42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the hour of 10:00 having arrived, I would ask Members to be in their seats. Our Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Richard Wood from the Illinois Conference of Churches. Reverend Wood has been with us in Springfield for many years, but I don't know if he's ever led us in prayer. No, he's never led us in prayer. Reverend Wood."
- Reverend Wood: "Let us pray. Oh God, as we come before You this morning and as we face a very hectic day, filled with all kinds of decisions, momentous and small, each one which deserves the attention of this Body, we pray that Your presence will be here among these people. Give them clear minds. Make them fully aware of the implications of each vote. May they each, take seriously the tasks that are before them today so that, in some way, steps toward furthering Your Will, will happen. This we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Balanoff, would you lead us in the pledge, please?"
- Balanoff et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Breslin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Piel are there any excused absences from your side?"
- Piel: "No excused absences, Madam Speaker. You could tell
 Representative Homer to lean forward and push his button
 and we're all set."
- Speaker Breslin: "I couldn't hear that, at all."

- Piel: "No excused absences, Ma'am."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Matijevich, are there any excused absences from our side?"
- Matijevich: "No, none on this side of the aisle, Madam Speaker."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Have all answered the Roll Call who are present? Mr. Clerk...would you record Representative Homer? He is present, but his switch is not working. Okay, take the record. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 218, Black. A Bill for an Act in relation to cemetery maintenance districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 353, Hensel and Steczo. A Bill for an Act in relation to certain land in Kane County. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "One more. Senate Bill 487, Kirkland. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Department of Central Management Services. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Message from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has passed Bills of the following title in the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #13, 20, 23, 33, 34, 44, 50, 61, 64 and 65, passed by the Senate May 16, 1989. Linda Hawker, Secretary."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's about time, and we've been here on the floor for about 40 minutes and Representative Ryder had a momentous occasion happen today where he turned 40, and it took him exactly 40 minutes, I mean, he left 40 minutes ago from his office, coming straight up here. But when you get older you know those type of things happen."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, congratulations. We're glad you're still with us for these 40 years.

 Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you and thanks to all my friends for the nice wishes. Considering the alternative, I'm also very glad to be here."
- Speaker Breslin: "Exactly. Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill #20, Cullerton. A Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to certain minor children.

 First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 53, offered by Representative Breslin. House Resolution 460, Williamson. 463, Novak. 464, Weaver. 465, Brunsvold. 466, Preston. 467, Balanoff. 468, Black and 469, Ronan."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, these are all congratulatory. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, you have before you, House Calendar Supplemental #1. It is printed in yellow. You will notice that this is a Consent Calendar. The Bills on this Calendar are both on Second Reading and on Third Reading. It is the intention of the Chair to proceed to the Bills on Second Reading on House Calendar Supplemental #1 and then to move those Bills to Third Reading today. We do not intend to vote on this Calendar of Bills today. We want to give you time to look over the Bills and determine how you wish to vote. However, if...we will, then after we finish the Bills on Second Reading, we will then entertain any Motions that you

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

might have on those Bills appearing on Third Reading that you wish to bring back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. I would advise you however, that if the Amendments you are proposing are controversial, it may risk your Bill being taken off of this Order of Business. If they are technical only and you wish to proceed with them, then by all means. If you wish to take them off the Order, that's at your discretion, as well. But, approach the Chair please and let us know within the next few minutes if you have Bills on the Oder of Third Reading that you are going to request be brought back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. On House Calendar Supplemental #1, Consent Calendar, House Bills Second Reading. The first Bill is House Bill 29. Representative Lou Jones. Lou Jones. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 29, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Housing Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There
 are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "But, a fiscal note has been requested.

 Representative Jones, have you supplied the fiscal note?

 Mr. Clerk, the Lady indicates she has already supplied a fiscal note. Could you do a search, please? Mr. Clerk...I see. With leave of the Body, we'll leave this Bill on the Order of Second Reading while they do a search for the fiscal note. When it's found we'll get back to the Order, Representative Jones. The next Bill is House Bill 250, Representative Ropp. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 250, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 342, Representative Granberg. Mr. Granberg. Out of the record. House Bill 522, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. House

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Bill 604, Representative Satterthwaite. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 604, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Satterthwaite."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, on Floor Amendment #1."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this is just a technical correction, a grammatical error in the original Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 604. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed '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: "Third Reading. House Bill 648, Representative McCracken. Representative McCracken. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. House Bill 649, Representative White. Representative White. Out of the record. House Bill 753, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard. Out of the record. House Bill 799, Representative Stange. Representative Stange. Out of the record. House Bill 854, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 854, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Steczo: "Thank Amendment #1 to House Bill 854, represents an agreement between the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois the Vocational Education Education Association and Association, in terms of trying to provide language in the statutes which provides statements relative to vocational education. It provides for language relating to entry of students into the world of work and also provides that each school district may make...shall make available to all students academic or vocational courses for the attainment of learning objectives. It was...the language has been placed in a non-mandated area of the statutes so the cost will be minimal, if any, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 854. On the question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Steczo as I understand Amendment 1 to House Bill 854, although it makes some technical changes to clarify the meaning, it also, I believe, adds the requirement that school districts shall, that means they must, make available to all students, academic and vocational courses for the attainment of learning objectives. Is that an unfunded mandate?"

Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, what we have attempted to do, if you will notice the original Bill places on page 1, line 18, under the areas taught, the words, 'and vocational education' that in fact, would be a...an unfunded mandate,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

if you will, that would require learning objectives and various other things which would cost you know, hundreds of thousands of dollars. What we have attempted to do is to try to provide in this statute at some place, some statement that vocational education in fact is viable and by putting that on page 2, line 4, we take it outside of that so called mandated section; and my understanding from talking to the State Board of Education, the cost for this language is minimal, if any. Technically, what we are doing is just making a statement that in fact students should attain their learning objectives either through academic courses or vocational education courses."

- Cowlishaw: "If that is your understanding of what this Amendment does, I think there would be no objection to it, but I wanted that clearly stated for the record. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 892, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Steczo. House Bill 854 had a state mandate note requested. Did you file it? State Mandate Note requested. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I believe that was filed last week."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, again the Member indicates it was filed last week. So we'll do a search for it, Representative Steczo. Meanwhile, the Bill will remain on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman also has... a the copy of what he filed in his hand. So he'll bring that to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

us as well. House Bill 1597, Representative Novak. Mr. Novak. Out of the record. House Bill 1666, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1671, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1925, Representative Currie. Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act in relationship to property taxation. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Ewing."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing. The Gentleman is not on the floor. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "He's in the back and we've asked him to come out to present it. Can we have just a moment?"

Speaker Breslin: "Sure. Let's take this Bill out of the record,
Representative Currie. We'll come back to it. Okay, House
Bill...with leave of the Body let's go back to House Bill
29. That Bill was already read a Second time. A fiscal
note was requested. It is now on file. Are there any
other Motions or Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Flinn is here on House Bill 1666. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1666, a Bill for an Act to amend certain

Acts in relationship to certain functions of state
governments. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Do you want to go to your Bill,

Representative Ryder? House Bill 1671. Clerk, read the
Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1671, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Maintenance Organization Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2006, Representative William Peterson. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2006, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative William Peterson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment 1 changes the classification of Federal aid primary and Federal aid secondary roads to Federal aid network roads, regarding which roads a local government may use a county road tax for. This is suggested by the County Superintendents' of Highways and Lake County Superintendent of Highways for the purposes of providing more flexibility to fund Federal aid primary and secondary roads in the wake of declining Federal road funds."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 2006. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative William Peterson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment 2 adds the County Superintendent to the approval process for incorporating platted subdivisions into township road district systems. It also increases from 500,000 to three million, the population of counties which must comply with these provisions. Once again, this is suggested by the County Superintendent of Highways in Lake County. It merely clarifies current practice by requiring the County Superintendent of Highways, who must be a civil engineer, to assist in preparing subdivision plattes prior to their being incorporated into the township road system."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2006. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, is being offered by Representative William Peterson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment 3 prohibits the construction on any earthen berme or drainage facility adjacent to a public highway without written permission from the local highway authority having jurisdiction. This also has been recommended by County Superintendents of Highways. What they are saying is, we do not want to prohibit this being done, but we want to be alerted and have approval when this is done so in case the road is moved we know what to do and how to provide for the right of way when the road is constructed. I know of no opposition. I ask for your approval of Amendment 3."

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

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Amendment 3 to House Bill 2006. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2198, Representative DeJaegher. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2198, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Repres...are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2255, Representative Countryman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2314, Representative Daley and DeLeo. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2314, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in respect to the medium use of present testimony. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2334, Representative Kulas. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2334, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2441, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 2482, Representative Keane. Mr. Keane. These Bills are on the Consent Calendar, we'd better start moving them. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cannabis and Controlled Substances Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2485, Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2485, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to State tax enforcement. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments? Are there any Floor Amendments on this Bill, Mr. Clerk? Representative Keane, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Keane: "Please take the Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 2487,
 Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2497,
 Representative Williams. Mr. Williams. Out of the
 record. House Bill 2529, Representative Hasara. Clerk,
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2529, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Excuse me, that Bill has a fiscal note requested. Was it filed? Representative Hasara, this Bill has a fiscal note requested. We need to move these Bills to Third Reading today. It's on the Consent Calendar. Would you tell your side of the aisle that you wish to have it taken off the Consent Calendar, please? Out of the record. House Bill 2582, Representative Steczo."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2582, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments? We'll have to take this temporarily out of the record, Representative Steczo.

Can't find the Amendment. The next Bill is House Bill 2599, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2599, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to recorders. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Committee or Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2655, Representative McNamara. Representative McNamara. Is he in his seat?

Out of the record. House Bill 2656, Representative McNamara. Out of the record. House Bill 2657, Representative Laurino. Out of the record. House Bill 2786, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Body, I'll go back to House Bill 2655, Representative McNamara. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2655, a Bill for an Act to amend the Small Business Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions. No further Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2656, Representative McNamara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2656, a Bill for an Act to amend the Small Business Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Committee Amendments or Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions. No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2657, Representative Laurino-Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2657, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to start at the top of this order again on Second Reading. We're going to start at the top of this order again on Second Reading. We're going to run through all the Bills that haven't been called. Even though you might not want your Bill to be called, we're going to read it a Second time and then you can hold it on Second in case it will be ready to move tomorrow on Third Reading. The first Bill on that order then is, House Bill 342, Representative Granberg. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 342, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. 522, Representative Granberg. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 522, a Bill for an Act to amend the Weight and Measures Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 648,

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Representative McCracken. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 648, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning bidding. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 649, Representative White. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 649, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 753,

 Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard. Clerk,

 read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 753, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 799, Representative Stange. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 799, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create a Local Solid Waste Energy Generation Act.

 Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 892,
 Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk,
 do you have the Amendments on this, yet? That's already
 been read a Second time, 892."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 892, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Were there any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions. No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1597, Representative Novak. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1597, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1925, Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act in relationship to property taxation. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor..."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 2441,

 Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2441, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Bréslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2485, Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2485, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to State tax enforcement. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 2487,

 Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2487, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 2497, Representative Williams. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2497, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed. No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2582, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2582, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, is

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

being offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. So nice to see...things back on track. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1, which makes a change to allow for a much more agreeable Bill. The Bill would allow the payment of warrants, within five years after the issue date of such a warrant, by the Comptroller's office. Under the Amendment the Comptrollers Office would replace warrants within three years of the issuance date and the Court of Claims will hear claims, based on warrants for the remaining two years. That's all the Bill does. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 2582. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Speaker Madigan, in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 3 of the Calendar, there appears a Special Order, Income Tax Increase, Second Reading, House Bill 490. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a Second time? Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a Second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 490, this Bill has been read a Second time previously."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was withdrawn previously. Floor

Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, stand at ease for a minute. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in this momentary lull, we'd like to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

introduce Dave Phelp's parents, Cecil and Hazel Phelps in the balcony. They are celebrating their 50th anniversary." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?" Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 490 is on Second Reading. It has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was withdrawn.

Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, House Bill 490 and Amendment #2 to House Bill 490 is the Amendment that deals with the income tax increase for the State of Illinois. As I stated last week...two weeks ago today, that it was my intent that this piece of legislation, and that this issue should be brought before this House on this date, and that we as a Body should take a stand as to whether or not the State of Illinois has sufficient revenue to take care of all of the needs and educational needs that our state has. As we read in the papers today, and as we looked around the state, all saw, and we all have heard and read that there is new movement on the question of the Income Tax. Due to these developments, I would like to sit and see what in fact this Body comes out with, cause I believe we need the revenue and I believe that the revenue is very urgent. But I believe that the chances of this Amendment passing are, few, if any, and I also know that if in fact anything is to pass in this area, it will be initiated and it will be pushed by many of the leaders. But I want to say here today, to those of you who have talked to me and worked with me over the past few weeks on the question of an Income Tax, as to whether or not a Member should go ahead and push anything, or think about anything, or do anything. think it proves, if nothing else, that if the Membership does ask for and work for a given vote, that in

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

something can happen. I believe movement has taken place and so at this time, I will withdraw Amendment #2 to House Bill 490 and that that being the case, we shall I believe, continue to discuss the issue of taxes and so long as the issue of taxes are being discussed, I will be happy to withdraw this in lieu of what I believe will be a fair and equitable tax increase plan for the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Amendment shall be withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Satterthwaite."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Satterthwaite, on Amendment #3." Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment is the same as legislation that I have introduced the last two years in regard to the need for additional funding for education and for human services. I have not had any direct contact from the Speaker's office in regard to what I should do with this Amendment, but I am happy to point out that this Amendment calls for a half percent individual income tax increase, and an 8/10's percent income tax increase for corporations. I believe and have believed for some time, that that will provide us with a sufficient amount of new revenue for the needs of our educational programs within the state. I am happy that the Speaker has made an announcement of a proposal that he feels he can support and because of that, I will not ask for a vote on this Amendment today. But I would presume that we will caucus on the issue to find out more details about the Speaker's proposal as we come to that vote. For the moment, I withdraw House Amendment #3."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Amendment shall be withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Speaker

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Madigan-McPike-Giorgi-Currie-Hartke-Saltsman-Richmond-Wolf."
- Speaker Madigan: "And the list continues to grow. The Chair recognizes Mr. Giglio."
- Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, I move for a Democratic caucus, immediately in Room 114."
- Speaker Madigan: "There shall be a Democratic caucus for approximately one hour in Room 114. Mr. Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would also like to caucus, simultaneously in 118."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Olson. Room 114. Both parties will go to caucus. Thank you very much."
- Speaker McPike: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their Chairs. Mr. Clerk...Mr. Clerk, do you have any reports to read in? The House will come to order. Consent Calendar, Third Reading. The Chair has four Bills that are on the Consent Calendar, Third, that need to be brought back to Second Reading for Amendments. leave, we're going to call these one at a time. The first is Representative Parke. House Bill 1842, page 5. Representative Parke here? Well, we'll come right back to this. Representative Steczo has House Bill 713 on page The Gentleman have leave to return House Bill 713 to Second of an Amendment? Reading for purposes Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill's on Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Amendment #1, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #1 deletes everything after the enacting clause, and simply provides that special education co-ops or special education joint agreements, may provide for multi-year contracts for their directors. So that makes the Bill I believe,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

non-controversial and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Steczo, I want to make sure that I understand correctly the provisions of this Amendment, since in fact the Amendment becomes the Bill. It's my understanding that under the provisions contained in this Amendment, a director of one of the joint agreement programs could serve under a three year contract. But it could not be more nor less. If it's going to be a multi-year contract, it has to be three years. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "Is it also correct that according to the provisions in this Amendment any director who accepts a multi-year contract when he or she does so, waives tenure rights for the duration of his or her employment as a special education joint agreement director. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "I believe that's correct."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. This is an excellent Amendment. I hope you have very good luck with it, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Third Reading, Consent Calendar. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call is used, and the Motion carries. And

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

House Bill 1148, Representative Steczo. Asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments on House Bill 1148?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #3 makes a simple change in the Library District Act. Library District Act right now indicates that officers of library districts must serve two year terms-presidents or what have you, that are named by the board. There have been some municipal library districts that have changed and have become regular library districts, and the municipal districts in some cases have had methodology where those officers have been elected by the board members for periods of one year and they would like to retain that system. the Amendment simply says that in library districts that the officers shall serve for terms not to exceed two years, which provides the current system of two years to continue, but also allows for those one year terms as well. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 1148 to Third Reading, Consent Calendar. Any objections? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries. Representative Parke. Has the Gentleman returned? Representative Parke. Representative Bugielski.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

House Bill 1423. The Gentleman asks leave to return 1423, it's on page 5 of the Calendar, to Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bugielski."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House.

 Amendment #1 just clarifies and defines inability and capacity by adding two words: to cause by 'physical inability' or 'mental incapacity' of the insured person.

 That's all it does. It's just...this is from the insurance industry to define those two words and we went a little further."
- Speaker McPike: "Are there any questions on the Amendment?

 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return 1423 to Third Reading, Consent. Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Attendance Roll Call is used. The Bill's on Third Reading, Consent. Representative Parke. Representative McCracken will handle the Bill. That's House Bill 1842. The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Parke."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken asks leave to handle

 Amendment #1. The Gentleman has leave. Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would require that the notice which is the subject of the Bill, be sent to the mortgagee or lien holder only if the insurer knows who that mortgagee or lien holder is. My understanding is this is an Agreed Bill between the banking and insurance industries...or an Agreed Amendment. I move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. The Gentleman asks leave to return 1842 to Third Reading, Consent. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call is used. The Motion carries. Are there any other Members that have Bills on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, that need them returned to Second Reading? Order of Business, State and local government, Second Reading. Appears House Bill 45, Representative Homer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 45, a Bill for an Act to amend certain
Acts in relation to services to prevent unnecessary
institutionalization of certain persons. Second Reading of
the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments? Any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 90, Representative Leverenz here? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 90. Nine, zero."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 90, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 103, Representative Saltsman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 103, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Mandates Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative...Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Has the fiscal note, mandates note been filed?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I have no record that any are requested on House Bill 103."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, is there a fiscal note filed on this?"

Clerk O'Brien: "There's no fiscal note filed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, there was a discussion last week regarding a number of notes on a number of Bills. We understand there's been an agreement and this is one of those Bills.

I will withdraw the request."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The Bill remains on Third Reading. House Bill 106, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Kubik."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

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

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

House. As we know, this particular Bill deals with an increase in salary for the Regional Superintendents of schools. What Amendment #1 does would be to remove Cook legislation. The...that...the Bill County from the currently...the regional superintendent of Cook County currently receives about 46...receives \$46,000 dollars a year. Under the new legislation he would receive \$61,000 dollars a year. We had a discussion about this Bill last week and as I indicated to the Sponsor of the legislation, I would be willing to support this legislation, but I just do not believe in good conscience that we can give a \$15,000 dollar increase in salary to a person who might again run for re-election and win, who is the current occupant of this office. He has been a problem in Suburban Cook County for a number of years and I just believe that we ought to stand fast and adopt this Amendment to make that the Cook County portion of the Bill is removed from the legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I move for the adoption of the legislation, or the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment and on that, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, as I said to the Membership, Friday, I'm handling this Bill for the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools. They oppose this Amendment. the pay raise should be a pay They feel that State of Illinois. I did discuss this throughout the matter with Representative Kubik, and I can understand why he's proceeding with the Amendment. However, I think that we should not legislate as to individuals, because we don't know what the future holds and who would hold that The fact of the matter is, that the regional position. superintendents of schools have not received a pay raise in

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the last eight years and in fact when this issue was brought up eight years ago, we had the same type of debate over this issue and nothing has really changed. I would hope that...I know many of you downstaters have talked to your regional superintendents of schools. They oppose this Amendment. They think it does no good for this type of issue to be debated with regards to the salary issue. So, I would urge the Members to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich on the Amendment."

