in the chamber? How is Mr. Domico recorded?"

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Domico from the Roll Call."

McNamara: "Farley."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

McNamara: "Farley."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley is in his seat."

McNamara: "Churchill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Churchill is in his seat."

McNamara: "Countryman."

Speaker Greiman: "Who? Mr..."

McNamara: "Countryman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Countryman is right there in his seat. I
would ask that all unauthorized people leave the floor,
since we are taking a verification. It's quite difficult,
and please retire if you are not authorized to be on this
floor. Proceed, Mr. McNamara."

McNamara: "Hensel."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hensel is right in his seat."

McNamara: "Hoffman."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman is in the middle aisle."

McNamara: "Karpiel."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Karpiel. Ms. Karpiel is in her seat."

McNamara: "Olson."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Olson is in an empty seat."

McNamara: "How can it be empty if he is in it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Unassigned, an unassigned seat."

McNamara: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Good point."

McNamara: "Thank you for the clarification. Mr. Hallock."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hallock is back in the rear of the chamber."

McNamara: "Laurino."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Laurino. Mr. Laurino. Is Mr. Laurino in the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

chamber?"

McNamara: "I thought not."

Speaker Greiman: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brein: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove him from the Roll."

McNamara: "Mays."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mays is sitting right in his seat."

McNamara: "B. Pedersen."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pedersen is in his seat."

McNamara: "And W. Peterson."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Peterson is in his seat."

McNamara: "Piel"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel is over here at Mr. McAuliffe's, seat.

Mr. Piel doesn't get a comfortable chair. He has a straight chair. Proceed."

McNamara: "Klemm."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Klemm. Mr. Klemm. How is Mr. Klemm recorded?"

Clerk O'Brein: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'ave'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Klemm."

McNamara: "Tuerk."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'."

Leverenz: "Thank you"

Speaker Greiman: "I have suggested that people who are not..."

McNamara: "Tuerk."

Speaker Greiman: "...who are not privy to this floor, leave the floor, and I will not say it again without naming names.

I'm asking you to leave this floor. Mr. McNamara, proceed."

McNamara: "Tuerk."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Tuerk. Mr. Tuerk is right in his seat, and
Mr. Klemm has returned. Return Mr. Klemm to the Roll

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Call."

McNamara: "Wait."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Wait is right here at Mr. Kirkland's seat.

Mr. Saltsman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Saltman: "... as 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Change Mr. Saltsman from 'no' to 'aye'."

McNamara: "McCracken."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Ms. Younge."

Younge: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "Record Ms. Younge as 'aye'."

McNamara: "No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 34 voting... Yes, Mr. Mautino?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Mautino as 'aye'."

McNamara: "Okay."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question there are 64... Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, record me as 'aye', please, from 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Hicks as 'aye'. Any other changes before I begin? Because once I start, you know. Mr. Christensen votes 'aye'. Mr. Christensen 'aye'. Okay, here we go. Yes, Mr. Barger. Mr. Barger votes 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "No."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey remains 'no'. Good, Mr. Mulcahey... On this question, there are 68 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 122. House Joint Resolution 171, Mr. Davis, the Gentleman from Will."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's always unpleasant to follow controversy when the subject is roughly the same, since it tracks Representative Panayotovich's kind of Resolution

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

that talked about the skyway being a part of the tollway and the study to do that. House Joint Resolution 171 does the same thing - directs the study for an eventual - and we know it will be a long time - but eventual southern leg of FAP 431, whether it will be a tollway or freeway. It simply says that the Department of Transportation must study this question and the Tollway Authority and give us a feasability study on whether that corridor will ever be built."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will has moved that the House adopt House Joint Resolution 171. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can only echo Representative Davis' comments and just give us a green vote so we can stay in the ball game."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will... from Cook, Mr.
 Marzuki."
- Marzuki: "I believe that this is already a part of the highway study. Is it not? That's the way it was some years ago.

 What did they do, shut it off?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Proceed. Is that a question? Do you want to respond to that? Mr. Marzuki, have you completed your remarks?"

Marzuki: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. All those in favor... Mr. the Gentleman from Kendall. The question is 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 17121 All in signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. and t he Resolution is adopted. Supplemental Calendar #6, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate 1546. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims and the State Comptroller. Second Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash. Mr. NcGann. Nr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. The Second Conference Committee Report simply deleted three parts to it and reduced it for those things that we didn't actually have to sign off on. I would ask for the concurrence and your green vote to accept Conference Committee Report #2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1546. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1546? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 71 votes required. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no' 2 voting 'present', and does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to Senate Bill 1546. And this Bill, having received Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I will ... We will return for a moment to Joint Resolution 171 that we considered a few moments ago. I declared that passed on a voice vote: however, I am advised that it is possible that it may require a record vote. Accordingly, Mr. Davis, the Gentleman from moves that the House do adopt House Joint Resolution 171. And on that question, is there any discussion? Cullerton, the Gentleman from Cook."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Yeah, he will. Thank you, Mr. Cullerton."