Terzich: "Yes, the Sponsor of the Amendment apparently seems to having some problems with specific school be а superintendent and is objecting to salaries, I assume then for all regional school superintendents. I really don't see how we could discriminate on this. He doesn't to be running for election for school going superintendent next election or what the problem is with the current one, as whether or not he should be earning this type of money. The regional school superintendent salaries are extremely low. They certainly need some salary adjustment and just because he's got personal that he doesn't like his regional school feelings, superintendent, is certainly not a sufficient reason to offer this type of an Amendment and it should receive a rounding defeat."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I think it's interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle here are saying that this discriminatory, when indeed we frequently, in this Legislative Body, discriminate with regards to populations over four million. I think what Representative Kubik is doing here is just fairness. Fairness with regards to what is frequently done here in Cook County. I would just

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

to relay some of the concerns that I've had in the district with regards to the regional superintendent. opposed to the other regional superintendents in the state, but when you come up to Cook County and you put our regional superintendent on for example, an education service center board. does he show? I don't think he really represents those of us in Suburban Cook County. So at least for those of you on both sides of the aisle that are in suburban Cook County, heed the message that you've received from your educational community constituents and also heed the message that we frequently send down here with regards for a separate agenda or a separate way of dealing with Cook County, and I think for populations over four million, Representative Kubik is absolutely correct."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this Bill. And I also find unpersuasive the contention that we do some violence to our system of government by excluding Cook County from the application of a Bill. Everybody knows that the City of Chicago when it wants to be or the County of Cook, when it wants to be, constitutes another state within the State of Illinois. It's done on a regular basis and it is often done for reasons which certainly aren't as meritorious as these reasons. office has a troubled history in Cook County. It has a troubled history and it will not go away. If you want opposition to this Bill, don't take Cook County out of the Bill. The problem is this, we are willing to give raises to every other Regional Superintendent. We do not want to give them to the regional superintendent in Cook County. With that Amendment, we are happy to support the Bill. Without that Amendment, we cannot support the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik to close."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I have spoken with the lobbyist for the regional superintendents and have told him that I would support this legislation if Cook County is taken out of it. And I think that that's what we ought to do, is to take Cook County of You know, there are very few...I found we're going to discuss a lot about education today. We've got education on the special call. And I found that there is a lot of things that educators and teachers and school board members and principals and administrators can't agree about. But in Cook County they can agree about one thing and that the current superintendent of...regional superintendent is enemy number one against education in iust think Cook County. And you know, Ι unconscionable that we should be contemplating giving this gentleman a pay raise with the kind of involvement had in Cook County. And it's not a question of whether he's doing his job. It's a question of how he abuses the office and he has abused it tremendously. All you have to do is talk to suburban school districts throughout the state and you know...throughout Cook County and talk to them about this particular office holder and I'll tell it's incredible. They're almost afraid to talk about him, because of the intimidation factor. And I think we ought to send a strong message, that that's not the kind of thing want from a regional superintendent. We want regional of superintendents like the rest the regional superintendents in the state, who work with their school districts, not against their school districts. appreciate a favorable vote on Floor Amendment #1 and Mr. Speaker, I would request a Roll Call on the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Granberg votes 'no'. McPike votes 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, yeah, this is on the adoption of the Amendment, isn't that right, Mr. Speaker? Not on the Bill itself."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich, you spoke in debate.

This is the adoption of the Amendment. Representative Cullerton, the Chair was misspoke. Would you please vote Representative McPike, 'no'? Thank you. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 61 'ayes', and 42 'nos' and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 211, Representative McNamara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 211, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial planning. Second Reading of the Bill. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

McNamara."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to with...to table

Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2."

McNamara: "Number one."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1, Mr.

Clerk. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall

Amendment #1 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara, Amendment #2."
- McNamara: "Yes, Floor Amendment #2 puts the Bill in to posture, which we wish and gives relief to communities that need the help."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Representative McNa...McCracken. No discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 215, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 225, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 384, Representative Capparelli. Representative Capparelli. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 384, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 McAuliffe."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McAuliffe, on the Amendment."
- McAuliffe: "Floor Amendment #1 just redefines the way we justify these civic centers. It adds 400,000 feet to definition of a civic center. That's what Capparelli told me."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton, on the Amendment. Representative Cullerton. Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 509, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 744, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. House Bill 757, Representative Countryman. Out of the record. House Bill 762, Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig. Mr. Hannig? Gary Hannig. Do you want the Bill called? 762, out of the record. House Bill 1091, Representative Currie. Ms. Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1091, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical care. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1097, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 1142, Representative Didrickson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Yes, read the Bill please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1208, Representative Homer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act in relation to tax amnesty. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1208,
 Representative...excuse me. House Bill 1304,
 Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1304, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1435, Representative Hasara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1435, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to State Fire Marshall. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Hasara."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hasara. Out of the record.

 House Bill 1474, Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1474, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1659, Representative Churchill. Out of the record. House Bill 1870, Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen. Out of the record. House Bill 1926, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act in relation to increases in property tax levys. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1..."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 2005,
 Representative Peterson. Out of the record. House Bill
 2031, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill
 2333, Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2333, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act pertaining to the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2513, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2513, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2550, Representative Matijevich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2550, a Bill for an Act to create the
Waukegan North Chicago Lake Front Development Authority.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Matijevich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #1 is an Amendment which would change the makeup
of the Lakefront Authority. I take out the Lake County
Forest Preserve District. That's a very controversial
government in my area, nowadays. So I take them out and I
change the makeup so the Mayor of Waukegan and the Mayor of
North Chicago have two members on the authority. And I

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

also change the language with regard to bond limitations to make it compatible with the limitations in other parts of the statutes. So, I would offer and move the adoption of Amendment #1."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 2550. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question of the Chair. Is this Amendment been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk? Yes, it has been printed and distributed. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2568, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to the Special Order of Business under State and local government, Third Reading. The first Bill is House Bill 575, Representative Wennlund. Out of the record. House Bill 1042, Representative Parcells. Clerk, read the Bill. These Bills are on Third Reading. Please survey this Special Order and be prepared with your Bill. House Bill 1042. Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Kirkland, 1158. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1158..."

- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 1164,
 Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. House
 Bill...
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 1164, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. House Bill 1434, Representative Edley. Out of the record. House Bill 1542, Representative Currie.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk...out of the record. House 1899, Representative Didrickson. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1899, a Bill for an Act to amend the Asbestos Abatement Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

House Bill 1899 amends the Asbestos Abatement Act, and it says that the Department of Public Health may prepare a list of certified industrial hygenists with regards to the Asbestos Act."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 1899. On the question, is there any discussion? This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1899 pass?' 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 question, there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and one voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentleman, we are now going to the Order of Second Reading under the Special Order of Criminal Law. Criminal Law. Second Reading. Representative Levin, Olson. be prepared for your Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Just asking why we're jumping around. Shouldn't we finish an Order of Business."

Speaker Breslin: "We would like to, but too many people have taken their Bills out of the record on Third Reading, so we thought maybe people would be more ready to proceed on Second Reading."

McCracken: "Okay."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 36, Representative Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 36, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of
 Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1
 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "We're trying to keep up with you. What Order are we on?"

Speaker Breslin: "We're on Criminal Law, Second Reading.

Criminal Law, Second Reading, Ladies and Gentleman. Please
look over the Bills on this Order, and be prepared to move
your Bill to Third."

McCracken: "Alright, thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The next Bill is House Bill 158, Representative DeJaegher. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative DeJaegher? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 158, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, no Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 294, Representative Myron Olson. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, excuse me. Representative DeJaegher? The Clerk says that there is a request for a fiscal note on this Bill, 158. Has it been supplied? Representative DeJaegher is recognized."
- DeJaegher: "To my knowledge, Madam Speaker, this has been complied with...that a fiscal note has been responded to."

 Speaker Breslin: "If you have a copy of it, would you please

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

bring it to the well. The Clerk indicates that there is no record of it being on file."

DeJaegher: "Alright, thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "We'll hold the Bill on Second Reading,
 Representative DeJaegher, for you to get that to us. Now,
 Representative Olson, on 294. Are there any Motions or
 Amendments on this Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 294, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedures. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Myron Olson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Olson."

- Olson, M.: "Thank you Madam Speaker. I would request permission to withdraw Amendment #3, and proceed with Amendment 4."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman withdraws #3. Are there any further Amendments. Mr. Clerk"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

 Myron Olson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you again, Madam Speaker. Amendment #4
incorporates two elements, both of them suggested to us by
a number l in the Committee on Criminal Justice, that any
warrants be offered only in the area of felonies by
respective circuits, and Amendment #4 which incorporates
both of the above. And this one in the sense that
Representative, or excuse me, Bob Repell of the State's
Attorney's Office in Cook County suggested we accept an
Amendment that said that if we were going to pick someone
up downstate on a Chicago warrant that a waiver would have
to be received. That would mitigate the probability of a
civil suit. We would ask adoption of Amendment #4."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 4 to House Bill 294. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1056, Representative Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 1111, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Second Reading
of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1202, Representative Homer. Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 1847, Representative Countryman. Out of the record. House Bill 1860, Representative Martinez. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1860, a Bill for an Act in relation to juvenile deliquency in sentencings. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 20...Representative Deuchler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Deuchler: "Madam Speaker, I just wanted to inform the House that
we have a student group here in the back from East Aurora
High School. They have written and produced plays around
the state with Operation Snowball on prevention on drug
abuse, and I'd like to have you acknowledge them."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Welcome. House Bill 2011, Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 2260, Representative McCracken. Out of the record. House Bill 2449, Representative Petka. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2449, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2662, Representative Zickus. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2662, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2693, Representative Stephens. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2693, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee...Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?'

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Stephens."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 is added at the suggestion of my good friends, the ACLU. When they heard this Bill in committee they had, they had some problem with it, and so we thought in order to...in the spirit of cooperation, we would add the language, 'that nothing in this law, as now or hereafter amended, shall be construed to create a right to abortion.' And also,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

further states that added to language that deletes the language 'shall procure an abortion and no person,' and in place of that as, we add the language, 'research experimentation on any tissue or organ,' which is in the context of the Bill, and I move it's adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2693. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentleman, the next Order of Business that we are going to, is the Order on Economic Development, Second Reading. Second Reading only on Economic Development. The first Bill is Representative Giorgi's Bill, House Bill 217. Out of the record. House Bill 255. Out of the record. House Bill 738, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 738, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black. Is Mr. Black on the floor? Representative McCracken. Oh, here he is. Representative McCracken? Representative Black on the Amendment."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll...first of all let me apologize for my inexcusable lack of legislative courtesy. This Bill was filed and I did not

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

check with the Sponsor of the Bill, and I do apologize for that. All Floor Amendment #3 does is simply put Cook County back into the Bill. And I think the reason for the Amendment is simple. If it's a good idea, if it's good for jobs, if it's good for economic development, well, we certainly want the biggest county in the state to have the same kind of advantages the other hundred and one counties would have. So, that's all Floor Amendment #3 does, and I'd appreciate a favorable vote on it."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 738. On the question, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House. I wholeheartedly except Representative Black's apologies for the inconsistent courtesies provided. By the same token, I believe that the provision that the proposal has embodied in it is already being accomplished by Cook County. I think this is a harassment Amendment. The last provision took out...for an Amendment, it took Cook County out of a Bill, before us, and I stand in opposition to Amendment #3 and ask my colleagues to do the same."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative...Did you have a question, Representative Mautino? Or you just spoke? Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I also rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment, we just heard from other Representatives on that side of the aisle, a few Bills ago, about how it was a good idea to take Cook out of a pay raise, and that Amendment was adopted. It was pointed out earlier that there are many times many good reasons why the County of Cook, or the City of Chicago should not be included in legislation. This is another one of those. The Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Mautino

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- was opposed to the Amendment. I urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."
- Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also stand in opposition.

 I couldn't believe that a good Representative would put in such a hostile Amendment on such a good Bill as this here.

 I also advise a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Breslin: "Question of the sponsor, Representative Black.

 Proceed, Sir."
- Kubik: "Representative Black, for the last couple of moments we've been hearing about how Representatives we should have it in or out of Cook County, what not. What does this thing do in the first place? I mean, what does the Bill do, and what does your Amendment do?"
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative, and I'm properly chastised, so let me just try and tell you what the underlying Bill does. It simply says that no project involving an expenditure...now listen carefully folks...No project that involves an expenditure in excess of \$25,000, dollars allotted from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, may be performed by a county, road district, or municipality with their own personnel, except under some conditions; and, it's my understanding that this was a...reported to be a Bill that would put road contractors, laborers, good workers to work, on road projects, and I think that's a pretty good idea. All my Amendment does say that, if it's such a good idea, we certainly ought to include Cook County, because they probably do as many dollars in road projects as all the other counties put

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

together, not quite, but they do a lot. So, if it's a good idea that you hire this done in Vermillion County, for example, I think it's only fair that it's a good idea that you do it up in Cook County as well, and that's all it is. I am truly sorry that I didn't talk to the Sponsor about it, and I'll certainly not make that mistake again."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik? Nothing further.

Representative Black, you're recognized to close. Do you have anything further to say? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' 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 question, there are 44 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and this Bill, having failed to receive a majority is lost. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1066, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 1135, Representative Shaw. Mr. Shaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1135...a Bill for an Act to create the
Illinois Advanced Steel Technology Assistance Act. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2421, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentleman, the next Special Order of Call will be Environment and Natural Resources, Second Reading. Environment and Natural Resources, Second Reading. The first few sponsors are Balanoff, Cullerton, Edley, Wennlund, Ryder, Phelps. The first Bill is House Bill 789, Representative Balanoff. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 789, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?'

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 914, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

. Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 914, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 1001,
Representative Edley. Out of the record. House Bill 1175,
Representative Wennlund. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1175, a Bill for an Act to amend the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1223, Representative Ryder. Is the 'old man' in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1370, Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1370, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1557, Representative Wait. Representative Wait. Out of the record. House Bill 1688, Representative Hallock. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Hallock. Representative Hallock and Giorgi."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hallock."

- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The
 Amendment to 1688, allows the Pollution Control Board to
 adopt already approved federal exempt materials as Illinois
 rules and I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 1854, Representative Balanoff. Mr. Balanoff, do you want the Bill called? Out of the record. House Bill 2039, Representative Parcells. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2039, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2040, Representative Mays. Representative Mays, do you want the Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act in relation to the receipts of monies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2304, Representative Wennlund. Representative Wennlund? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2304, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Township Refuge Collection and Disposal Act. Second
 Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1...this Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was ruled not germane, 2 and 3 were tabled."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "There is a request for a fiscal note, and it has not been filed. Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that the fiscal note Act be held inapplicable to this Bill. There could absolutely be no way, whatsoever, that there could be any cost to the State of Illinois, as a result of this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, if we could inquire of the Chair, who filed the fiscal note request?"
- Speaker McPike: "...withdraws the request for a fiscal note.

 Third Reading. House Bill 2306, Representative Preston.

 Representative Preston here? Out of the record. House
 Bill 2308, Preston. Out of the record. House Bill 2310,

 Representative Churchill. Mr. Churchill here? Out of the
 record. House Bill 2435, Representative Mays. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2435, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to waste management. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2463, Representative Parcells. Do you want the Bill read. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2463, this Bill has been read a Second time, previously."
- Speaker McPike: "There's a request for a fiscal note on Amendment #3. It has not been filed. The Bill stays on Second Reading. House Bill 2712, Representative Mays. Out of the record. House Bill 2713, Representative Peterson. Mr. Peterson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2713, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Request for a fiscal note on this Bill has not been filed. Stays on Second Reading...Order of Higher Education, Second Reading. There's House Bill 32, Representative Hallock. 32. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 32, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. This Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2 was withdrawn. The Bill was held for a fiscal note. Fiscal note is filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 921, Representative Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 921, a Bill for an Act to amend the Baccalaureate Savings Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

42nd Legislative Day May 17, 1989

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "There is a request for a fiscal note, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "State your inquiry."

Black: "We, we think that committee Amendment #1 may be out of order. It should have deleted page 2 of the Bill, and did not. Could we have the Chair inquire as to that point?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, would you state your point again?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We feel that committee Amendment #1 is out of order, and that it should have deleted page 2 of the Bill, but did not do so."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, the question of the Clerk, Mr. Speaker. We have
the Amendment in front of us, and the...line fourteen of
the Amendment says that, 'and in by deleting page 2', that
would appear to answer the Gentleman's question, if we have
the right Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Page 2 is deleted by the Amendment. We have a copy of the Amendment here, Mr. Black. Page 2 is deleted."

Black: "You're right, Mr. Speaker. We must of had an old Amendment. I apologize, and will withdraw our objection."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn, there is a request for a fiscal note, and that is filed. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I just wondered if we could have a look at that old Amendment, that they..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, there is a request from Representative Cullerton if you will furnish him with the old Amendment, #1. We, all we have is the new Amendment

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- #1. Tell him to get off the phone too, please. Third Reading. House Bill 1484, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1484, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1, was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2033, Representative McGann. Mr. McGann here? Out of the record. House Bill 2803, Representative Shirley Jones. Representative Jones. Shirley Jones, do you want the Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2803, a Bill for an Act to amend the Baccalaureate Savings Acts. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Special Order, Sports Reform, Second Reading. House Bill 2623. Out of the record. House Bill 2624. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2624, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2626. Read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2626, a Bill for an Act to amend the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, can we withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 2626, becomes the Bill. will become a omnibus Bill, if you will, dealing with the whole issue of steroids in the State of Illinois. As you know from reading the newspapers, as you know information you've received on your desks, and as you know from watching the Olympics last year...the issue anabolic steroid abuse is starting to become a rampant drug problem in our society, and this is one area that we can legislate here. Amendment #2 discusses several things: It discusses penalties for possession in certain Penalties for distribution in sales in certain cases, and it sets aside a requirement that DASA helped to train educators, pharmacists, health club professionals, other people that might come in contact with steroids, people that want steroids. This is a Bill we need to have in the State of Illinois. It has quite severe penalties for repeat offenders. It might even touch some of the professional sports teams, and if you have been reading the papers, you've seen that there are some members of the National Football League that have appeared before a

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

congressional committee, who have been investigating steroids, that have indicated, that of the linemen in the National Football League, as many as 50 or 60% of them are using steroids. We should be doing something to control this. The Bill speaks specifically to amateur athletes using these, amateur athletic coaches, helping amateur athletes to get these and health club professionals. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have about this. The people of the State of Illinois need this Amendment and they need this Bill to be passed."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2, and on that, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will."

Countryman: "Representative, our analysis indicates that there's some factors to be considered by the court in sentencing in this Bill. Can you explain those to us and the rationale for it?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Yes, if you'll bear with me for one second...to try shorten this, Representative Countryman, the guidelines as listed in this Amendment are exactly the same guidelines as are now indicated in the Controlled Substances Act. These are not mandated to the court but merely guidelines that the court can use in helping determine an appropriate sentence."

Countryman: "So, this is a new Act called the Steroid Control Act similar to the Controlled Substances Act?"

Lang: "Well, that is correct...It's particularly similar in this section. I believe the statutory language in this section has been lifted from the Controlled Substances Act."

Countryman: "Alright, and it creates a Steroid Education Fund, is that correct?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Lang: "That is correct."

Countryman: "And, what...where do the monies from that fund go?"

Lang: "The fund would be partially...the fund would come from fines that were levied under the Steroids Control Act.

Those funds would be divided into various segments, if you will, and some of those funds would be siphoned off into this area."

Countryman: "Are those funds just from seizures of property or from fines?"

Lang: "From both, Representative."

Countryman: "Alright, and if there's a seizure of property, does that...how does that money go then other to the Steroid Education Fund?"

Lang: "It would work in the same manner as it does under the Controlled Substances Act now."

Countryman: "To the same agencies, is that what you'r saying?"

Lang: "The same agencies except for the instance of the Steroid Education Fund."

Countryman: "Alright, now can it...it's to my understanding that possession of an antibolic steroid without a prescription is a Class (c) Misdemeanor, is that right?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Countryman: "And if somebody is caught with that in their automobile, can their automobile be seized as a result of that?"

Lang: "Merely having the steroids in the car would not be sufficient. However, under a new case, if the automobile was used for the purpose of delivery, or if the steroids were hidden in the car for the purpose of delivery, it's possible the car could be seized. But, not if they were merely sitting on the seat, for instance."

Countryman: "But, you've got a combination. You've got some Class (c) Misdmeanors. Some Class (a) Misdemeanors, and

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- then some heavier felonies. What I, guess my question is can seizure occur for any of the misdemeanors?"
- Lang: "Seizure can occur under any of the violations if the automobile that you're eferring to was used for the purpose of delivery."
- Countryman: "Well, isn't delivery a felony?"
- Lang: "Delivery in a first offense is a misdemeanor, if it's a gratuitous transfer. In other words, if I'm driving to your house to bring you a package of steroids, and you're not paying me, and it's a first offense, that's a misdemeanor."
- Countryman: "Alright, so...so any time there isn't money involved it's a misdemeanor. Is that right?"
- Lang: "That is correct."
- Countryman: "You think that this is good policy to allow seizures in misdemeanor cases?"
- Lang: "I think, under certain circumstances, it might be."
- Countryman: "Do you think we ought to invest that discretion in the powers that be?"
- Lang: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."
- Countryman: "Do you think we ought to invest that discretion in those powers that be?"
- Lang: "I think that we have to trust the State's Attorneys' in this state to excercise the necessary discretion."
- Countryman: "Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Countryman, anything further? No.

 Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "I guess I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please." Speaker McPike: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Pullen: "I'm looking at your definition section, and I'm concerned about the way that anabolic steroid is defined.

 Are you aware that there are such things as steroid medicines that are used on a prescription basis for

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

appropriate medical uses?"

Lang: "Certainly, Representative. There are appropriate medical uses for steroids, and that's why steroids that are prescribed by a doctor are not covered by this Bill."

Pullen: "Where does it say that?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This seems to be a rather protracted debate. Representative Ryder left me in charge of his cake, his birthday cake. In his absence, I'd like to invite everybody over and have a piece of cake before the Republicans eat it all."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pullen, continue."

Pullen: "I believe the Gentleman has not yet answered my question, Mr. Speaker."

Lang: "I will find the answer, Representative. Representative, if you'll look at section 6 of the Amendment, which is on page 5, it states that, 'no person shall manufacture, dispense, deliver or possess with intent to deliver, prescribe or administer on any anabodic steroid for use, except in accordance with the order of a physician for valid medical purposes.'

Pullen: "Would it not be appropriate to define anabolic steroid more carefully in the definition section, so that it isn't a definition that is simply written, 'includes', but would say it is such and such, which includes, because to say includes, does not say that it excludes certain things? Then it goes on in the definition section further to say that it does not include any which are expressly intended for administration through implants to livestock or other non-human species, and approved by the FDA, for such use. Would it not be appropriate to add a paragraph there that says it does not include those that are prescribed for

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

medical purposes?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, I frankly think that the language in here is good language. This language was worked on with my office, with DASA, with Representatives on the Republican side of the aisle. In fact, this language was proposed by DASA, so I think the appropriate department of the State of Illinois has looked this language over, and has determined that it is sufficient for their purposes, and will be sufficient to help head off this...growing trend towards steroid abuse in our state."

Pullen: "Well, I understand it's purpose, Sir. But, DASA is not an agency that that deals with medical practice. It is, it has a bias an appropriate bias concerning controlled substances, and abused substances. I'm not standing in opposition, Sir. I'm trying to suggest something that would make your language much clearer. By simply excluding it from the provision of section 6, I still do not believe that it is carefully enough defined, that everyone is going to know what is meant by this, and what is not meant and you may inadvertently, be preventing medical treatment by a perfectly useful drug."

Lang: "I have, Representative, I have gone over this language with the medical society as well. They think the language is sufficient. I talked to a goodly number of pharmacists, they think the language is sufficient. What I would like to do is move this Bill, and this Amendment on to Third Reading, and I'd be happy to work with you if there's some language you'd like to propose, and we can always move it back to Second Reading, for that purpose."

Pullen: "Fine, I would appreciate that. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Lang, to close."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Lang: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading...Special Order, Income Tax Exemptions. Appears House Bill 490. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 490, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act has been read a Second time previously. Floor Amendment #4 is now before the House."

 Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you withdraw Amendment #4?"
- Speaker McPike: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?

 Floor Amendment #5 is now being offered by Speaker

 Madigan-et al. Speaker Madigan on Amendment #5."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House.

 Amendment #5 contains my proposal concerning the imposition of a surcharge on the Illinois Income Tax to be imposed for two years, and to be used exclusively for two purposes.

 Number 1, education. Number 2, local Government. First, let me explain. I have not changed my position regarding the Governors request for a 40% increase in the Illinois Income Tax. I have said over the last two years, that Illinois does not need a 40% increase in the tax, that the Government of Illinois does not need to grow anymore: that we should not let the Government of Illinois grow anymore.

 And so I reiterate, that I stand in opposition to the Governors request for a 40% increase in the Illinois Income Tax. In this year alone, we will be able to provide 900 million dollars of growth in our budget just from the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

sources which are available to us now, as proposed in the Governors budget. At the same time that I offer these remarks, let me explain that I stand here today recognizing and acknowledging that there are two pressing needs in this Number 1, funding for education. Just a few weeks state. ago at the request of Representative Hicks. Representative Hartke, I traveled to Mount Vernon and to Effingham. In the course of that trivel, in the course of that trip, I met with a variety of School officials. Local school officials from the Mount Vernon area, local people from Effingham, regional superintendents from the area, generally south of Springfield. That meeting, plus earlier with people like Representative Giorgi, conversations speaking to me concerning the school situation in Rockford. Meetings with school officials and school people from all over the state, has convinced me of the gravity of the situation concerning financing of local school districts in this state. These problems have generally been brought on, because of local assessment practices, and because of reductions in federal support for education, which have been implemented over the last serval years. It's for those reasons, that I have come to the position that there should be more support for education. In the area of local qovernment, I have been reading over the last several these documents which were provided to me by the United States Census Bureau. They clearly set out the fact that local government in this nation has been ravaged by the current fiscal policies in Washington policies which have consistently reduced the level of support from the Federal Revenue Sharing Program and other categorical programs to the point where local governments all across this nation, and particularly in Illinois, need help, and that's where I propose to offer today. I would propose

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

that we adopt a two year surcharge, a surcharge to be imposed upon the Illinois Income Tax. This surcharge would be less than one half of one percent. That would raise the personal rate from 2.5 to 2.96. It would raise the corporate rate from 4.0 percent to 4.736 for two years. This increase would result in an increase of gross receipts of 781 million dollars, providing for 55 to 60 million dollar of refunds. There would be a net gain to the state and then to these local units of 726 million dollars. would propose that of the 726 million dollars that, that, money be divided equally between education, and the local Government Distributite Fund. Therefore, there would be 363 million dollars of new money provided for education, elementary and secondary education, and higher education. The money would be guaranteed for those purposes, because the language of the Amendment specifically provides for the creation of a new fund for the assistance of educational programs, both elementary and secondary, and The other half of the money, 363 million education. Government dollars would be provided for the Local Distributive Fund. Concerning the education money, if you begin with the Governor's current budget proposal for FY90, which would provide for an increase of 344 million dollars; if you add to that the money which would be derived from the surcharge of 363 million dollars, you come to a total of 707 million dollars of new money for education. I would propose, that of the 770 million dollars, 235 million dollars be provided to higher education, and 472 million dollars be provided to elementary and secondary education. This amount of money, under this form at distribution would provide that the categoricals would be fully funded of 100 percent. It would provide that in preschool, wherever there's a slot, wherever there's a Chair available for

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

preschool, it would be paid for. It would provide for a very substantial increase in the school aid formula. Concerning the Local Government Distributed Fund, if you look at the amount of the money, that would be provided to your local town, in the next budget, take that double the number. If a town would normally have gotten 100,000 dollars from the Local Government Distributed Fund, its share of the 1/12 of the State Income Tax, then it would get 200,000 dollars in the next budget year. money having been received by the local units can for variety of purposes. It could be used for transportation purposes. It could be used for other in frastructure purposes, if that local unit chooses to use this money for that type of purpose. A local unit could choose to use this money for something such as mental health. It could also choose to use this money for other human service needs, but it would be a decision for a local unit of government. Certain units could even choose to use this money to slow, stop, or reduce rising property taxes, and I would recommend that to the units in places like DuPage County where property taxes are on the rise. The money could be used for financially strapped cities such as East St. Louis. The important point to remember is that this money, all of it, will be put in the hands of local officials. Those people who are closest to the voters, those people who make local decisions, and then are required to account for those decisions when they stand for election for their local office. People will ask, only two years?' I say two years, because if it's put on for two years, it gives us, the Members of the General Assembly, the opportunity in two years time to review the effectiveness of this program to determine if this is a good program. If after two years, we find that there is

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

waste, if after two years, we find we made a mistake, then we simply don't renew the program. If after two years, we make a decision that it's a good program, that it ought be continued, then we vote it into effect again. own sake, representing a district that includes part of the City of Chicago, I do feel that there ought to be review in terms of the implementation of the reform Bill for the Chicago public schools. I support it, changes in the Chicago school system, as almost all of us did. think that the money contained in this proposal can be used to implement those reforms, but if after two years we find that that agency has simply fallen back into it's old practices, then there is no need to renew the money. conclusion, again, I am not changing my position concerning the Governor's request for a 40% increase in the Illinois Income Tax. I say that, because state government can move along very well with the sources which are available, as explained in the Governor's Budget, the Governors budget proposal, without this 40% increase in the Illinois Income Tax. There are very significant increases provided already in areas such as health care provider rates, mental health, drug abuse programs, the start up of new prisons, COLA employees, provisions for state health insurance improvements for state employees, DCCA loans and grants, new and expanded parks. I firmly believe in the wisdom of this proposal. The matter will be called today, I strongly recommend to everybody in this Body, support this idea. . is a tax increase. It's only for two years. It puts the hands of the people closest to the voters, money in the the ones that the voters know best. So, that if there is waste, if there are problems with the program, it'll be known very quickly and then we can take action in two years time. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5, and on that, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment because for too long we in General Assembly, have turned our back on our constituents here in the State of Illinois. We have told educational community that we can't help them to the degree that we're supposed to help them. One of the things we're sent here for is to fund education, and we haven't done the job. This will go a long way in improving that situation. We've told our local elected officials, 'we don't care about their problems.' We had the Reagan Revolution, said, let's shift all the responsibility of the local level but then nobody decided to help them pay for it. And because of our inaction, we've raised local property taxes. This will help solve that problem. The only caution that I want to make, and I hope that there are 60 votes on this important Amendment and 60 votes on the Bill, is that I hope the Senate adopts this proposal, because if don't, we still have five more weeks to get back and analyze and review, and come in with a proper response to the needs of the people of the State of Illinois. Today's action is important. But, if it isn't successful in Senate, I would hope that everyone would continue the efforts that are necessary to do what's right, because the worst hypocrisy that we could bring forth to this state, would be for us to pass this today, but not do the job that has to be done by June 30th to help education, and to help local government. This is a good idea. Its time to vote for it is now, but let's make sure that we don't make this the final voice, if the Senate doesn't act. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment that was put together with great care, and great deal of hard work, on the part of many persons in the General Assembly. I don't agree with everything that the previous speaker has said, because I don't think that we, in this Body, have been insensitive to the needs of education, either higher education or secondary and primary education. I don't think we've been insensitive or indifferent to the needs of local governments or to the people who have sent us here. On the contrary, I think in years past and presently, that we have been very considerate, very deliberative, very careful with spending the dollars that belong to our constituents, the taxpayers in Illinois, and I think we are doing that today by voting out this Amendment and then the Bill. I think that is a deliberative effort that shows that we are sensitive to the needs of the people we represent, and sensitive also to the needs of more revenues to take care of the educational concerns and the concerns of local government that serve the mental health community, that serve programs for senior citizens, that serve a whole variety of social service needs that we, throughout Illinois have. I could not, more highly commend the Speaker, the Majority Leader Jim McPike, and others who have worked so diligently to put what I think is a brilliant program together, that shows that we're careful with taxpayer dollars, at the same time we take care of the people that we've been elected to serve. I'm going to vote 'aye' and I encourage all others to do so."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of
Amendment #5 to House Bill 490 for five reasons. One, it
provides funds for education so sorely needed downstate.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Two, local governments make the wise decisions with money, at least better than state government, I feel. This Amendment does not expand state governments. I don't think state government has to get any bigger, but we must provide funds for education and local government. It is limited. It's limited to two years. Number three, we have not forgotten the children of Illinois. That's why I stand in support, and urge your support, also."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too rise in support of this Amendment. Earlier today, I withdrew my Amendment based upon the fact that I knew that we would be having a proposal that had a real opportunity here today. the issue of taxes starting early in this session because I believe we had to address it, and that's what we're going to do here today. Whether this be perfect for everyone, I think it addresses what everyone's basic need, and that's the dollars for education. Last year, I reluctantly voted for the school reform, and at that time we were promised that we would try our best..to find enough funds to fund that reform. I believe this proposal's the first step towards funding that reform. I believe that it is a start, and it is not necessarily a start in the sense of more taxes, but it is a start in the sense that we must live up to our obligations to the school children of this believe that local governments have been undercut throughout the past few years, by Federal Government, and I believe that we in the State of Illinois must take a step. Those of you who have been clamoring for the past few years about the right to vote on a tax proposal, this is it. Those of you who have said over the past few years that we want to be able to do certain things within the State of Illinois, that we want to fund education, and that we want

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

to see improvements in our local standard of living, this is it. So, I say to you today, that we must come out and provide the necessary funds to take care of the programs that we have mandated, to take care of the reforms that we have inacted, to take care of the local government that we in essence, have short changed over the past few years. So, I wholeheartedly endorse this Amendment, and I would hope that it receives the necessary 60 votes necessary to go on to be passed and to be signed into law."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too, plan to vote for this Amendment, because I believe that it recognizes two of the most severe problems that we have in this state. The need for more money for education, and the need for monies for our municipalities. We have a number of municipalities that have declining tax bases. Their tax base have been eroded. They were getting Federal Revenue sharing money. They're not getting that anymore, and they need our help. I'm supporting this Amendment because, it provides the kind of statesmanlike leadership, which I think that we are sent here to do. We're sent here to help municipalities solve their problems, and I commend the Speaker, and I intend to vote for it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I applaud the efforts of Speaker Madigan, in coming forth with a proposal that does a very good job of bringing together the concerns of the Members. Although, I'm sure that each of us could find some portion that we don't totally agree with, I think that the essence of the program is one that moves us forward in consideration of adequate funding for our educational programs, and at the same time providing an opportunity for local governments and local decision making

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

in regard to whether or not these increased funds will be available for services or whether they will be available as a reduction in real estate tax, and only the people at the local level will know best, which of those alternatives or combinations of those alternatives should made available. I do have concerns about the fact that the limited time for which these funds will be available means perhaps. that local school districts and local governments will make some decisions that might not be the most efficient for long term planning. But obviously those are things again, that will be controlled at the local level, and where we will expect input from local citizens to help to determine the fate of those funds, and how they are be expended, or to be distributed back to local taxpayers. Again, I'm sure each of us would do something differently if we had the decision in our own hands, but the Speaker has had to take the interests of many into consideration, and has done a masterful job of coming forth with this plan. We certainly need to move forward in the attempt to provide these additional funds for local services."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

Mr. Speaker, Members of DeJaegher: "Thank you, the General downstate Legislator, Assembly. Αs Ι am of the Speakers Bill, and I think basically, it'll only take me a minute why I'm supportive. Hampton is a small village in my legislative district which possibly 2,000 people residing there, and this is the reason that I am supportive of this legislation. It not only solves one problem, but it solves two as well. Hampton is an elementary school with a problem of declining student numbers. In turn, this has dramatically reduced State of Illinois funding. The worst case scenario in the face

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

this, would be the closing of a school. As village officers, this is an unacceptable conclusion. The well being of Hampton, and similar towns, hinges to a...greater degree on the ability to deliver quality education within the community. Without a school, small communities suffer population attrition, with loss of commercial and other business interests. Ultimately, the town would seize to exist. We ask you to review present educational funding procedures, existing options to some more small community schools, or to devise innovative legislation, to design to maintain educational facilities, as a key entity in a battle for the survival of Illinois towns and villages. With this legislation, I believe he has addressed himself to two specific problems that are confronting us. have an opportunity of making these fundings available not only for the schools, but to towns and villages as well, and I am welcome to be supportive of this legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too rise in support of this proposal. Since my tenure here, first coming to the Legislature and the House, was faced with somewhat more of an extreme dilemma maybe than most of you even in rural areas such as I, because of the degree of severity is probably worst downstate, extreme southern tip of the state. But, I think that the rural areas in the last few years, have been forced to look at state government to bail them out, so to speak, not because they have put their ownselves in the same...in the situation in which they're trying to struggle out of, and meeting several demands, that are not self-inflicted. one, because the dimenishing Federal funds that have been shifted...the burden to the State and local levels, the decrease in the tax base, not of any fault of their own,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

only, because of slumping agricultural activities and in my area, coal mining, farming, and coal as a tax base. it's not because of their own power have they been able to address their priorities that they'd like to funds, such as That's because of the increased demands of state government and Federal in the way of mandates, and we've talked about that word for years, but it's gotten to a point finally that we have a way to at least, to ease those pains. This is not a fix-all, and we are looking at two But because the increased mandates in the Federal years. and state levels have driven local governments and school districts scrambling for ways to fund things such as new jail requirements, election consolidation, animal control, those are not the things if you ask people back home if you have your own local money to spend how would you prioritize it from 1 to 10, and then you find he's not even on the list of ten, but yet they've had to do it, and then loss of revenue sharing, all those mixtures of forcing local governments and school districts to face the music has put us where we are today, and I commend our Leader for offering this proposal. But, at the same time I send with this vote a message now to the locals, in saying, you will have the money to do many of these things that you've been screaming about that you can't on your own. Now you will have the assistance, and let's look for a screening period of two years and see how you have managed them, that you will manage these funds, where you have accused us as state government, of not doing that. Now we have a handle on it, and we are passing it down to you. Let's show ourselves approved. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've served for 12 years in this Assembly and over

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the last few years, I've noted a disturbing trend. Perhaps, you have noted it too. There is a growing chasm of mistrust between the people of Illinois, and their state government. This chasm of mistrust is growing because people are, among other things, skeptical, about the need for a tax increase, and why not? If anyone wanted to create conditions which would assure intense opposition to tax increases, they could of done no better than Governor Thompson did himself. Before the elections in 1982 and 1986, he spoke to the people of Illinois in glowing terms about the fiscal health of our state, and yet, before he was sworn in for another term, he announced that the state would need major new tax increases in order to stay afloat. 1982, he weakened his credibility, and destroyed it. But, it didn't end there. The first tax increase proposal was for, about 900 million dollars if my memory serves, after the various tax relief...proposals were netted out, and what were his priorities? His priorities were to spread it evenly across the everyone gets about eight percent. Not even the education advocates who were so desperate for these funds, supported that proposal until the 11th hour, because it did not focus on the needs of the state. The next year, after the failure of that proposal, the next year the Governor comes before us and asks now for a 1.4 billion dollar tax package, and now what are his proposals? Well, he doesn't tell us, what his proposals are for spending the money, until the middle of June, when there is less than two weeks to go in the session. What has been lost in the discussion, up to this point, is that a tax increase is to a means to an end, not an end in itself. Α tax increase should always be considered a means to an end. proposal before us, which I am proud to support, makes that

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

connection clear. This proposal addresses, the education reform package that was passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in 1985. It addresses a Chicago school reform package. It keeps faith with the people. The only bridge over this chasm of mistrust is the bridge of truth. We must tell the people the truth about where their money is going, we must make the connection between the tax dollars we raised from them, and the expenditures that we provide on their behalf. This proposal does that. This proposal tells the people the truth for the first time in this two year long debate. It is time now that we take this action, and so I am proud to rise in support of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm cosponsor of House Bill 490, and also cosponsor of the Amendment, but in this case, there are a number of emergencies in Winnebago County, and I'm going to enumerate four that this Bill, this Amendment addresses. You're very familiar happened in Rockford School 205...School District 205, when school district ran out of money, and have decided to close 10 schools. They're going to leave off over 250 teachers, and maybe 150 supplementary employees. Now, you know what that does to a community when you close 10 schools, when you're getting charges...of...racial charges...even discrimination charges and the schools that remain open, are suspect. Now, I helped with the Amendment, glad that the Amendment is gonna sort of shape some of the destiny that I'm concerned about. In Winnebago County, our River Blust Nursing Home, River Bluff Nursing Home, court order has to take indigent patients, and because we take indigent patients, and all of us know about the pay back plan by the State of Illinois, we are in a deficit of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

almost one million dollars. One of the wings of this nursing home is closed, and more wings might be closed if we don't infuse some new money. Further, the Department of Corrections has come into Rockford and Winnebago, and said detention facility is substandard not juvenile complying with the regulations of the Department of and by 1990 we have to have a brand new Corrections, juvenile detention facility. Those are three of the items. The fourth item was brought home to you last week on the Floor of the General Assembly when you met the new Mayor, Mayor Botts of Rockford. Well, during the election when he was elected Mayor, a couple of public works projects that the City of Rockford desperately needs were not passed. Now this infusion of new is going to give Winnebago, and The school systems are going to Rockford a good start. pull out of their traumatic experience and plan for the furture. Our Junior College System is going to get some help All money incorporated area are going to get some The County of Winnebago is going to get an infusion of new money, and I think this will give them time to write their House or get their house in order, and I support this Amendment wholeheartedly."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this Amendment with not only enthusiasm, but with the expectation that it will have been the most important single thing this Assembly does this year. Some have suggested that it is only a two year period. I say that that two year period gives us an opportunity to determine whether or not this is an effective pilot program for the needs of this state. Some have suggested that this may not do what we think it should do. If it doesn't do what we think it should do, we know where the money is going. This