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Cullerton: "Maybe someone else can answer."

Speaker Greiman: "We will wait for Mr. Davis."

Cullerton: "Is he taking a walk on his own Bill?"

- Speaker Greiman: "He is probably beginning the study of his leg.

 We will take this out of the record. Mr. Vinson, for what

 purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, to move the passage of House Joint Resolution 171 so that we have a record Roll Call vote on it."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Cullerton has some questions to propound, and you might be the one to whom they should be propounded. Mr. Cullerton, I recognize you on House Joint Resolution 171."
- Cullerton: "Representative, the maker of the Motion would answer a question. What is the need for having a record vote? Is there going to be expenditure of funds as a result of passage of the Resolution?"
- Vinson: "Representative, the... Two things. Number one, the
 Resolution directs the study; and number two, the tollway
 would prefer having that ... and Transportation would
 prefer having that as a Roll Call vote."
- Cullerton: "Well, are you referring to Bule 43(c)? It says that you need a record Roll Call, if the Resolution directs investigations. Now is this directing an investigation?"

Vinson: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And it also says that a record Roll Call is needed if
the Resolution calls for an expenditure of funds. I don't
read it to call for an expenditure of funds, and I am just
wondering if the tollway thinks that it does call for an
expenditure of funds. How much money are they planning on
spending? Who is going to do the investigation? In-house
or contractual?"

Vinson: "It is a combination of the Secretary of Transportation

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

and the tollway. They are directed to perform a study. In order to perform a study, you have to necessarily involve the expenditure of funds."

Cullerton: "And how much money will the study cost?"

Vinson: "I don't know."

- Cullerton: "Do you have any objection to having a record Roll

 Call on the ... Representative Panayotovich's Resolution?"
- Vinson: "We did. We did, and I spoke for it, and we did for that very reason."
- Cullerton: "I don't believe it was a record Roll Call. We can double check that."
- Vinson: "It was unanimous leave with his, which puts on a record Roll Call vote on the thing."
- Cullerton: "And you have no idea how much money is going to be spent?"
- Vinson: "No, not on this one, or not on Representative

 Panayotovich's."
- Speaker Greiman: "Perhaps, Mr. Vinson, it might be as we close this Session down - it might be in the best interests of all of us that you might amend your Motion to include House Joint Resolution 171 and House Joint Resolution... and House Resolution 1180, and so that this record will stand both of those. Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 171 and House Joint and House Resolution 1180? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On these questions there are 97 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', House does adopt House Joint Resolution 171 and House Resolution 1180. Alright, we will just stand at ease for a few moments...We will just stand at ease for a little while. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage,

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

Minority Leader Daniels, seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have all worked hard this Session. I think that as we review accomplishments, that this Session will go down as one of the more cooperative Sessions in history. It will also go down as one of the finer Sessions in terms of economic development, agreements reached for the people of Illinois and for the betterment of our state. In honor of that, the House Republican Policy Committee is going to have a party at the Governor's Mansion. No, the Governor is party at the Governor's Mansion. And you are all invited to attend the party at the Governor's Mansion immediately following Session, at the request of the Governor. And he hopes that you will be his quests to enjoy the successes of the Session, and while we are in a little bit of a a lull, let me offer my personal once again to the Speaker, to Speaker Madigan, for his fine cooperation, his evenhandedness as far as running the House. I think we've had a new day in the General Assembly, a new day in Illinois Government, and although on issues, at times we disagree, I think, in the final analysis, as we review this Session, we'll find out it's the better Sessions. And of course, to all the Members in the General Assembly, I wish to offer you personal thanks for your assistance, as well as to what I feel is the finest staff on both sides of the aisle. in government today. Thank you all for all of your help."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo Mr. Daniels' remarks. I

wish to thank the Members. I wish to thank the staff for

the many hours that we have all given to this process, for

the outstanding work that we have done. I think that we

can look back upon the last two years and honestly say to

145th Legislative Day

July 1. 1984

ourselves that we have gone a long way toward improving the image of the House of Representatives as an institution. and we have gone a long way toward improving our own individual image as Members of that institution. You may recall, that at the very beginning of this Session, I spoke to the question of the image of the House individual images of all of us, and I asked that we all cooperate together to improve ourselves and to improve that And I think we have done an outstanding job. image. think that today, we moved to an orderly consideration of legislation and an orderly consideration of the issues, and that is to the credit of all of us, and that is to the credit to our staff. And for my part, I simply wish to say, thank you very much."