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

money is earmarked. That's a tremendous advantage to all of us, not only as Legislators, but as persons who are involved in government. Local officials now will have revenue sharing from us that becomes instantly meaningful. In my district in the suburbs, I wrote down what it means for the Village of Skokie, Mr. Speaker. For the Village of Skokie, this means \$1,886,000..\$1,88...it's so much money I can't even... contemplate it. It's, \$1,886,888.00. is a fantastic amount for the Village of Skokie. I think every Representative in this room ought to look to what it does for his local community. In the Village of Niles, Ladies and Gentlemen, \$956,456.00, of new money, additional. money. In the village of Morton Grove, \$743,354.00, new additional money, for local government to be responsible about, to be responsive to their citizens for. When the Federal Revenue Sharing Program was dissipated, was terminated, these villages and towns which I represent had an instant problem for funding. We are now allowing them the opportunity to make their own destiny. Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, consensus, as I perceive it, of the felt needs and necessities of suburban Representatives I would urge my colleagues on each side of the island, those who've already demonstrated their support and those who have not yet indicated their support, to do so with the same enthusiasm that some of us have seen, that this affords us. Gentlemen, if you will look at the earmarking proposals, if you will see that this money is funneled to a real need, to a need which is clear and present and has been there for many years, you will see that we have created in this Amendment one of the most innovative and instructive ways to handle government problems and it is a method, Ladies and Gentlemen, which you can terminate in

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

two years, if our confidence in our educational system has been misdirected, if our confidence in our local officials were unwarranted. This assembly has the responsibility to review it, change it, modify it, or extend it, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge at this time a resounding 'aye' on Amendment #5."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in support of this Amendment. It's an excellent Amendment, well crafted, and for this I applaud Speaker Madigan, Majority Leader McPike, and the entire staff, I also, applaud Representative Williams for keeping this on the front burner for all of us. And there are other people who are applauding now. These people are all over the State of Illinois, because there's something in this Amendment for everybody in the State of Illinois. something in this Amendment for the preschoolers because this Amendment will cause large dollars for preschool education that we've never had before, that we so desperately need. For the elementary school children, there is large dollars to help them in their education, to help school districts fund categoricals, more money for state aid. School boards are going to be applauding this Amendment, because school boards have said to me, 'we don't want just a tax increase so that the monies are in one large pot that we may never get'. This is a Bill, an Amendment, that earmarks money for these schools, and these schools are going to be happy that they know what they're going to get, that this is money they can count on. The college boards are happy for the same reason. They'll be able to keep professors in the State of Illinois that are going off to other places that we can't keep in this State. Same for college students, these will provide a significant

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

additional programs for them, significant additional programs at our educations of higher learning so that we can keep students in this State, which will in turn help improve the economic growth and vitality of our state. There's applause by state...by local governments that desperately needed our help for so long. The Reagan Administration turned their back on local government they said, 'you take these problems, we won't help you with them but you take these problems.' Now, the State of Illinois is going to help the local governments all across the State with these problems. And finally, Ladies and Gentlemen, the entire State of Illinois will be applauding us, because we have the opportunity now to do what we were elected to do, to take a step forward and to be leaders. We have a chance to be leaders, to show the people in the State of Illinois that we're not merely politicians, that we're not merely here as an exercise in futility, that we're not merely here to make promises we can't keep, that we're here to do what we were elected to do, which is to promote the welfare of the citizens of the State of Illinois. I can think of no better way of proving that to the citizens of our State than by helping each of their individual communities, each of their individual school districts, and I assure you, if you step forward and be a leader and vote 'aye' on this Amendment, you will be doing yourselves and all the citizens of our State a great service."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak"

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too, rise in support of this measure. It's tough to vote on an income tax increase, but I think the time for us is to stand up and be counted in this State. I applaud Speaker Madigan, Majority Leader McPike, and all those

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

staff people that worked so hard and diligently to put this package together. I'm standing up to be counted here today, because I'm looking at this program and how it's gonna help my school districts in Kankakee and Iroquois County, how its gonna help with the municipalities and the county government in my district at home. I'm gonna vote for this Bill, and I'm gonna go home and defend it, successfully. I'll have my detractors, I know that, as some of the other Representatives who will vote for this But I feel comfortable in voting for this have theirs. Bill, because this is gonna address some serious needs in And one great thing I love about this Bill, the Illinois. Governor doesn't get a red dime. The Governor doesn't It goes into these funds, specifically dime. education, and local government. and I applaud the efforts of everyone who put this together. I hope that when we take the vote, we see a lot more green lights.

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a superb Amendment, its a superb idea, and I think it will do a tremendous amount for our schools. Last year, this Body worked very hard to bring about reform in the Chicago public schools. We decided to put a cap the bureaucracy to eliminate a lot of the waste. decided to provide for control by the parents because they the ones who have the vested interest in seeing the system work. We decided to make an awful lot of other significant reforms, which are now beginning to be But without more money, we cannot have real reform in the Chicago public schools. That's what we heard last year from the parents and the community groups that worked so hard for Senate Bill 1840. This Amendment gives us the opportunity to go that second step in terms of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

reform in the Chicago public schools. This Amendment will provide the very badly needed money to finance those reforms, and to improve the quality of education of the students in Chicago. The figures I have, suggest, that with the speed up that the Governor has approved of forty three million dollars, if we pass the composite Bill for the Chicago board, that would produce another twenty and if we end up passing the cigarette tax, that million, should put the board at about zero. They won't have a deficit. This money that would be provided by this Amendment will provide the additional funding that is gonna be needed for the school reform. I think its an important Amendment. It's well drafted. It's fair, and it meets the needs of the students of the City of Chicago. I applaud it and rise in support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. are few days in a year or even in a lifetime when one has a premonition about what might occur. This is probably especially true when one is talking about a truly momentous event. When I awoke this morning, it seemed to me like any other normal legislative day. We come into session. We come out here. We'd have Second Reading and Third Reading, and I started out when I came and read our papers, as Gentleman pointed out. But when I entered the State House, it seemed to me that the usual clusters of kibitzers were charged with an unusual intensity. I couldn't help but overhear some of their conversations and I must say that I was slightly surprised and somewhat shocked. I was shocked because they were discussing, Speaker Madigan's proposal for an Income tax increase. That's right, I said they were discussing the income tax increase proposal being put forth by the Speaker. Savor that idea for a moment with me.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker, the one Illinois Politician who has tried to reshape his career into being 'Mr. Anti-Income Tax Increase,' i now Sponsoring an income tax increase. It's like finding out, I might suggest, that Batman's nemesis, Well, why is the the 'Joker,' is really a good guy. Speaker Sponsoring an income tax increase, such a difficult idea to accept or to understand. For me, there is a simple answer to this question. It's because I thought he was sincere all along. For three years this Speaker has said 'no'. To his fellow Democratic Members, he has said, 'follow me ignore what is plain as the nose on your face and follow me.' The Chicago Tribune wrote that it was the Speakers staff, the Speaker's own staff that labeled the rank and file Democrat Members as ducklings. For three years, we've heard demeaning, how incredible. the Speaker say 'no'. Campaign dollars reinforced his 'no' vote with his Members. But for three years he has stifled foreclosed opportunities, and even crippled debate, progress on the most important discussions to take place in this State. We cannot recapture what we might have accomplished during those three years, but to have listened the Speaker during that time, one had to be convinced, as he claimed he was, that everything was fine. Speaker disclaimed any political motivation, at all for his decisions. He thought the kids in his hometown were doing fine. They didn't need anymore help, for more teachers, better school labs, enrichment programs, or whatever. was not a political vendetta. This was just hard edged, rational, deliberative decision making for which the Speaker is justifiably infamous. The Speaker's anti-income increase juggernaut, just three weeks ago, was still as hard-lined as ever. No income tax increase is necessary, he claimed, over and over again. But then,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

election, cracks started to appear, the invincible began in the disassembling process, apparently, even if you and I couldn't yet discern it, it was occurring. Let me offer one example that demonstrates what we couldn't have known. On April 11th, the Springfield Journal Register recorded that the Speaker told a Menard County Democrat Central Committee meeting that he still opposed an increase. The Speaker told them, 'I think we have to begin with the proposition that all of us are going to have to live within our means.' 'The Speaker remains unconvinced of the need for an income tax increase', the reporter wrote. Can it be any clearer? Speaker Madigan, on April remained adamant. He remained unbowed. He remained llth. resolute. So much for principle, and so much for belief. Today, without an inkling even for the ducklings, the Speaker is proposing we raise the state income tax rate. did he come to this conclusion? What has happened to change his mind? What happened to tightening our What happened to living within our means? What talk? happened to positioning the Democratic party's need to become the party of fiscal restraint. How can we help but be skeptical by this thunderbolt? Ιs the Speaker's strategy to shock us into submission, rather than offer an explicit analysis that makes him drop his death grip of opposition to an income tax increase? We need more information. We need to hear the facts that brought about miraculous conversion of Mr. Speaker from opponent to convert. Was there a revelation? If so, please share it We, really have so little to go on. There must have been many long nights, studying the alternative solutions and considering wrestling with whether we had done all we could to go it alone, to down all of our capital and to exhaust our financial and

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

human resources. Where is the proof? Why does the Speaker stand before us, a humble convert, who is mute evidence which brought about his conversion? I, for one, am personally unconvinced. This proposal can only be viewed with suspicion. I know I didn't convince him, and I know the Governor didn't convince him. For a very long time, no one has been able to convince him. This tax increase, proposed by the Speaker, leaves many things to the imagination. We are left to wonder about the rest What are state government. What are his assumptions. his conclusions about how this will affect the rest of state government? Education and local governments, we know would enjoy this help. But, what happens, one, two, three, five or even ten years from now, and down the road as the surcharge which his called which is a euphemism for a increase, then expires, and we are then asked to renew it for these very organizations that have gotten used money. What economic projections support the Speaker's income tax increase? How much new revenue growth will enjoy in the next five fiscal years, and how will this proposal change that? Will this proposal enhance or the probability of a public aid recipient grant increase in out years? Will mental health be better to meet the needs of the less fortunate and to meet the needs of the mandates of OBRA because of this Bill? quaranteed property tax relief is built into this plan? Instead of a, 'I hope that governments will realize reduce property taxes'. Some have asked about distribution formulas and whether or not this additional funding from the Speaker's income tax proposal will be distributed equitably. I'll tell you, we have so many questions, but so few concrete answers, based in fact, and based upon economic conditions. How was the Speaker

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

converted? Who will stand and say, I was a witness to his conversion and I know he will remain among his new brethern. There are too many questions. We should not be stampeded by this convert. First, we need to test his judgement, his commitment and his logic. For that reason and for the reason that so many questions have to be answered, I intend to vote 'present' on this Amendment, and urge each and everyone of you to do the same until such time as the questions that are so many are answered. in conclusion, I would suggest to you that a meeting will take place at five o'clock this afternoon in the Governors office where he has asked the four leaders to come and And Ladies address these important subjects. Gentlemen, I'll be there hoping to get some of the answers to the so many questions. I vote 'present'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels, did you wish to address the Amendment? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I think I did."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I, like any good fiscal manager, oppose a tax increase. However, I believe that some relief is in order for homeowner's. Some relief is certainly in order for those who live in counties who are finding that their property tax is almost equalling their mortgage payments. I believe that as long as we have schools on financial alert and special alert because of a lack of funds, then we certainly must look some place. I recognize that during the 84-86th session, the 85th General Assembly, during the reign of our honorable Mayor Harold Washington, we could not seem to get this package together. The needs were the same, just as they are today; we have the same problems with lack of funds in higher education, we have

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the same problems of a terrible increase in our property taxes. We have the same infra-structure problems, but I am glad too, that the honorable Speaker has allowed us to get this package together with the help of other Legislators. feel that with our ability in two years to take a look at this and how these funds are actually being spent gives me a greater impetus to vote for this piece of legislation. I think because the children of Chicago, and because the children in these other areas that are on watch, need to know their school doors will be open and because I, too, am a homeowner and I am tired of seeing the increases in those property tax Bills!!! I say let's look to a new source and I urge you to vote 'yes' on this income tax increase. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this Amendment and I wasn't going to say anything until I heard the words of Minority Leader, casting aspersions on the intent and the frankly honor I guess of the Speaker. Well, quiet Representative, we wouldn't be in this situation had there not been some certain grandstanding in 1983 on a temporary increase, and that didn't need to happen then and I don't think it needs to happen, now. One of the things that I have reservations about is the, perhaps temporary nature of what we are proposing to go ahead with. think the Speaker has crafted a genuine proposal. I think we all understand the needs of education in local I have some hesitation, however, that new governments. money is not being designated for child abuse, or drug abuse, or mental health, or the health care of poor children or the proper funding for the various pension systems. I also have concern that we are basing

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the numbers that we have discussed here today, both in caucus and on the Floor, we're basing these numbers on a...addition to a tobacco tax increase, which frankly, I do not think will pass. But, because I think this is a proposal which is a very good step in the right direction, and because I think it is a genuine proposal, I'm gonna stand in support of this and suggest that all other Members of this Legislature without political demagoguery support it, also, and vote 'aye.'"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I'm one of those individuals who've tried to help fund education over the last couple of years playing the lottery, and let me tell you that I have not been successful. Like education has lost, so have I, if I was to bet on whether we we're gonna take a vote on an income tax increase this session, I would have lost again, so my record seems to be a very clear cut one. I rise very reluctantly, to support this Bill. I'm not sure what reluctant support means, and you can decide for yourself what that is. But, I'm certain that an increase such as a temporary increase that was proposed by the Governor a few years ago, I should say I supported that temporary increase that was supported by the Governor a few years ago, and that the thing that I hated most about that temporary increase is that it was just that, it was temporary. certainly understand the need for new money for education, but I also feel that there are some other areas of state government that need funding, just as well. For example, a healthy mind and a healthy body are necessary to learn, and if there's not enough funds available for mental health or for public aid increases, or for housing which we've never funded in this state, then a child is not going to learn, I

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

don't care how much money we put into those schools. You need a healthy body and a healthy mind to learn, not just a school building that is fully funded and educators and administrators that are paid. I also recall since that last tax increase was rescinded, how hard it was for us to take another vote on a tax increase because most of us were afraid or concerned about being reelected, and we had a fear that if we in fact, voted for a tax increase we would not be here. A temporary tax increase, although it sounds good, is just...that. I don't feel that it's fair to the people of this State to subject them to the political shananagains that's going to take place two years from now, when we're up for reelection again and there's still a need for more funds. And lastly, I can't help but wonder about this \$94 million dollars, windfall for the City of Chicago and yes, we all agree that where are deficits that exists there like in all local municipalities throughout this But I can't help but think in the back of my State. that it was only a change in the administration that brings this proposal to this table today. I reluctantly support this Bill and I pray that the Mayor of the City of Chicago and the local elected officials there do...do what is right. That is, that they will use some of this windfall to help prepare our childrens minds and bodies and that they will help create a better housing environment in that because without it, reading scores are not going to change and yes, education will do better, but, the people of this state will suffer in the long run."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in defense of the loyal order of ducklings. Minority Leader, if it sounds like a duck, and it walks like a duck, it's a duckling. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the House, the Minority Leader doesn't know what pressure he's getting himself into, I listened to his... I listened to his courageous speech but let me tell you, I feel I'm a freed man today, I'm not going to demand that the Chicago Tribune sign a release, but I feel like pressure is going to be on somebody else now. The fact of the matter is that the Minority Leader said, what has been the Speaker's conversion? I don't look upon this as a conversion. For two years now, I've told my press, and I guess I may have convinced somebody, I know I didn't convince the Tribune, but I think I've convinced a lot of people in my area, that I was not for the billion...six hundred million dollar tax increase, because education didn't get a fair allocation, that in two years...education would have come back here looking for more funds. think if you listen carefully to the Minority Leader, as I you sensed why he's voting 'present'. said, what's in it for state government. What's in it for state government? That is precisely the reason that I voted against and didn't support the Governor's huge That's all he was concerned about massive tax increase. was, what's in it for state government? Because state government translates into, what's in it for me? What's in it for me? What's in it for patronage? What's in it for jobs? That's what the Governor was interested in. Speaker Madigan found a way to fund education, to fund local government, who has needs because Washington renigged. Washington has not been responsible with regards to the needs of state government. Speaker Madigan has found a way without giving a penny to Governor Thompson, but does that mean that we are now advocating state government? No, the fact of the matter is, we could have found within the budget some extra monies for education, we

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

could have probably come up with maybe fifty million dollars in funds, we could have weeded out the state budget, I'm sure, and found about fifty million dollars. We can provide the needs of state government. We can fund education and we can also give monies to local government. Now, haven't you heard it said many times that we ought to give monies the closest to where the people are? local government. They know the needs, the needs change everyday, and that's why I think it is so important that we give monies to local government. They surely can't look to Washington anymore, and I guess some people applaud that. Now, I don't know how the Minority Leader for all these two years can say that we have to fund education, and now that there's a plan to fund education, all of a sudden the Minority Leader is silent, is going to vote present. Representative Bowman is right that our think...I think, problem is and the people relate to it is, that they relate to everything with scepticism, they are frustrated. Government get along? Can't they see a good thing and reach out and support it? Now you are saying you can't be for it. No wonder the people say they are sceptical, because now we have come around and we say we're going to fund education, we're going to fund it at the level that the State Board of Education says is needed. We're going to give money to local government, and you can't be for it. I don't know where you stand. I Where are you at? realize that it has been very silent on that side of the isle, very silent. I think the Minority Leaders light was the first one to go on. It's silent because you know we're right. It's silent because you can't take a stand and be for education and the needs of the people in your local governments. You gotta be for it, there's no other way. You gotta say, yes. I think that some of you ought to vote

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

'yes', in spite of your Minority Leader, you can't vote maybe on something like this. You have to vote 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This being the first opportunity that I've had to speak to this Body, I feel that its a priviledge that I have the opportunity to speak in behalf of support for this As a freshman Legislator, I think that I probably, positively should be silent, but as I listen to some of the comments that were made and some of the comments that were made from both sides of the Floor, I realize how important it is for my wishes and my views to be heard. too believe that we have a responsibility to the children of this state. I too believe that we have a responsibility to local governments of our communities and counties that we represent. I too believe that we as State Legislators shall stand up and be heard. I too want to very definitely support the Speaker and his staff as they have prepared this plan, because I believe it does address in a very positive fashion, in a responsible way, not the forty percent increase that was proposed before, because we positively do not need that. But twenty percent will accommodate the needs that we have at the immediate time. too want to go on record as being very actively supporting even...even to the point of being a freshman Legislator, never been elected but selected. I stand in fear, but never to the point that I do not stand in support of what I believe is true and right. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw."

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

I rise in...with great reluctance, in supporting Amendment
#5, because of the sunset, it sunsets two years from now.

And the reason, that I am reluctant about this particular

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

package is because I know that contracts...or teachers all across this state will be coming up probably two years from now, and based on whether the schools will reopen or not, it will depend upon the Legislature. It will depend upon this Body as it has done so many times. I would rather see a tax that was lasting and if something is wrong with that tax then certainly this Body could change it. Last year we passed, educational reform in this state, we didn't give any money, and today we are about to vote on House Bill 490, as a temporary solution to the educational reform that we passed and we made that permanent last year. I don't think that's fair to the little children of this State, by taking that position. I would rather see a tax...levied here where that everyone, organized labor, the teachers, the children will know what they will be doing and know that the classrooms are gonna be open...two years from now, rather than to be sitting here two years from now getting involved in politics, about whether we should extend this tax or whether we should not extend this tax. I think that is the thing that we should be looking at today. This should be a permanent tax. When I ran for office, I told the people of my district that I would vote for a tax increase for the children of this state, told them that everytime, and I say that today. have any fear of voting for a permanent tax for the children of this state. We know that local municipalities need additional money, I understand that. I voted for money for the City of Chicago, under previous mayors, as long as it has been good for Chicago. I have no problem with voting for taxes and sending money to the City of Chicago, under this mayor, I have no problem with that. But, the problem that I have, is for the little children two years from now, when people will be sending letters to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

me and to you, about their schools will not be able to open unless we pass a or...extend this surcharge tax that we are talking about here today, and as you know so many times things get bogged down in rhetoric down here, and I don't think that the children's education of this state should get bogged down in that rhetoric. What are we gonna when they...labor come up and talk about the teachers need a raise, and they do, they do. But you'll be facing that two years from now, and unless we extend this tax...this particular tax two years from now, it will practically plunge every school system across this state into a bankrupt type of situation, if we don't extend this tax, and I think we must look at the long haul, certainly. will be voting for this Amendment and this Bill. just wanted to go on record, as to point out that there is some short comings in this legislation, and the short coming is not upon us, the short comings will be on the children...the school children of the people of this state, and I think the people of this state is willing to pay to for their children getting an education and I think they want it permanent."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, let me repeat the main points of the proposal. This is a two year surcharge, it will be used for two purposes exclusively. One, education, the other local government needs. The money does not go to the State of Illinois, the money goes to local units of government, those units of government closest to the people. In partial response to a previous speaker, in a question that was asked, concerning what some might perceive as a change of position on my part. The very beginning of my remarks, I explained, and I'm not changing my position concerning the Governors request for a

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

forty percent increase in the Illinois Income Tax. There is no change in that position. I am acknowledging that there are two pressing needs in this state, and I am prepared to move forward to work on those two needs. adopted a position two years ago, relative to the Governors request a forty percent increase in the tax. I maintained that position through last year and I stand here before you today advancing my proposal for the two year surcharge. did all of those things because of something that was told to me by my father many years ago; when he told me as a young boy, he said, 'Mike, when you believe in something have the courage of your convictions. If you believe in something stand up and say it, and stand with that position stay with that position, and if you change your mind and if you change your position have the courage to stand up and say it', now that's exactly what I've done over two years. That's what I'm doing today. I don't need to ask further questions about the operations of state government. We have debated these questions throughout how many legislative Sessions? The Motion that you need to ask a question, about the Governors budget, indicates that you have not been working on the Governors budget, as I presume that all of us have. I don't need to go to a meeting with the Governor to ask questions. I've been to many meetings with the Governor. It's all showtime, showtime, Governor notifies the media, the media occupies the area outside of his office, there's a parade of people office, and out of the office and it's just opportunities for the media. That's all they are. Governor asks me come to a meeting tonight, I always exceed to Governor's request. I'll be at his meeting. telling you right now, and if he's listening I'm telling him, if he's not lisening Mr. Riley can relay this message;

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

it's all showtime, just so the Governor and his leaders can say we're working on the problem, were very serious about this. But we're afraid to vote on the floor. We're afraid to vote on the floor. We know there was a vote today, but we don't want to vote, we're working on the problem, and we're here real hard, and Senator Philip is with us, and we're in constant communication with Chairman Knuefer in DuPage County. So, it'll be more of the same tonight. In the meantime, we're gonna take a vote, because we're gonna see where everybody is and I recommend an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5, be adopted?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative

Steczo to explain his vote."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Just to explain my...'aye' vote. For the last thirteen years in this General Assembly, I have...I've had an opportunity to serve on the local government committees and in fact, Chair the Cities and Villages Committee, during this Session of the General Assembly. For those of us that have had an opportunity to meet with representatives οf local governments on an ongoing basis, we know how awful the fiscal plight of those local governments are. Loss revenue sharing funds, other losses of funds, problems with property tax values, etc...etc..and a willingness not to extend the property taxes any higher, have really created fiscal confusion among many local governments. Just today have received letters from the Northwest Municipal Conference and the mayors and managers of the south suburbs from the West Central Municipal Conference, from the Village of Brookfield, who say; we need to have the extra revenues desperately to take care of our infra-structure problems, to take care of our waste water problems, to take

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

care of other problems that are really near and dear, not only to us, but to our residents. For the last three months we've been talking about the plights of counties and county jails, especially downstate, where there's is no The need to give employees pay increases that they haven't had for three, four, five, six, seven, eight years but there's no money. This will allow us an opportunity to do exactly that, to be able to help those local governments that really, really, need the dollars, as well as, those school districts who play a major, major, major role in the State of Illinois, and we are now acknowledging that it's our duty and our responsibility to make certain that dollars, in fact, very needed dollars do go there and only there, and I think a 'yes' vote is the proper vote and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Morrow to explain his vote."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think one thing that no has really thought about in this process, you've heard of the song, 'Happy Days are Here Again'. I'm concerned with the fact that the good ole days are here again. When I say the good ole days...those of you who are a little bit older than me, you were around when the good ole days were here, when your vote was not...was already counted, I think our votes here, I know those from the City of Chicago, my colleagues, our votes were already counted on this Bill. I'm gonna put the focus on that person who's counting our votes. Two years from now, I'm gonna vote for this, two years from now, I want the question to be raised to City Hall, if this program does not fulfill what we have passed here today. I want the people of the City of Chicago, especially the people of the City of Chicago, to ask, where is the money? What happened to the \$94 million dollars, that we sent to the City of Chicago in FY94..in

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

FY90? We want to make sure that that money gets equally shared in everyones district in the City of Chicago, and for that reason I had to rise to explain my vote. The schools, that monies needed, it's truly needed, but we have to be concerned with how that money is going to be spent, back in the cities, and my question is gonna be two years, where is the money? Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk
 will take the record. On this Amendment, Representative
 Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis: "I wanted to say 'hello', to the Rainbow Coalition, and

 Operation Push, and welcome them to the General Assembly

 and certainly let them know that we're working in their

 behalf."
- Speaker McPike: "Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 60 'ayes,' 11 'nos', and 44 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 490, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Income Tax. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Repre...Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we've had a very full and fruitful debate on this question when the matter was on the Order of Second Reading. I think we all understand what's in the Amendment, I think we all understand the implications of this vote, and Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we now call this Bill on the Order of Third Reading, final passage."

- Speaker McPike: "Yes...the Bill is on Third Reading and the Chair is recognizing Representative Currie, on the Bill."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There are no questions about what this Bill does, it's a two year

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

surcharge in the Illinois Income Tax and there's is no dispute about the allocation of that surcharge; Half to local governments, half to education, both elementary and secondary and higher education. I think everybody knows what this Bill is for, I think no one can have a question how he or she feels about the importance of meeting our responsibilities to our school children and to our units of local government that can help solve the problems of the people of this state at the local level. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 490. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 490, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 60 'ayes', 19 'nos', 36 voting 'present'. House Bill 490, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State and Local Government, Appropriations Bills only. On the Order of Government Administration. Appropriations Bills only. Appears House Bill 591, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 591, a Bill for an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent expense and grant in aid for the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, would you take this Bill out of the record. I...think."

Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 592,
Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 592, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

Madigan-McPike-Giorgi and Hartke."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin in the Chair."

- Speaker Breslin: "What's the number of this Amendment, Mr. Clerk?

 Representative Steczo, there's some confusion over the

 Amendments on this Bill. We'd like to take the Bill, out

 of the record at this time. Out of the record. Ladies and

 Gentlemen, we are moving to the Order of Special Order of

 Rural Assistance. Second Reading. Phelps, Homer, Phelps,

 Mautino, Phelps, please be in your Chairs ready to present

 your Bills. The first Bill...the first Bill is House Bill

 421, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relations to the development and health of university resources. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Representative Steczo, it appears they've found the Amendment that was lost so we are going to go back, Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Government Administration, Second Reading. Government Administration, Second Reading. House Bill 592. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 592, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Speaker

Madigan-McPike-Giorgi and Hartke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We just passed a tax increase for 726 million dollars. The Speaker in his remarks explained that we would divide that in half; 363 went to local governments, we have a continuing appropriation for local government so that requires no Appropriations Bill. 363 million is going to be provided for education. The Bill pro... the Bill before you, is for K-12 and this Amendment deals with the state aid formula. We are adding 250 million dollars over last year to the state aid formula. This is about 40 million dollars more than the state board recommended. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 592, on the question the Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Mays: "How much...you indicated that we're adding money into the state aid formula. How much is the state aid formula being funded without this Amendment, currently?"

McPike: "The Governor recommended a 109 increase in the state aid formula, this raises it from his level of a 109 up to 250 million dollar increase."

Mays: "Okay, and this is the monies that get distributed to the local school districts, by the formula, is that right?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Mays: "Now, if I understand it, you're proposing to spend this money from the income tax vote that we just had, is that

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

correct?"

McPike: "If you had listened to the Speaker, he suggested that the Governor had in his budget, 345 million for education.

It is our plan to add 363 in addition to the 345. Those two figures add up to 708 million."

Mays: "Okay."

McPike: "You divide it by two thirds, that goes to elementary and secondary, 472 The 472 million new dollars for elementary and secondary, this Amendment represents 250 of the 472.

The next Amendment will account for the balance."

Mays: "For the categoricals, that'll be the next Amendment?"
McPike: "That's correct."

Mays: "Now, assuming that we...or that the votes are there to adopt this Amendment and let's just for purposes of discussion, suggest that we do add these kind of dollars into the state aid formula this year, because we have a surcharge, because the dollars will be available as the surcharge goes through. Would you then...we would probably be doing the same thing next year, would you not concur? The school districts will probably then be spending these dollars we give them of course, for their contracts and various things that they enter into, is that not correct? And then, then the surcharge is off, right? Two years out?"

McPike: "The surcharge may be on or off, depending on what the future General Assembly that's elected in 1990 does. So, I can't predict what the...either you, if you're reelected or if the Democrat that beats you. I can't predict either what you or he would do."

Mays: "Keep on trying, Jim. The point is, when we get to...there was a whole lot of discussion about accountability and this surcharge is such a sweet little idea, you know, we're gonna come back in two years and see if it worked. Well,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

what is it that we're gonna measure whether it worked or not against, if we're just gonna be putting the money in the formula and what are the measurement criteria here, Representative, that you have built into these dollars?"

McPike: "Well, you voted 'no' on the surcharge, so I don't know what criteria we could use to influence you to vote 'yes'.

But those of us that voted 'yes' will probably take a hard look at how the money is spent and if we think it's spent well and wisely, then we will vote to keep the surcharge.

I doubt if we'll ever get your vote."

"Well, we'll have to see, I'm always open. But it would Mays: seem to me...and to the Amendment. The Representative was correct. I voted 'present' on the previous surcharge discussions and I think that was an appropriate vote. concern is that we'll be spending up the base in this...in particular area. I don't know what accountability factors we have built in when we just the dollars into the state aid formula for distribution throughout, so I don't know what kind of accountability measurements the Representative would suggest we should measure against when we determine whether to extend this program or not. For that reason, I'm still going to continue to vote 'present' on this Amendment."

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

Bowman: "I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. This is precisely the way to handle a tax issue where the connection is clearly and explicitly spelled out...by companion legislation that passes at the same...day that the tax proposal passes, so that everyone knows exactly how the money is to be committed. This is exactly the way it should be done. I'm surprised at the remarks of anyone from downstate, in opposition to putting money into the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

formula. Everybody knows that the disparity between the wealthy districts and the poor districts, many of whom are in downstate areas, has been growing, and this proposal, this spending plan, is necessary to close that gap. This is a disgrace on the State of Illinois...who to have allowed this to happen. I'm pleased to say that we are now able to reverse the trend and to move forward again in the State of Illinois; Forward in education, this is time to take this step."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen from Morgan, Representative Ryder, on the Amendment. Does the Gentleman still seek recognition? He does not. Representative McPike is recognized to close."
- McPike: "Well, this is a very simple Amendment, it increases the school aid formula by 250 million dollars. If you want to give 250 million more to districts based on the formula then vote 'yes', if you don't want to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2, be adopted?' 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...Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain his vote. Representative Matijevich has been recognized."
- Matijevich: "I'm explaining everybody's votes. I notice we have a lot of converts."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no'. 14 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since it seems the will of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

this House to now place education as priority one, which is certainly where we wanted it to be in the first place. We will at this point withdraw our Amendment, and go with the larger amounts. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Are there any further Amendments?"

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

 Madigan-McPike-Giorgi and Hartke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike...Representative McPike." McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, to follow along then with the answer to Representative May's question, we put 250 million of the 472 into the school aid formula, the remainder of that 472 million goes into the following programs: we will 100 percent fund categoricals, special Ed, bilingual, transportation, a lunch/breakfast program. We will be at the...we will be at the state boards level on preschool, we will be at the state boards level on textbooks, on truant dropouts, on gifted, on K-6 reading, on adult education, on private transportation. We are even with the Gove...we have kept the Governors new intiatives at the level that he suggested, we have kept retirement at the level he had suggested and we will increase education spending by 16.7 percent. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4, to House Bill 592. On the question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for some questions, please?

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ryder: "Representative, as I understand it this is collapsing another Bill into this one, so all of the school board...would not only, the school aid formula, but the categoricals would all be in one Bill?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

McPike: "Correct. Except for retirement, that's a Republican
Bill. A Republican has the Bill on retirement, so I don't
want to mislead you. We had two Democratic Bills,
Representative Steczo, and Matijevich they've been
collapsed into one. You have one Bill dealing with
retirement and we did not touch that."

Ryder: "Of the new money that was voted, how was that money split between school aid formula and the categoricals?"

McPike: "472 in total, 250 went to the school aid formula, so 222 goes into the rest of these programs. We started with the proposition that we wanted to 100 percent fund the categoricals, then we picked out every other major program and tried to match the state boards level. I read those to you, if you want me to repeat them..."

Ryder: "No, I do not."

McPike: "Okay, and then what was left we put into the formula which was 250 million."

Ryder: "And where does this compare with the request of the State

Board of Education that they originally made, not when they
reduced it."

McPike: "This is what I'm talking about. Their original request,
we are above their original request in general state aid,
by 40 some million and we have matched their original
request in all these other areas that I reiterated."

Ryder: "Okay, that's what I needed to know. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted.' 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 question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Pike...(sic. McPike), now moves that the Bill be heard immediately on Third, hearing no objection. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 592, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 592, in its current...in its current condition does something that we in the legislature have been wanting to do for a long, long time, in response to the request made to us by our local school districts, and that's to provide a significant amount of new funding for those local school districts, 472 million new dollars for this year. What we have also done is cured a couple of problems that school districts have always had. They tell this General Assembly you mandate, you tell us what to do, and you never come up with the money. What we've provided now is 100 percent funding for those Categorical programs that need to be funded at 100 percent. In my area, that's where we make money from the state, we don't get money from the formula, we get money from the categoricals, my districts benefit. For those districts that do benefit from the formula, I'm certain that the 472 million dollars will certainly come in very, very, very handy during this year and of course, the increased allocation we expect to have next year, Madam Speaker, and I would move for the passage of House Bill 592."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 592, and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

House Bill 592, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no.' Voting is open. This is final 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 lll voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and l voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order of business is the Special Order on Rural Assistance, Second Reading. Representatives Phelps, Homer, and Mautino have Bills on this order. Please be prepared to present your Bills. The first Bill is House Bill 421. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the development of health in university resources. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the provisions in this Bill requires SIU Carbondale to set up an International Commerce and Development Center. I spoke with the Sponsor of the Bill about changing that to authorizing them, rather than requiring them, and I believe that he agreed to that and that is what this Amendment does. It changes it from a mandate to SIU to an authorization, and I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 421, and on the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative

 Homer-Phelps-Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer. Turn on Representative Homer's mike, please."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker...Amendment #3, would create the..."
- Speaker Breslin: "No, this is Amendment #2."
- Homer: "Oh, I'm sorry, okay, thank you. Amendment #2 creates within the Illinois Department of Public Health, the rural health center, and the Bill outlines and delineates the functions to be provided with that center for rural health within the Illinois Department of Public Health, and that would be to assist rural communities, providing technical assistance to communities in terms of their rural health needs, and to promote the development of primary care services in rural areas. I would urge your support for the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 421, and on the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1494, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 6 of the Calendar, House Bill 1494, a Bill for an Act to amend the Family Practice Residency Act.

 Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1782, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1782, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Public Transportation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Novak."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Novak. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Novak? Representative Novak?

 What is your pleasure, Representative Phelps?"
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I did give my commitment to Representative Novak that I would allow him to put this Amendment on, and I...he was here just a moment ago, I feel like he's near. If we can come back, I've got another Bill up we can come right back possibly."
- Speaker Breslin: "Fine. Out of the record. House Bill...Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"
- Cullerton: "Could ask leave to handle the Amendment for the Gentleman?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman ask leave to handle the Amendment on behalf of Representative Novak, is there any objection?

 Hearing none, he has leave. Proceed, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This adds an Amendment to Section 2-2.02 of the Downstate Public Transportation Act, and the way that Act reads right now is that a participant is a city serving an urbanized area of over fifty thousand population, on the effective date of this Amendatory Act of 1979. All this Amendment does is to strike the limitation be...an urbanized area of over fifty thousand on the effective date

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

of this Amendatory Act. By removing this time limitation the Amendment makes the Act applicable to any area that is now over fifty thousand in population. So I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 1782, on the question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', 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: "Third Reading. House Bill 2520, Representative Mautino. Is Mr. Mautino in the chamber. Out of the record. House Bill 2596, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2596, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning service of process in civil matters. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, I don't have a copy of the Amendment, I didn't know there was an Amendment filed...I'm sorry."

Speaker Breslin: "It has your name on it. Can somebody get him a copy of that Amendment, quickly?"

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did agree to this Amendment in committee, I'd forgotten. It makes the Amendment apply to only those counties with a population of less than one million. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1, be

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

adopted.' Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall it be it adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', 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: "Third Reading. House Bill 2765, Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On Page 36 of the Calendar, House Bill 2765, a Bill for an Act in relationship to indigent health care. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed, and no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps, a fiscal note was requested, did you file it?"

Phelps: "...Yes, Ma'am I believe so."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, would you do a search for that fiscal note? In the meantime if you have a copy of it would you file it again, Representative Phelps? I'll return to this Order and move the Bill if that is provided.

The...Bill will remain on Second Reading until then. House Bill 2781, Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps is recognized."

Phelps: "Madam Speaker, in relation to House Bill 2765, the...I think the...fiscal note was requested before it was amended and so the Amendment brings down the fiscal impact considerably, so that may be the problem. But we can go on to 2781, if you'd like."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. House Bill 2781. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2781, a Bill

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to health care. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Is Representative Mautino back?

 No. Mr. Clerk, have you found the fiscal note for Representative Phelps Bill, 2765? Okay, we have no record of one being filed, Representative Phelps, so you're gonna have to file it again. The next Order of Business is the Special Order on New Regulation. New Regulation. The Sponsors are Tate, Ryder, and Preston. Please be prepared to call your Bills Gentlemen. The first Bill is House Bill 1626, Representative Tate. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 29 of the Calendar, House Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1661, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 6 of the Calendar, House Bill 1661, a Bill for an Act to amend the Structural Pest Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there a fiscal note requested, and has it been complied with?"

Clerk Leone: "There's no fiscal note on file."

Speaker Breslin: "Is it requested?"

Clerk Leone: "Fiscal note has been requested."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Bill remains on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2729. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On Page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 2729. A

 Bill for an Act relating to a lien for licensed psychiatrists. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Special Order, Ladies and Gentlemen is the Order of Airports. Second Reading.

The first Bill. The only Bill, is Representative Cullerton's Bill, House Bill 599. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 19, of the Calendar, House Bill 599. A
Bill for an Act to require permanent noise monitoring
systems. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment deals with the DuPage Airport Authority... A couple of...within the last couple of weeks, tax Bills went out...property tax Bills went out in DuPage County, and a number of people have been contacting their Legislators, and lawyers, and the media....and trying to find out why the property tax Bills have gone up so much. One of the reasons why the property tax Bill went up is that for the first time on that tax Bill there is a new line, and that line says, 'DuPage County Authority.' It turns out, that we passed a Bill that allowed for the entire county of DuPage to...have a property tax increase imposed upon them so that they could fund some expansion proposals at the DuPage County Airport This Bill lowers the property taxes in DuPage Authority. County, it also changes the makeup of the authority. Now, a couple of years ago we passed a change in the Airport Authority that was viewed as a compromise and it passed both the House and the Senate, the Governor amendatorially vetoed that Bill. As a result, we were not able to get the necessary votes to override the Governor's

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

veto, and what happened was that lawsuits were filed and the lawsuits have tied up the efforts of the Airport Authority to expand, and to build new runways; and that litigation. And they still are virtually precluded from selling bonds and involving themselves their expansion proposal. What this Bill does then, is to change the makeup of that authority to make it seven...have seven commissioners, one each appointed by the mayors of certain towns around the airport. There would be three from Kane County, there would be three from DuPage County and the seventh member would be appointed by the Mayor of Wayne, which is a little village, which is located both in Dupage and in Cook. It also says that there should be a referendum required for any bonds issued by this authority, for expanding or improving the existing airport. The time that we imposed this property tax on DuPage County, we did not do that with a referendum, rather we did down here in Springfield. I think it's a appropriate time for us to adopt this Amendment. The problem is that the tax Bills just came out in DuPage County and the people are very, very upset. It was a front page story, on the front page of the Chicago Tribune on Sunday, talking about groups being formed out in DuPage to protest the incredible increase in the property taxes that has occurred out there. One of the reasons was because of this Airport Authority Tax, which we imposed. eliminates that property tax increase. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 599. On the question, is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Order of Business is the Order of...Special Order of Medical Practice. Second Reading. The Sponsors are Ryder, White, and Balanoff. Please be prepared to present your Bills, on Second Reading. The first Bill is House Bill 1662, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 7 of the Calendar, House Bill 1662, a Bill for an Act concerning the Administrative Acts regulating health care professions."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Committee Amendments? Representative Ryder, the Clerk has a clerical problem with the Amendments as they were filed. The Bill's been read a Second time we'd like to ask you to take the Bill out of the record and hold it on Second until they clarify it."
- Ryder: "Madam Speaker, always willing to accommodate the Chair."