- Speaker Greiman: "And now, in rebuttle, Representative from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Well, the Speaker and the Minority Leader may have this okay buddy system going pretty well, but I am still curious about when we are going to expand the women's restroom facility."
- Speaker Greiman: "I thought you would ask that question, Mr. Vinson, and this summer, probably, there will be something along those lines. And you live in Clinton. You can drop by and watch the construction. And Sam there is an appropriation in the appropriation process that will provide us with a plaque, and it will be forever known as the Sam Vinson Washroom. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with your indulgence, there is one more thing I would like to say, and I'm sure you will all join with me in commenting upon an individual who has served us for 22 years in the Illinois General Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I could think of

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

no higher honor then to leave public life with the kind of reputation that this individual will be leaving public life next January when the new Session takes place. County Chairman. He is a State Central Committeeman. a leader. He is a friend. Нe is an outstanding And Mr. Speaker, we were guite concerned because at the Republican Convention, Mr. Neff was injured at that Convention. We were worried about his health, you know, there is no person that I know of that's stronger that's tougher - that has a greater heart then a friend of all of ours. And I know we'll say some more words next January, but we'd be remiss if we didn't Clarence, we're delighted to have you back. We're going to miss you when you leave us. You are, perhaps, one finest individuals that I've ever met in my life, and when the day comes for me to leave governmental service if I can have done half of what you've done, then I will have been a success as a politician, as a man and as a person. Join me in honoring our good friend, Clarence Neff."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, first of all, I'd like... all those good words about orderliness. I've been here 18 years, and last night was the most orderly June 30th that I have ever seen. T+ may have been chaotic to somebody up in the gallery, but compared to past sessions, I have never, never seen a 30th like we had last night. And maybe a compliment to all us is the fact that there wasn't a big crowd up there Did you notice that? They used to always come here and watch the zoo in the past, but there wasn't And I also want to compliment big crowd last night. everybody here that makes this place run. But I also qet up and say we're going to lose the dean of the

145th Legislative Day

July 1, 1984

House, Larry DiPrima. And Larry, in his own way. offered so much to this General Assembly. He is a kindly man. know he represents the veterans interests. We love him for that. Somebody has to speak for those interests. we also know him as a genuine good fellow. And I. personally, also want to say that I am going to lose a good friend of mine, Dan Pierce, who also happens to be a State Central Committeeman and has done such an effective job. Zeke Giorgi was hoping that Dwight Priedrich would leave. and then Zeke could have the #1 license plate, but... but Dwight's going to be around for awhile. But I want to compliment both Larry DiPrima - Dan Pierce left a moment ago with his wife - compliment those genuine good fellows for being such outstanding State Representatives."

- Speaker Madigan: "Does anyone have anything... Does anyone have anything else to say? The Chair is prepared to adjourn.

 The Chair recognizes Mr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 14th, 1984, at the hour of 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. We stand adjourned until November 14 at 12:00 noon."

09/27/84 15:11

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JULY 01, 1984

	·		
HB-2400	CONFERENCE	PAGE	75
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	25
	CONFBRENCE	PAGE	117
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	123
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	48
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	49
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	50
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	136
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	53
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	86
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	55
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	114
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	29
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	115
HB-3177		PAGE	45
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73
SB-1538		PAGE	1
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	58
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	85
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	148
SB-1546		PAGE	131
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	85
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	56
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	101
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	109
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	46
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	47
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	112
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
SB- 1574	CONFERENCE	PAGE	113
SB-1583	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	48
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	69
SB-1609	RECALLED	PAGE	132
SB-1609	THIRD READING	PAGE	135
SB-1612	CONFERENCE	PAGE	129
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	41
SB-1870	CONFERENCE	PAGE	125
SB-1928	CONFERENCE	PAGE	30
SB-1933	CONFERENCE	PAGE	94
HR-0364	ADOPTED	PAGE	21
HR-0837	ADOPTED	PAGE	1
HB-0961	ADOPTED	PAGE	3
HR-1104	MOTION	PAGE	83
HR-1104	ADOPTED	PAGE	84
BR-1153	MOTION	PAGE	43
HR-1153	ADOPTED	PAGE	43
HR-1159	TABLED	PAGE	6
	ADOPTED	PAGE	5
HR-1176	ADOPTED	PAGE	21
HR-1176	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	6
HR-1180	MOTION	PAGE	138
HR-1180	ADOPTED	PAGE	139
HJR-0171	ADOPTED	PAGE	147
HJR-0171	OTHER	PAGE	149
HJR-0180	ADOPTED	PAGE	131
SJR-0013	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	7
SJR-0104	MOTION	PAGE	45
SJR-0104	ABOPTED	PAGE	45
SJR-0113		PAGE	65
SJR-0113	ADOPTED	PAGE	68
SJR-0122	ADOPTED	PAGE	141
SJR-0128		PAGE	11
SJR-0130	ADOPTED	PAGE	11

09/27/84 15:11

STATE OF ILLINOIS 83RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

JULY 01, 1984

SJR-0131 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	12
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN PRAYER - CLERK O'BRIEN PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BOLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR AGREED RESOLUTIONS GENERAL RESOLUTIONS REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	1 1 1 55 137 137
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR ADJOURNMENT	PAGE PAGE	155 155