 Speaker Breslin: "You're getting better in your old age,

 Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 1769...take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1769, Representative Preston, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Preston: "...Just for a question, Madam Speaker. Is Mr. Hill supposed to be sitting on the railing up there in the rear of the gallery."
- Speaker Breslin: "...We'll look through the rules, and see if there is a rule that applies to that."
- Preston: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "As long as he doesn't jump we're in good shape.

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Representative Representative White, 1769. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. It's been read a Second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted previously on Second Reading on May 16."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed, and no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2684, Representative Balanoff, Representative Balanoff? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 35 of the Calendar, House Bill 2634, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to public school courses of study...correction, that's 2680...That's House Bill 2684, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Are we ready to go back to Representative Ryder's Bill, Mr. Clerk? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not going to go back to that yet, because the Sponsors aren't here and we still don't have the Amendment printed to deal with it. We'll continue...if you want to move it, we'll move it, but you'll have to move to table those Amendments that are out of order. Okay. At the Sponsor's direction, we'll take the Bill out of the record. The next Order of Business is Housing, Second Reading, the Sponsors are Madigan and Williams. The first Bill is House Bill 1000. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 24 of the Calendar. House Bill 1000, a
 Bill for an Act in relationship to homeownership. Second
 Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor
 Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2491, Representative Williams. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. The next Order of Business is Revenue. Special Order of Revenue, Second Reading. The first Bill is House Bill 35, Representative Olson. Out of the record. House Bill 309, Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson? Out of the record. House Bill 466, Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 466, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 585. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, Representative Steczo? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1070, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1070 on page 5 of the Calendar, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Kulas."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Myron Kulas. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Representative Currie, what is your pleasure? Representative Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Thank you, I would move to table the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 1070. On the question, is there any discussion?
 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, being offered by Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Kubik and Zickus."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik. Clerk...the Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kubik and Zickus."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik. Withdraw the Amendment.

 Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1147, Representative Didrickson. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1147, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Bureau of the Budget. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1787, Representative
 Anthony Young. Anthony Young. Out of the record. House
 Bill 2048. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 31 of the Calendar, House Bill 2048, a Bill for an Act in relation to disposition of certain state taxes and fees. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2130, Representative Didrickson. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2130, a Bill for an Act concerning youth drug dependency programs. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2484, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2486, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2519, Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2519..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 2784, Representative Kubik. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2784, on page 13 of the Calendar, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House.

This Amendment was actually proposed to me by a constituent who discovered that by virtue of an investment in a foreign corporation he got...a break on the Illinois State Income Tax that would not have been available to him had he invested the same dollar amount in either in Illinois or any other United States Corporation. When a constituent brings you a loop hole, that should be closed in order to cost him money, I think we should go for it. So that's the purpose of Amendment 2 to this Bill. I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2784. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2785, Representative Frederick. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2785, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to taxation. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. We'll go to the Order of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Revenue, Third Reading, for the purposes only, of addressing Bills that wish to be brought back from Third to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. That's Revenue, Third Reading. The first and only Bill that I know of is House Bill 564, Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "On page 37 of the Calendar. House Bill 564, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relating to the installation of sprinkler systems. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments? Oh, the Bill's on Third Reading. The Lady asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second, for the purposes of an Amendment.

 Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, she has leave...Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Cowlishaw."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #1 was adopted in committee, but it was then discovered that there were some disagreements about the exact procedures that should be involved between the State Fire Marshall and the State Board of Education. So I have had meetings several rather extended with representatives of both of those groups and we have arrived at something that everyone has agreed to and is willing to sign off on; And that is contained in Floor Amendment #2. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 564. And on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. We'll now go to the Special Order of Civil Law, Third Reading, for the purpose only of bringing a Bill back from Third to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. That's Civil Law, Third Reading. The Bill to be brought back is House Bill 1754, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 43 of the Calendar, House Bill 1754, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment...I'm sorry, could we withdraw #2 and go with #3?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #2. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and
 Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is the same as a
 Bill that was approved unanimously in the Judiciary
 Committee and I'm only attempting to consolidate the
 Condominium Property Act...Bills What the Amendment does
 is to add a Section which states that partial payment of
 amounts demanded under the Condominium Act will not

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

invalidate it...notice, if it's accepted."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 1754. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. 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: "Third Reading. The next Order of Business is the business of Medical Practice, Third Reading. Those Bills that are on the Order of Third that wish to be brought back to Second. Only that business. The only Bill on that Order is House Bill 2362, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 45 of the Calendar, House Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning certain rights of medical patients. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?

 Representative Cullerton has asked leave to return this

 Bill to the Order of Second and he has been granted leave.

 What Amendments are filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment was suggested, I believe, by the Hospital Association. It allows disclosure to persons making treatment decisions, instead of patient's legal guardian. It permits disclosure to persons doing peer review and quality assurance. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Amendment 2 to House Bill 2362 and on the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, this Amendment was suggested by Representative Pullen. Amendment #1 allowed for disclosure of medical information where otherwise required by law. What this Amendment does is to say or otherwise required or authorized by law. And I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 2362. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Going to the...back to the Order of Revenue, Second Reading. There are two Bills that the Sponsors are ready to call. The first Bill is House Bill 1787, Representative Young. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 29 of the Calendar, House Bill 1787, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 585, Representative Steczo and Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Page 18 of the Calendar, House Bill 585, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Steczo and Pullen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo, Representative Pullen do
 you wish to present this Amendment? Representative Pullen
 is recognized."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment puts into this Bill the taxpayer protective language and back door referendum that we have put into every other section of the statutes dealing with back door referendum. I brought the Amendment to the Sponsor of the Bill and he agreed with it and filed it in his name and mine and I move its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 2
 to House Bill 585 and on the question, the Gentleman from
 Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam, we agree with her Amendment and accept her Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Are there any further Amendment's?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Order of Business,
 Ladies and Gentlemen, will be the Order of Education,
 Second Reading. Education, Second Reading. There are
 many, many, many Bills on this Order. So please survey the
 Order and be prepared when your Bill is called. The first
 Bill is House Bill 3, Representative Preston. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 13 of the Calendar, House Bill 3. A Bill

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions. No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 21, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 21, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 22, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 22, a Bill for an Act creating the
 Illinois Department of Child Advocacy. Second Reading of
 the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 145, Representative Mulcahey. Out of the record. House Bill 366, Representative Satterthwaite. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 366, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Did you say there were no Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 381, Representative Curran. Is Mr. Curran here? Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 381, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 4... no Committee
 Amendments, one Floor Amendment. Who's the Sponsor of the
 Floor Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Rice."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rice."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Rice: "It's an extension of the date..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rice, proceed with your Amendment."

Rice: "It's asking for an extension of the date for qualified candidates for the state certification."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 381. On the question the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Rice, as I understand this Amendment, it establishes some special extraordinary conditions under which the test of basic skills and subject matter may be waived for people who want to be certified teachers. May I please ask, why we would want to waive the subject matter and basic skills test for any teacher who is going to teach children in Illinois?"

Rice: "Representative in 19...the State Board of Education allowed that anybody who completed his qualified examination or his class studies prior to June 30, 1988, be allowed to waive the certification that was throughout the state. Some parts of the state, people were notified of this and other parts it was not. This is to accommodate people that receive their certification seven days prior to the 30th day of June, it is not...it is not precluding any class studies."

Cowlishaw: "Where are these teachers who somehow were ignorant of what the provisions of the grandfathering or grandmothering or whatever this cause was; where were these people located who were ignorant of the fact that they had to do something by a certain date? Do you know where most of the people who fall into that category live or teach?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Rice: "I take exception to the fact that you're calling them ignorant. The State Board of Education was dealing with these people and did not let them know that they were eligible for this exemption at that particular time. Now they were up in the Chicago area and they had not completed...their class work seven days prior to the date. That's the reason for the problem. When they received their certif...when they received their paper work back the day had gone by. But they had completed the work the 23rd day of June."
- Cowlishaw: "I understand. Thank you, Representative, and thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 400, Representative Ropp. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 400, a Bill for an Act relating to the cancelation of drivers licenses and permits of dropouts.

 Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment merely clarifies a procedure by which the total Bill will be implemented.

 It has been recommended by the Secretary of State..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 400. On the question is there

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 462, Representative Weller. Representative Weller. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 462, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #l is adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 565, Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 565, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to life safety and fire prevention inspections.

Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 565, becomes the Bill. In my negotiations with the State Board of Education and the State Fire Marshalls Office we came upon two, what...may seem like rather minor things, having to do with the annual inspections that regional superintendents are required to conduct in order to inspect for life safety and fire safety in every...public school in the state. One of those is that under the current law the reports that are filed must be sent to the boards of education, but not to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the State Board of Education. It is...it seems to me that it is important for the State Board of Education to also have a copy of those reports indicating what the result of those investigations was. It also appeared from both the State Fire Marshall and the State Board of Education that both of them were concerned about the fact that there doesn't seem to be any standardized sort of form that is used by the people who conduct those investigations. Since the State Board of Education has...is almost completed right now with...a suggested standardized form for the use in those inspections, this...Amendment provides that those inspections shall be made based on the documents that are provided and that are now being developed by the State Board of Education. It just...does those two things and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 565. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 572, Representative Wennlund. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Cowlishaw, the Clerk informs me that a fiscal note was requested on 565 and that it has not been complied with. Is that correct?"

Cowlishaw: "Madam Speaker, I have a record of the fiscal note that was filed on that Bill. I would be glad...it's just a xeroxed copy, but I...since I have it, I can't believe that you don't."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, would you...make a copy of that and get

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

that to us?"

Cowlishaw: "That's on 565?"

Speaker Breslin: "565."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Madam Speaker, thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, this has been happening a great deal, when Members are pretty sure they've already filed them. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Clerk indicates that Members are confusing a state mandates fiscal note with a fiscal note. They are different. They require separate filings. So, when you review your file please note which is requested. This Bill will remain on...House Bill 565 has to remain on the Order of Second Reading, Representative Cowlishaw, until the fiscal note is filed.

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's a fiscal note that is required, is that correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, there's a request for both."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The state mandates fiscal note has been complied with, but not the fiscal note request. House Bill 572. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 572, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There's a Motion to table Amendment #1, offered by Representative Larry Wennlund."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund, on a Motion to table

Amendment #1."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. The Amendment was...had some technical flaws in it.
I have a Floor Amendment #2 to cure those flaws."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Is

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- there any objection? Hearing none, Amendment #1 is tabled.

 Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. All Floor Amendment #2 does, it changes the
 original Amendment that had two incorrect lines...were
 referred to in the Amendment. This just changes that,
 otherwise the Bill remains exactly the same."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 572. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 588, Representative Didrickson. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 588, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "A fiscal note, however, has been requested,
 Representative Didrickson. So the Bill remains on the
 Order of Second Reading. House Bill 650, Representative
 Satterthwaite. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 650, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Library Systems Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 677, Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Kubik. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 677, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed...Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Kubik."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment 2 simply corrects a drafting error on the original Committee Amendment and I would request its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 677. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have, it the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 809, Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 809, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 815, Representative Levin. Mr. Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 815, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Levin."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 carries out a promise I had made in committee and that is that we discovered in the underlying law, this is a law that requires...where a public unit college or university receives a foreign government endowment. That that be disclosed. We discovered that the existing law required disclosure by...of endowments by American citizens living abroad. Amendment #1 deletes that requirement, so that the requirement for disclosure is of endowments that come from foreign governments or people who are not U.S. citizens."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 815. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 946, Representative Kirkland. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 23 of the Calendar, House Bill 946, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, is being offered by Representative Kirkland."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 takes some language out of the Bill that we added...and in fact it takes the language of Amendment #1 out of the Bill and returns the law...well...and...as to that portion of the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Bill, there is now no change to the law. We did adopt
Amendment #2 in committee which will become the Bill when I
have it heard on Third Reading."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 946. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Representative...Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, is being offered by Representative Johnson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson. Mr. Johnson on Amendment #4."
- Johnson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House, this addresses a problem of a number of school districts and provides that a motor vehicle designed for the transportation of not less than seven or more than 16 people for the purpose of transporting not more than 15 students to and from interscholastic, athletic or other school sponsored events. It provides more flexibility on the part of the school districts, less cost. As far as I know, there isn't any opposition and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 4 to House Bill 946. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland, there is a fiscal note

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- requested on the Bill. The Bill remains on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 1174, Representative Black.

 Mr. Black. Out of the...Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 25 of the Calendar, House Bill 1174, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1222, Representative Curran. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Curran in the chamber? Yes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1222, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, is being offered by Representative Curran."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Madam Speaker, this Bill is a First Dollar for Education

 Act kind of Bill and...Amendment and I move for the

 adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 1222. On the question the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Cowlishaw: "Representative Curran, as I understand this Amendment, it...effective with the forth coming fiscal year, that is FY '90. The General Assembly would be obliged, under this provision, to appropriate for education the total amount that was appropriated for the prior fiscal year, plus 50 percent of the total of new General Revenue Funds for that year. Is that correct?"
- Curran: "Madam Speaker, I just remembered that I've been asked to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

take this Bill out of the record."

- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 1270, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1270, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of an Act in relation to vocational education.

 Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This
 Amendment was worked out in conjunction with the Department
 of Adult Vocational Training and Education in the State
 Board of Education, merely to clarify what the purpose of
 the Bill is, and how it would operate. The underlying Bill
 is about insuring that there is appropriate oversight on
 issues of sex, bias, and vocational education. So, I'd be
 happy to answer your questions on the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 1270. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1303, Representative Hensel. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1303, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions or Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1395, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 1523, Representative Mulcahey. Mr. Mulcahey. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1526, Representative Mulcahey. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1555, Representative Hannig. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1555, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1681, Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Klemm."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klemm, is the Sponsor."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm, excuse me."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker...Amendment #1 changes the computation of the 88 for 1.05 to 1.15 and I move its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 1681. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1994, Representative Klemm. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to dedications of land. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments and no Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2151, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. House Bill 2274, Representative Hasara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2274, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Hasara."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker...Amendment #1 to House Bill 2274 addresses a problem in the Bill that arose in committee. The Bill itself deals with girls or boys playing on teams of the opposite sex. The Amendment limits

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the number of girls playing on boys teams or vice versa to 25 percent of the total team membership."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to
House Bill 2274. On the question the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Cullerton: "The original...the Bill that you filed along with Representative Curran, prohibits a public school from preventing a student from participating on existing teams or interscholastic athletic programs, if one team is the only one available for a given sport?"

Hasara: "Right. I'll be glad...do you want to discuss the Bill?"
Cullerton: "Maybe...you can explain what the Bill is and that how
the Amendment changes it."

Hasara: "Alright, the Bill arises out of a situation in Central Illinois where a young woman in the 7th grade made the boys...there was no girls basketball team, made the boys basketball team, she played on the team the whole year, until the tournament came, and she was not permitted to play in the tournament. They had to go to Federal Court and sue to permit her to play. This Bill address...tries to address that problem. The Amendment was...came out of a suggestion in the Education Committee."

Cullerton: "Well the...did the Federal Court then allow her to play saying there was a need for a change in the States Statute?"

Hasara: "Yes, the attorney's then asked for this change in the legislation."

Cullerton: "But, this Amendment has a quota."

Hasara: "You're right. It lets...may I explain? One of the problems was evidently, somewhere in the state, there was a girls bowling team, four boys got on the girls bowling

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

team, went to the tournament and won the state tournament. So the feeling was...there needed to be some limit on the number of members of the opposite sex that could play on a team."

Cullerton: "So...your Amendment is concerned about boys being on girls high school teams and dominating...and dominating...you're suggesting that boys could dominate the girls tournaments."

Hasara: "There have been...or it could be the other way around."
Cullerton: "Well, if it was the other way around then we wouldn't
 need this Amendment."

Hasara: "We might. You might have a boys basketball team and four girls would get on it and win the state tournament."

Cullerton: "What's wrong with that?"

Hasara: "I, well... I think it would be great."

Cullerton: "But, your Amendment prohibits that from happening."
Hasara: "That's right."

Cullerton: "Why don't you just..."

Hasara: "I'm compromising, Representative."

Cullerton: "Well, why don't you consider an Amendment that just prohibits boys from participating more than 25 percent of the total team membership of girls teams being from the opposite sex..."

Hasara: "Actually, some parents came to me and said they were concerned, because there was not a boys volleyball team at a school and their sons were refused membership on the volleyball team and that's why I did...I tried not to make this a feminine issue only."

Cullerton: "Well...yeah, it seems to me that you could do something here where a majority of a team was of one sex, that that team then became eligible for that sexes tournament."

Hasara: "I'd be glad in the Senate, if this Bill passes, to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- change...the percentage to 50."
- Cullerton: "Well, I'm just afraid that you might be accused of limiting the amount, the opportunity for young girls to make and participate in boys athletic teams and I think that this Amendment does that. It limits it to 25 percent, and I certainly don't think you would want to be accused of limiting exceptional athletes from participating on a team. It's like reversed sex discrimination, perhaps."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Mrs...Madam Speaker, all Representative Hasara's doing to this good Bill, is accommodating the wishes of the Members in the committee. It makes...this Amendment makes a...I know you weren't Representative, that's why you didn't know...but, this Amendment just makes a good Bill better and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite on the Amendment."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the chamber, I too rise in support of the Lady's Amendment. As was indicated in committee there was some concern, that in fact, the team might be taken over by the sex opposite to the one the team was originally organized to accommodate, and I think a 25 percent representation is extremely good. If we were to go to 50 percent, for instance, we might still find that all of the boys were playing while the girls sat on the bench, for a team that was supposed to be a girls team and vice versa. If it is...girls were fortunate enough to get onto the boys team and if there were 50 percent permitted, we might have more girls playing than boys and the boys would all be sitting on the bench. So, I think 25 percent allows for the accommodation of those particular cases where we do find someone who excels in a particular sport and should

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

not be prohibited from playing on the only school team in that sport. I recommend adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representatives Hasara and Curran, I think have, first of all they have identified what I think clearly...it may be a minor problem, but if it was your son or daughter who was involved, it would not seem like a minor problem to you. They have tried to work with everyone who was interested in this issue, from the Education Committee to the representatives from the . Illinois High School Association and so on. I don't think there's anything discriminatory about this Amendment. applies equally to boys and to girls. But, it simply makes more opportunities available for young people of both I want to commend Representatives Hasara and Curran for the conscientious efforts they have...made to put this Bill into the form that it will be, when Floor Amendment #1 is adopted and I genuinely recommend the adoption of Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', 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 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 6...none voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2365, Representative Hoffman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2365, a Bill for an Act relating to

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the abatement of asbestos in elementary and secondary schools. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Anthony Young."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Anthony Young. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and you Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 corrects a misspelled word, changes another term from 'accredited' to 'licensing' and then clarifies at the request of some school districts the fact that the Response Action Contractors Identification Act doesn't compel schools to indemnification under that statute. It makes it clear that they can do, as most of them do now, make a decision to seek indemnification from some other source, bonding or insurance as the case may be. Also, in the original version of the Bill, we inadvertently repealed Section 15(a) of the Act, and what this Amendment does, it repeals that section and restores it to the law. It's necessary to keep this section in the law in order to provide an assurance to schools and staff and family that...contractor in fact financially responsible for any damages that might occur. And I move for the adoption of this technical Amendment, Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2365. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye',

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Hoffman are you ready on House Bill 2151? Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have agreed not to call that Bill beyond Second Reading until we get an agreement."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 2411, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2411, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2447, Representative Pullen. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2447...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Madam Speaker, I need to move to table Amendment #1 so that we can hear Amendment 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2447. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Lady
has leave to table Amendment #1. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Pullen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is to ban smoking in public schools and this Amendment would permit school boards to designate outdoor spectator areas of school property during scheduled interscholastic or extracurricular athletic activities. And also to designate a smoking lounge for teachers and if they designate a smoking lounge for teachers, also to provide an area for teachers that would be smoke free. I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2447. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2448, Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2448, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. No Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2450, Representative Petka. Is Mr. Petka in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 2452, Representative Black. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2452, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "And no Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black, there is a fiscal note requested. The Bill has to remain on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2605, Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2605, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments or Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2605 is the Scientific Literacy Act. calls for curriculum development in the areas of mathematics and science through grant programs administered by the State Board of Education through regional service centers and public colleges and universities. The Amendment expands those provisions to allow, private not for profit organizations, to be included in the grant and development provisions. It also adds a requirement that an advisory council composed of members of the scientific community advise on the implementation of these programs. Persons associated with, private not-for-profit organizations, including private schools, came to me and asked if we could not expand this so that they could be included in these programs and we were delighted to do so. I move for adoption of House Bill...Amendment #1 to House Bill 2605."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2605. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2634, Representative Hannig. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2634, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to public school courses of study. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2671, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2796, Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2796, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Body, I'll go back to House Bill 2450, Representative Petka. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen we are now

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

going to go back to Bills on other orders that were held on Second, because of the failure to file a fiscal note. The first Bill is House Bill 158 on the Order of Criminal Law, Second Reading. The Bill is Representative DeJaegher's Bill. Mr. Clerk, has the fiscal note been filed on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill will therefore move to Third Reading.

On the Order of Education, Second Reading, House Bill 588

was held on Second for a fiscal note. It's Representative

Didrickson's Bill. Mr. Clerk, has the fiscal note been

filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill moves to Third Reading. On this Special Order of Education, House Bill 946 was held on Second for a fiscal note. Representative Kirkland, are you going to move that the fiscal note does not apply?"

Kirkland: "Yes. Yes, I do."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland moves that the fiscal note Act does not apply. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Giglio, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Kirkland: "He doesn't."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99...101 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. The fiscal note Act does not apply. Representative Phelps, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We were voting whether the fiscal note was applicable or not, right?"

Speaker Breslin: "On this Bill, yes. On 946."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Phelps: "Okay... what determines that request? My dilemma has been lack of response to fiscal notes requests, and yet there are some that requested and they...can just declare them inapplicable and maybe I could do that to move my couple Bills along."
- Speaker Breslin: "You can. This happens to be one in which there was no controversy. It's your determination as to whether or not there is controversy."
- Phelps: "That's the word I've been looking for."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 946 should move to the Order of
 Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2452...House Bill
 2452 appears on the Order of Education. It's
 Representative Black, Bill. Representative Parke is
 recognized."
- Parke: "Thank you, I would like my fiscal note request removed."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke withdraws his request for a fiscal note. The Bill will therefore move to Third Reading. I see, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2452, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On this same Order of Education appears House Bill 565. It's Representative Cowlishaw's Bill. Has the fiscal note been filed? That's 565."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A fiscal note is filed."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Bill moves to Third Reading. Oh, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 565, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
 relating to life safety and fire prevention inspections.
 Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments. This Bill has been read a Second time previously."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2568, on the Order of State and Local Government. It's Representative Currie's...Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker, on House Bill 565, could you ask the Clerk to inform us as to the status of Amendment #1?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes...Mr. Clerk, what does your file show as to
 the status of Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Floor Amendment that was adopted earlier today."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the next Bill is on the Order of State and Local Government. It's House Bill 2568. It was called earlier today. It's Representative Currie's Bill. Has the fiscal note been filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Has the Bill been read a Second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "It has not been."

Speaker Breslin: "Please read it."

Clerk O'Brien: "It has been read a Second time previously."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, then move the Bill to Third Reading. On the Order of New Regulation, Third Reading. Those Bills in need of an Amendment, appears House Bill 1611, Representative Kulas. Clerk, read the Bill.'

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1611, a Bill for an Act in relation to radon testing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas asks leave to return this
Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection,
leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr.
Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kulas."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "I'd like to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kulas."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. It was drafted by the Department of Nuclear Safety. What the Amendment does, it creates the Radon Detector Licensing Act and provides that the Department of Nuclear Safety shall establish a procedure for the licensing of persons who engage in the detection of radon gas and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1611. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, the next Special Order is the Order of Consumer Protection, Second Reading. Consumer Protection, Second Reading. The Sponsors are Van Duyne, Levin, Dunn, Martinez, Preston, Lang, Balanoff, Matijevich and Giglio. Please be prepared to present your Bill on Second. The first Bill is House Bill 141. Representative Van Duyne. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 141, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pull Tabs and Jar Games Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne on Amendment #1."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is very simple. It allows employees to sell the pull tabs and jar games at the establishment. A little...by way of a little explanation, most of the people in the veterans club today do not want to tend bar and utilize the cash register in the place so that they are forced to hire employees to do that work and a lot of these employees are not members. And presently the law stipulates that you must be a member in order to sell these things and so this is a very simple change and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "And further, the Amendment becomes the Bill now."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 141 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 320...396 (sic-296),

Representative Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 296, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Levin."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 was worked out by our staff to resolve a problem raised by one of the Members of the Consumer

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Protection Committee...with respect to the Bill"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 296. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 498, Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 498, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Levin and Harris."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Levin and Harris."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #2 was the Amendment that would have been offered
in committee, except the Bill went on the Agreed Bill list
in the committee. It simply requires intent and restores a
right of private civil remedy, which existed up to the time
that we amended this computer law four years ago."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 498. On the question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Countryman: "Representative, does this provide for a liquidated damage sum?"

Levin: "Yes, yes, Representative, what the second part of the Amendment does, what it does is to restore a private right of action that existed prior to the time that this statute was amended. I think it was three years ago, and it puts back into the statute, the exact same private remedy and liquidated damages that existed at that point."

Countryman: "But, does this require a finding of guilt?"

Levin: "Yes."

Countryman: "Before you can proceed with the civil remedy?"

Levin: "Yes, cause it states any person injured by a violation of this article, so you have to demonstrate that there is a violation. And the way you get a violation is by...I think, a finding of guilty."

Countryman: "Well, would that require approximate cause proof then too? I mean could you do this unknowingly by...if you and I were, and wanted to dial up LIS from our offices and get some information and somehow because of my ineptness with my computer, I type in some material which causes a problem with the states computer which is hooked to some other computers. Could I be liable under this Act if I didn't intend to do that?"

Levin: "The first part of this Amendment deals with that problem.

As the Bill was originally drafted it...it is directed at viruses that are placed in computers. As originally drafted it talked about causing or being designed. As this Amendment changes that to...changes that language to read, 'are intended'. So you have to intend...you know this is

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the kind of Amendment that Representative Cullerton has been known to offer....So that if there is an inadvertent effect of injuring another piece of software or computer, this would not...it would not be covered. You have to take an action which would be intended to cause injury."

Cullerton: "Now the liquidated damages, were they five thousand dollars or the actual amount of the damages, whichever is more?"

Levin: "...It's ten thousand or actual."

Cullerton: "Is it ten? I don't have the Amendment in front of me..."

Levin: "Yeah, yeah."

Cullerton: "Ten thousand dollars or actual damages, whichever is more?"

Levin: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Why should there be an automatic ten thousand dollars if somebody does this?"

Levin: "Representative, this is taken verbatim from what the statute previously read and we just intended...attempted to restore that private right of action....I'm not witted to any particular amounts, I can't really give you a justification just to say this is what was in the statute, was in the law, prior to about three years ago."

Cullerton: "Why did we repeal it, do you recall?"

Levin: "There was a comprehensive rewrite...of this section and my understanding was that in the rewrite they forgot to put that provision in."

Cullerton: "Well, I guess I really feel uncomfortable with us putting in a mandated ten thousand dollars in civil damages, when somebody might do a dollars worth of damage and I...it really, really bothers me...to go that high. I guess somebody's entitled to their actual damages and maybe their actual damage is an attorney's fees and if I recall,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

attorney's fees are a part of the right of action...and so forth. But, to go ten thousand dollars seems to be pretty high. I guess it's your Bill and your Amendment and I should maybe reserve those things for Third Reading, but it seems to be my feeling on it."

- Levin: "I'd be happy to discuss this further. I would ask that we put the Amendment on at this point and let's have further conversations before Third Reading. Because as I say, I'm not witted to ten thousand, our object here is to deal with a problem which is a very real problem, one that I personally have experienced about a year ago. I was the victim of a computer virus, it can have a very costly and devastating effect on a computer system."
- Cullerton: "I understand that, and my office has been the victim of the hypodermic needle that was supposed to keep the virus from coming in and caused all kinds of problems, so sometimes these things can be unintentional and I hate to see us get in a position where we can create a large measure of damages or cause of action that could be harassing in nature. But, why don't you go ahead and move the Bill and see if we can work it out."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 498 and on the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 603, Representative John Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 881, Representative Van Duyne. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 881, a Bill for an Act to amend the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In our over zealousness to protect the diabetics in the State of Illinois, by putting a color coded drivers license in their pocket, we as I say, we are a little bit over zealous. We find that some of the diabetics are a little bit defensive about being designated as being some kind of an illness ridden person. So, have objected to this being mandated. So in order to satisfy them, we have inserted in the Bill, 'upon request'. So in other words, if they want that license...drivers license, so they can be designated as being diabetics, that they would have to ask for it. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 881. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. 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. House Bill 1019, Representative Martinez. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1019, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1514, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1514, a Bill for an Act in relation to charitable trusts and solicitations. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 McCracken."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you. This is an Amendment which I will call truth in advertising. Unfortunately, there are too many nominally independent "consumer organizations" which in fact are tools for various political parties. This Bill would require that where non-profit organizations solicit funds from the public and receive \$1,000.00 or more per year from Political Action Committees, they must disclose that fact in all solicitations. This is aimed for example, at which purports itself to be some independent consumer group, when in fact it's liberally supported by the Democratic party. And I think since this Sponsor in particular and the Democratic Members of the House are all for truth in advertising, this is a logical extension of that and I can't imagine how anybody could oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514 and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respect the intentions of...and I have great affection for the Sponsor of this Amendment, but it should be clearly understood that this Amendment is absolutely in opposition to the Bill and frankly, is designed to kill the Bill. This Amendment attacks really one

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

organization...which is the Illinois Public Action Council, and would require that organization to make some that it's advertising that it receives contributions from political action funds. We ought not be sitting here and trying to muddy up the waters of a very necessary piece of legislation, as House Bill 1514 is, which is a Bill sponsored by the Attorney General of Illinois to aim at organizations, professional fund raisers, who in some cases charge up to 90 percent of the money collected as their fee to act as a fund raiser for a charitable organization. That's what the Bill does. This Amendment will impede the passage of that very important, very timely piece of have no objection to Mr. McCracken or legislation. Ι anyone else offering this Amendment as a separate piece of But, do not mess up this legislation which legislation. has been worked on hard and long, involving most of major charities throughout the State of Illinois. And just as to give you an idea of some of those charities that have been working on House Bill 1514 are; The United Way, The Jewish United Fund, and a whole variety, a long list of charities throughout Illinois who want some protection from fund raisers who have been calling people saying that, 'we represent a charity, please donate money'. And when that person donates a dollar, anywhere from 50 to 60 to 70, all the way up to 90 cents of that dollar does not find it's way to the charity, but instead finds its way into the pockets of that professional fund raiser. So I'm asking you to please, if you're interested in protecting charities from this kind of behavior, vote 'no' on this Amendment. The Amendment is intended to kill this Bill."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. I arise in support of this Amendment. I think

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

there's nothing wrong with a 501-C3, or non-for-profit group that is going out to soliciting money from people who accepts a thousand dollars or more, to tell the people that they are soliciting money from, who they're receiving their This is not unreasonable and this, in fact, money from. will not kill this Bill, that the Bill is good as it's implied to be and it probably is, this should just enhance Because we now have, we'll be putting freedom of information out to people so that they can know where what basis they're they're getting their money and on getting the money. I think that all groups should be willing to go out and stand up and be counted when they solicit the people of Illinois. And if this is related to one particular group, I think that they probably would say that since they tried to tell us that...they represent a cross section of people in Illinois, that they should be proud to stand up and be counted as to where they receive their money. And I think this good Amendment will enhance the Bill and I think everybody should vote for this Amendment."

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

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

I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I might say too that I have found through the years that when there's an organization you don't like you best keep your mouth shut, because the more you raise heck about that organization, the stronger that organization gets. I understand that many here don't like the Illinois Public Action Council. The reason you don't like the Illinois Public Action Council is because you probably have a very poor voting record on consumer issues. That is really why you don't like the Illinois Public Action Council. I think we need more organizations like the Illinois Public Action Council.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the fact of the matter is, that the public Do you know needs, the public...No, the fact of the matter is the public needs more organization to protect the publics interest. There were public interest groups that we're talking about the dangers of ALAR a few years ago. Nobody Nobody said, they are trying to protect listened to them. our interest. Ιt always seems to me organizations that are protecting the public interest, there's always somebody trying to down them, saying they're no good. Let's really look at what the real issue is. A lot of people like to hide their voting records. A lot of people don't like the public to find out if they're on their side, so I rise definitely, Representative Preston has a good Bill here, let's keep it clean the way he wants it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to oppose Amendment. The Bill itself is a shell Bill that was offered on behalf of the Attorney General's charitable trust division as their 1989 Charitable Trust Act Clean Up Bill, should be a relatively non-controversial Bill and Amendment #2 would implement the provisions recommended the Attorney General's charitable trust division. It's a non-political...simply a good Government Bill. Sponsor of Amendment #1 takes a shell Bill and directs his ire through the Amendment at IPAC trying to say that any charitable organization that qualifies under 501C3 of the Internal Revenue Code would have to report in written solicitations for funds, if it has ever received more than a \$1,000.00 from a political action fund. The Bill drafted however, or the Amendment would require this reporting in perpetuity, so that if in the year of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

whatever group had received a \$1,000.00 contribution in 1989 would still be having to include this information in written solicitations. Not. mind you. electronic solicitations or TV commercials. reason of course, to differentiate between written and electronic advertising and further, would do something, I don't think the Sponsor of the Amendment intends, and that is to pull within this web, not only IPAC but any other charitable organization whether it be your parish, your church, Wally Phillips Needy Children Fund or any of the other myriad charitable organizations that are exempt under the Internal Revenue Code who happened to have received a \$1,000.00 contribution from some political action committee and I would submit there are many, many of them that They would have to report forever in their written solicitations that they solicit those kind of That's way over reaching, even though I think the Amendment is designed to be mischievous in an attempt to slap IPAC...It's effect would be far beyond that and something that should not be offered as an Amendment too shell Bill offered by the Attorney General's Consumer Charitable Trust Division to implement Amendment #2 which is a non-controversial Amendment. So, I would think we would all want to stand and vote 'no' on this Amendment." "The Gentleman from Coles,

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Apparently there's a great deal of confusion about this Bill and this Amendment. One of the previous Speakers says it's a very valuable Bill and ought to be kept the way it is. The most recent Speaker just told us it's a shell Bill. I think we really don't understand what the Bill does or doesn't do, but this Amendment is very straight forward and plain in what it

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

does and I think we need to adopt this Amendment to really make something worthwhile out of this Bill."

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

"Thank Madam Speaker. First of all, I'd like to Stephens: you, note that whether this is a shell Bill or an important the Amendment doesn't eliminate the language of the Bill and I think it ought to be noted why an Amendment like this would create so much support especially on this side of the aisle. It was alluded to, earlier that maybe that had something to do with our voting record and we were somehow embarrassed by the Illinois Public Action Council for their pointing out certain points in our voting record. The truth of the matter is, that they reached into the very bowels of the General Assembly and looked for issues such as discharge Motions, votes in committee on procedural matters, and then they went back to the districts where the bequest of the Democratic party, they were instructed to go and to work in certain races. Not because the membership of the Illinois Public Action Council sought their input, but because they were given direction by a political party and we take exception to that. We think that if the Communist Party or the Socialist Party Illinois is contributing to the Illinois Public Action Council that when they go door to door soliciting funds that they ought to say, 'listen we're supported by the Communist' and it's time that you let that information out. Now whether it's worse to be supported by a Communist or the Democratic Party I'm not certain the people of Illinois need to make that...discernation here. That we need to discuss that. The point is, where you're getting your backing from political parties ought to be public knowledge, when you're asking the public to give you money.

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

They are, this is an organization that I find very hard to understand. I think they're kind of two faced. They come and they talk about, 'well we're here to protect the people'. The people they're trying to protect are the people that put the money in their back pocket. It's a Democratic Party in Illinois and they ought to say it, they...ought to have the courage when their soliciting funds to say to the people of Illinois, 'here I am, I want your money, I'm also supported by the Democratic Party and by the way, we call ourself some other name', in this case the Illinois Public Action Council. So what this Amendment does, it makes you say what it is, you're really about. And why would you be against that?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken is recognized to close."

McCracken: "This is...this is the ultimate consumer protection issue, and those of you on the other side of the aisle who pride yourselves on protecting the consumer should be this Amendment. I am proud that they don't like me. I think a man can be known by his enemies as well as by his friends. But not everybody knows who these people are. They go wow, IPAC hates McCracken, wow that's terrible. say, 'no, that's a badge of honor'. IPAC is a Democratic front organization and they ought to tell everybody. are they afraid of? If they represent the consumer why are they afraid of labeling? Why are they afraid of truth in advertising? Why? How could anyone be against this Bill? Representative Preston, how could you be against this Amendment? I ask for a Roll Call and we're going to knock of all of you guys who aren't here and we're going to put this Amendment on the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is...Out of the record. House Bill 1546, Representative Lang. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1546, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed...Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, or Lang?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Lang."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is simply a clean up Amendment. There was some language in the Bill that was superfluous and IDOT suggested that we remove it so that's what this language does in the Amendment. I ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 1546. On the question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Would the Sponsor yield, please, Madam Speaker?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Lang, I believe as originally drafted, this Bill requires seat belts in school bus after a certain date and also requires roof top safety hatches after a certain date, in all school busses, in all that are operated by school districts in Illinois, at something like cost per vehicle, twelve hundred dollars per vehicle for the seat belts and so on. Does this Amendment do anything about insisting the state should have to pay for all these costs that we are imposing by this Bill upon local school districts?"

Lang: "The Department of Transportation has no objection to the Bill, they just merely suggested that I drop some superfluous language out of the Bill, Representative. It has nothing to do with who's paying for it or anything of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

that nature."

Cowlishaw: "The Amendment does nothing to address that fact?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "That's a shame."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 1906, Representative Balanoff. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1906, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1, 2, 3 & 4 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 2171, Representative Matijevich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2171, a Bill for an Act in relation to Fire Safety and Flammability testing on furniture. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill remains on the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of obtaining the fiscal note. House Bill 2592, Representative Giglio. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2592, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "...Madam Speaker, withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 is a technical change brought on by the Commerce Commission. It changes the height of the lettering from 5/8 to a 1/2 inch and...the Amendment also makes the Bill comparable, or in line with the Illinois Commercial Transportation Law, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 2592. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have some Bills to return to that have been addressed earlier today. The Members are present, wish to have those Bills called. The first Bill is on the...Special Order of Revenue on Second Reading. It is Representative Johnson's Bill. House Bill 309. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 309, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Income Tax Checkoff. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Weller."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a simple Amendment...I've discussed this Amendment with the Bill's Sponsor. He agrees to attach this to his Bill and supports the Amendment. It sets up a checkoff program to Fund Community Base Substance Abuse Programs. It's legislation that's supported by the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse and also I added the support group for that. I'd be happy to answer any questions I support..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 309. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Bill is on the Special
Order of Rural Assistance. It is Representative Mautino's
Bill. House Bill 2520. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2520, a Bill for an Act to establish the Illinois Rural Bond Bank. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are two Bills on the Consent Calendar, Second Reading, that the Members would like called. The first one is House Bill 753, Representative Woolard. Clerk, read the Bill. This is the special Consent Calendar on Supplemental #1."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 753, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1 & 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Woolard."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Yes, first of all I'd like to table Amendments 1 & 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendments #1 & 2.

On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none,
the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 & #2 to be tabled?'
All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion
of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, Amendment's 1 & 2 are
tabled. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Woolard."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Specifically, what Amendment #3 is incorporate, what
the language we had in 1 & 2, with the correct spelling in
one instance and also the correct positioning of the
exemption of Cook County from the part of the Bill. I move
that we amend it..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 753. On the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is...The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken on the Amendment."

McCracken: "Does this, excuse me, will the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Woolard: "Yes...."

McCracken: "Is this aimed at excluding O'Hare airport from the application of the Bill?'

Woolard: "Yes."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

McCracken: "And who asked you to do that, if anybody?"

Woolard: "I think this was something that came out of our committee hearing."

McCracken: "It came out of your committee?"

Woolard: "Yes."

McCracken: "Well, now what does it mean if the Amendment is adopted, that property owned or leased by O'Hare would not be tax exempt?"

Woolard: "Specifically, on the O'Hare issue, I cannot address that. But specifically I can, the one located in Williamson County."

McCracken: "Then you don't know who asked for this Amendment?"

Woolard: "I think that it came from Ron Levin."

McCracken: "Pardon me?"

Woolard: "Ron Levin, from staff."

McCracken: "Oh, Oh, Oh...Well you know...to the Amendment. I

don't really understand the purpose of excluding O'Hare.

Is there anyone who knows why we would want to exclude

O'Hare? Well, the Amendment excludes O'Hare. I know I

don't, I'm asking, why would you want to exclude O'Hare

from the application of the Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion?"

McCracken: "Yes, will someone answer me?"

Speaker Breslin: "Well, I'll move on to the next."

McCracken: "Representative Cullerton seems to know the answer."

Speaker Breslin: "I'll move on to the next Speaker if you're relinquishing your time."

Woolard: "The Bill specifically addresses the issue of our local Bi-County Health Department which is located on Airport Authority Property in Williamson County. With the language of the Revenue Department as it is now stated, we would not be able to exempt them from taxing. As the Bill is presented, it would accommodate a tax exempt entity such as

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- the Health Department to be rendered that same tax exempt status located on the Airport Authority property."
- McCracken: "Okay, now if I understand the Amendment correctly, that would mean that O'Hare leased property, would not be exempt under this Bill, if the Amendment is adopted."
- Woolard: "Not unless it was specifically to a tax exempt authority based entity."
- McCracken: "Okay, I still don't understand. Does anyone know?

 Is O'Hare property taxable now if it's leased to a third party?"
- Woolard: "If it is not a tax exempt authority, yes. If it was leased to a group that would have tax exempt status...I'm wrong. I'm wrong. They would be subject to taxes as the law is written today, yes."
- McCracken: "O'Hare would be. Well, I think that's noble. I'm glad to see a Cook County or City of Chicago Bill which finally doesn't give O'Hare or the city a break relative to the rest of the state. I think all of the Cook County Democrats should be congratulated. This is a wonderful Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I was just going to make the same point the previous Speaker did. It's a wonderful Amendment and we should all support it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading...And leave to be restored to the Order of Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Hearing no objection, he has leave. The Bill will be returned to the Order of Third Reading Consent Calendar. Representative

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

McCracken."

McCracken: "I can't figure it out, it must be a plot. But we'll let it go back to Consent."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Stange has a Bill on this Order. That Bill is House Bill 799. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 799, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Local Solid Waste Energy Generation Act.

 Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill's been read a Second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stange."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stange."

Stange: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 deletes everything from the enacting clause, amends the Public Utilities Act to require public utilities to purchase power from waste energy facilities fueled by landfilled generated methane gas and owned by forest preserve districts for 20 years, not ten as required by other fuel facilities."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption. Mr. Clerk, can you put this up on the board? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 799. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Levin: "Okay, I heard the magic words, Public Utilities. I didn't hear the full explanation...can you explain again, what does the Bill do, and what does the Amendment do to change that?"

Stange: "...Okay right now, the law states we can only buy, purchase the energy for no more that ten years required by the Act. The forest preserve districts now will have 20 years to require the fuel from the various facilities."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Levin: "You mentioned Public Utilities in here, that's what caught...how does the public utility come into this?"

Stange: "The Public Utilities will be these waste landfills, heavy generating systems that will be selling the energy to like, Commonwealth Edison for example. Right now the forest preserve districts can do this only for ten years. We're putting an Amendment to make, to requiring...a minimum of 20 years for the purchase of the energy."

Levin: "This is...the Amendment to the Bill we passed about three years ago?"

Stange: "Two years ago."

Levin: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton is recognized."

Cullerton: "Yes, I remember the Bill in committee,
Representative...Now, could you...tell me about the
Amendment? Did the original Bill deal with forest preserve
districts in any way?"

Stange: "I believe they did...Only for ten years."

Cullerton: "Alright, well, maybe I can ask you the same questions that Representative McCracken asked. Who gave you this Amendment? Who's this Amendment for....?"

Stange: "Jim McPike"

Cullerton: "Okay, and the Commerce Commission...their position on the Bill?"

Stange: "They're neutral right now."

Cullerton: "And that's not changed by the Amendment?"

Stange: "Not at all, It's a great piece of legislation."

Cullerton: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Are there any

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

further Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Stange now ask leave to keep this Bill on the Order of the Supplemental 1, Consent Calendar. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "Order Government and Administration. Second Reading, appears House Bill 38, Representative Tony Young.
 Out of the record. House Bill 113, Representative Keane.
 Mr. Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 165,
 Representative Granberg. Out of the record. House Bill 526, Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 5..."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 591. Out of the record and 592...has been done. House Bill 1200. Representative Churchill. Out of the record. House Bill 1990. Out of the record. House Bill 2106, Mr. DeLeo. Do you want to call this Bill, 2106? Read the Bill. House Bill 2117. Clerk. No. out of the record. Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Special Law, Second Reading. House Bill 101, Order, Civil Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 101, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committe."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 247,

 Representative Preston. Yes, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 247, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 359, Representative Stange. Mr. Stange leave? Representative Stange? Out of the record. House Bill 496, Representative Levin. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 496, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 899, Representative Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 1450, Representative Countryman. Out of the record. House Bill 1483, Representative Kirkland. Out of the record. House Bill 1660, Representative Churchill. Out of the record. House Bill 1673, Representative Countryman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any...Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Returning to...Mr. Stange, came back on the floor. House Bill 359. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 359, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 1741,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. House Bill 2265, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2265, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Currie and McCracken."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment

1 to House Bill 2265 does a better job of accomplishing the
purpose of House Bill 2265 than did the Bill as introduced.

I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate
your support."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1.

Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1
be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2328, Representative Dunn. John Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 2517, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. House Bill 2630, Representative Countryman. Out of the record...House Bill 1660, Representative Churchill...on Civil Law, Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1660, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Dental Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. State and Local Government,

 Third Reading. House Bill 575, Representative Wennlund.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 575, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill.
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Mr. Speaker, could we pull that out of the record please? I have an agreement with Representative Keane, I don't know why it's still coming up, pull it out of the record, please."
- Speaker McPike: "Sure, out of the record. House Bill 1042, Representative Parcells. Representative Parcells, do you wish to call the Bill? Representative Parcells, the Chair was not aware that it was on Postponed Consideration, so we'll get back to that when we get to that order. I apologize. Out of the record. House Bill 1158, Representative Kirkland. Out of the record. House Bill 1164, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act regarding driver's license and the privilege of driving. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland (sic McAuliffe)."
- McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the annual Secretary of State's Clean up Bill which we passed last week and I ask for you to take it back to Second Reading, because they were going to amend it, now they changed their minds...So I'd ask you to pass it again for me."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McAuliffe, did you want to explain the Bill?"
- McAuliffe: "The Bill is the Secretary of State's Annual Drivers

 Services Administration Clean Up Bill. It makes numerous

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

technical and non-substantial changes regarding the definition of probationary licenses."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton...on the Bill."

Cullerton: "Did you say their annual Clean-Up Bill?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah, they have to clean things up annually."

Cullerton: "Well, why don't we just clean the whole thing up forever, for good? What was the Amendment that they wanted to put on?"

McAuliffe: "They were going to use it as a vehicle in case the Senate never got their act together. Now that they've got their act together they don't need it as a vehicle anymore."

Cullerton: "So this won't come back?"

McAuliffe: "I hope not. This is the second time it's been up, we passed it last week."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Would you like to close?"

McAuliffe: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1164 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 'ayes', none 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1164, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 1434, Representative Edley. Mr. Edley. Mr. Edley. Representative Edley. Edley? Would you like to have this Bill called? Would you like to have your Bill called? Out of the record. House Bill 1542, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 1899...it has already been House Bill 1944, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1944, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Governor's Council on Health and Physical Fitness

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays. Out of the record. House
 Bill 1964, Representative Parcells. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1964, a Bill for an Act in regard to

 Motor Carrier Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask to take this back to Second. I've heard there has been an Agreed Amendment..clarifying Amendment, that Representative Ronan has filed. I wonder if that has been filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed? The Amendment's not been filed. Out of the record."
- Parcells: "Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 1966, Representative Black. Mr. Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act to amend the New Vehicle Buyer Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Could I have leave of the House to take this Bill back to Second Reading. There are two Amendments that I think need to go on the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. No objections, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 Amendment #1 is an attempt to clarify the underlying Lemon

 Law as it relates to recreational vehicles. What we're

 attempting to do in #1, Amendment #1, is to establish

 legislative intent that it doesn't apply to the living area

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- of a recreational vehicle. In other words if your microwave goes out on a 100 thousand dollars R.V., four times in one year, we don't think you ought to be able to go back to the dealer and get a new R.V.. So that's what Amendment #1 attempts to do."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 requires that conversion vans and other modified vehicles may only be sold by the original manufacturers authorized dealership or franchise. This Amendment was brought to me by the New Car and Truck Dealers Association and let me call your attention to the fact that I don't think this in an Agreed Amendment and I'm sure there's opposition to it."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. On that, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

 Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will."
- Countryman: "Representative Black, what does this do to the rest of the Bill that we just amended?"
- Black: "Well, what this does, Representative, it takes conversion vans and other modified vehicles, and quite frankly. effectively prohibits a conversion van company from selling such vehicles to an independant, in other words a non-franchised dealer. A non-General Motors, non-Chrysler, or non-Ford dealer."

Countryman: "But does it gut the rest of the Bill?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Black: "No it does not."

Countryman: "Well...then, let me ask you this. Does this...this would say that some little guy in my district who buys these vans in his little shop there, he puts in carpet and some seats and so forth, he can't sell those to anybody but a franchise dealer. Is that what you're saying?"

Black: "I believe that that is the intent of Amendment #2, yes."
Countryman: "Well...isn't it in your opinion, that a restraint in trade?"

Black: "Well...I think that one could reasonably could attach that interpretation to it, I guess, and I know where you're coming from Representative. I guess the problem is that there are consumers, and by the way some of these independent dealers are even open on Sunday and I know some of your dealers in your district are not happy about that, and I guess it comes down to the fact that when you spend twenty or twenty five thousand dollars for a conversion van, you have a consumer's right to expect that that can be adequately serviced under warranty and it's my understanding that some of these independents, who are selling these vans are simply not able to provide that service."

Countryman: "Yeah, but what you're saying is, that if I wanted, in my garage on weekends when I'm not down here, if I want to convert these vans and try to sell them to somebody, I can't do it. All I can do is sell it to some Ford dealer, or some Chevy dealer, some other dealer like that. Isn't that what you're saying?"

Black: "Why I think that's exactly what we're saying. Did you say sell them to some poor dealer?"

Countryman: "No, I said you couldn't sell them to...somebody other than a Ford dealer."

Black: "Oh, a Ford Dealer."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Countryman: "You know, you've always been in my idol for the champion for small business, but you're really trying to put small business out of existence with this Amendment."

Black: "Well, I think you'd agree...No, you know, it would appear that way, and I appreciate the compliment, but I'm really not, we're just trying to make sure that these dealers are indeed authorized and able to do the service on this van that people are putting a great deal of their money into."

Countryman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair?

Is this Amendment in order?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, could we see the Amendment?"

Countryman: "Mr. Speaker, while you're looking at that, could I go ahead and make my comments?"

Speaker McPike: "You certainly can. Proceed, Sir."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this may be a sleeper even though it's not a I think this is the biggest restraint of sleeping van. trade that we have seen around here in a long time. this says is to the small person who's out converting a van and trying to make a buck as a small businessman, you can't manufacture these things in Illinois and you can't sell them in Illinois unless you're a licensed franchised That is somebody who's got a franchise from Ford, dealer. Chevrolet, GMC, all those other people who make trucks, you've got to have that franchise of that truck. Now these people go out there and they buy Ford vans and they converts Fords, then the next week they might vans and they convert Chevys. They might buy Dodges and no particular significance for...any brand that I left out. But what you're saying is, the Chevy dealer can't sell a Ford van because he's not franchised in that particular line. I frankly think this is a bad Amendment and it ought to be defeated, if the Chair rules that it's in order,

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

I ask for a 'no' vote and a Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Klemm: "Representative Black...if I've got an RV dealer in my community and they purchase, I guess quite a few automobiles and they convert them and then they put them on their lot to be sold. They couldn't do this anymore, is that right?"

Black: "If I heard you correctly, Representative, this Amendment, it's my understanding and certainly, my attempt or my intent, that this Amendment would not prohibit an independent recreational vehicle dealership from selling RV's. We're really trying to address the conversion van problems."

Klemm: "Who does it prevent then, from selling them?"

Black: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Klemm: "...Who does it prevent from selling RV's?"

Black: "It prevents people who, as Representative Countryman has said, you may have a garage or a vacant lot and go buy a van from a dealer or a conversion dealer, say in Indiana, bring the van to his or her lot and sell that van doing business as leisure time, whatever. They are not a franchised motor vehicle dealer of any kind, way, shape, or form. The consumer pays a good deal of money for this conversion van. He or she has a right to expect that the warranty work on that vehicle can be performed. When he buys it from someone who is not a franchised dealer, you are putting that consumer at risk."

Klemm: "Okay, why would an RV dealer be franchised, to be allowed to sell this then?"

Black: "No..."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Klemm: "You've excluded them in the Bill?"

Black: "Yes, sepaerate the RV dealer from someone who just goes into the business of selling conversion vans that they buy at wholesale, they may or may not convert them, but they are not a franchised dealer and they're selling vans off their lot."

Klemm: "So, could a used car dealer buy a van and have it converted and put back on the lot to be sold?"

Black: "I believe that this Bill would prohibit that unless they were selling a vehicle that they were a franchised dealer for. Now, when you get into used cars, that is not adequately addressed in this Amendment. I will admit that. I don't think it bothers any dealer from selling a previously owned vehicle."

Klemm: "So, if an RV or an convertor is not a franchised dealer however, he could not sell them."

Black: "Alright, but now...seperate the RV dealer, if you would, from the conversion van market...Winnebago..."

Klemm: "Okay...then a company that specializes in converting vans, could not buy 100 vans from Ford or Chevy, fix them all up and put them on a lot to sell them, right. This would prevent that person..."

Black: "That's my understanding, unless they were authorized to do so, and I believe the manufacturers of the underlying chassis, the vehicle, does indeed have some of those agreements."

Klemm: "And the car dealers are saying they don't like that, even though they bought those 100 vehicles from the car dealer in the first place?"

Black: "I would say that would be an accurate assessment."

Klemm: "Thank you, for your explanation."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "May I address this?"

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the Gentleman will yield to questions."

Rice: "Representative Black, when you referred to conversion, what part of the vehicle is the conversion part?"

Black: "Well, anything that they would do to alter the basic factory vehicle. They can buy a chassis and put whatever they want on it, or they can buy a cargo van, but if they convert that van, it then becomes a conversion vehicle. By that, I mean if they carpet it, they put in a fancy stereo, lights, captain's Chairs, or a referigerator etc. from that point, you have altered the basic manufacturers vehicle and it becomes a conversion van."

Rice: you know that most of the conversion vans are converted? Well, let me share this with you. Because my cane, I've been buying conversions for the last 10 or 12 years. Most of those conversions come out of Elkhart, down They are not, the conversion part of that in Indiana. vehicle is not quaranteed. Tthe motor part, the chassis part is the only thing that Chevrolet, Dodge or Ford deals with. Those conversion are usually, as Representative Countryman said for a better deal, you find a craftsman who works for one of those industries, who does that kind of work on the side, otherwise to try to buy a conversion that's similiar to what you're talking about, the Ford Motor Company and Chevy prepares with, the captain chairs would not come out. Now when you get frivilous, like these guys do with these little moon windows and what not, those are backyard operations. I think, to be very honest with you, you should research it a little further when you try to make the distinction."

Black: "Well, Representative, I think we've done that. We're not addressing the captain's chair, the carpeting, or the living area of a conversion van. We're not addressing that at all. I agree with you. You can't cover that under the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Lemon Law. What we are saying, is that if you alter the basic vehicle, if you move the wiring harness, if you move the gas line, if you do anything to alter the underlying vehicle, we want that covered under the Lemon Law and we think you ought to be a dealer, if you're going to sell that, so we can be assured that the warranty work will be done properly to the advantage of the consumer."

- Rice: "That...if you changed the harness, if you changed the gas line, that's covered by Ford or Chevrolet. I can show you right downstairs now, where they have attempted to do that with the one I have. That's not part of the conversion."
- Black: "Well, all I can tell you, Representative, is that the underlying Bill addresses the very thing you're talking about. We do not have a Lemon Law in this state on conversion vehicles or recreational vehicles. I think we should. I think a lot of consumers out there, and this was brought to me by a consumer in my own district who's recreational vehicle was tied up for months and months and months, and he got the run around from everybody. I think this Bill, the underlying Bill is a pretty good Bill for the advantage of the consumer, and I don't think there's a lot of opposition out there from the industry to the underlying Bill. Obviously Amendment #2 as you can see, does have some controversy."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn, there's no one seeking recognition. You may proceed. Representative Dunn, go ahead. Representative Black to close."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just ask for an 'aye' vote on Amendment #2, to this good Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman, I apologize, the Amendment is germane and it is in order. The question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That'll be the last time I alert anybody to a potential controversy on an Amendment. I suppose it's too late to ask for postponed consideration on this good Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "I think it's significant that we're already in May and we have yet to have the first awardee of the annual Brian Duff Award...and this is it. Anytime you get in the Century Club you're awarded that distinguished award, and so to Representative Black, from both sides of the aisle we want to congratulate you and hope that this is a harbinger of things to come."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a serious note, if this vote were to hold, or does hold the way it's going right now I like to verify the two positive votes, please."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm. Representative Hultgren."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, you've got my microphone on, can I talk?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, go right ahead. Representative Flinn."

- Flinn: "I'd like to say I realize I'm out order, but on this question, I'd like to move the previous question."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk
 will take the record. On this Amendment there are 2
 'ayes', 109 'nos'. Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1978, Representative,
 I'm sorry, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, with your permission can we now take

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

this back to Third Reading and run the Bill? Because, I would like to thank my one friend for hanging with me, but now that Amendment 2 is gone, I would like to run the Bill."

- Speaker McPike: "...The Bill has been amended so you will have to...the Bill has been returned to Second Reading and amended. Amendment #1 was adopted so you'll have to make a Motion if you wish to call the Bill today you'll have to move, to so do. The Gentleman moves to waive the appropriate rule so the Bill could be heard on Third Reading at this time. Any objections? No objections. Attendance Roll Call is used, the Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act to amend the New Vehicle Buyer Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you, very much. I think the underlying Bill has been debated and now that Amendment 2 is off, I'd certainly ask for a more favorable consideration of the underlying Bill than I received on the Amendment. Thank you, very much."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1966 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1966, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1978, Representative McCracken. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1978, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act of the Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- McCracken. "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this
 Bill would put the Department on Aging under the
 Administrative Review Act, require that any appeals taken
 from departmental decisions be taken pursuant to the Act.
 Most other agencies, if not all of them, are under this
 Act. I move the passage of this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1978. Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1978 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 1 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1978 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2032, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2032, a Bill for an Act to limit the creation of organizational units by state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you, very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2032 is an Audit Commission Bill which would limit the ability of state agencies to form corporate out growths...agencies that are not subject to state financial controls or state fiscal controls or property controls and so on. I would move for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of 2032.

 Is there any discussion? On the Bill, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Yes..just wanted to ask the Sponsor, did he have any specific state agencies in mind when he created the Bill?" Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."
- Mays: "No...What we're seeking to do, is stop the creation of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

future corporate out growth by agencies for whatever whim and reason that they might come up with. We're not eliminating any that are there already, we just want to limit the proliferation of these things. If they want to have them, if there's a good reason for having them, then let them come to the Legislature and we can authorize them."

Williams: "Do you know of any cases where this abuse has taken place so far or is this just sort of an anticipated abuse we're trying to stop?"

Mays: "Well, we always come across various outgrowths. Everv time we do, we have to almost seek special permission from them to get their audits, to have them open up the books and let us know what's going on with their agencies. We've had problems in the past. I think you might recall some of athletic association problems that we've had. U of I. You might also recall some umbrellas that the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs purchased several years for their office in the State of Illinois Building through these types of things. There have been problems in the past and we just want to try to limit the proliferation of these things. If it's a great idea, by golly, come to the Legislature and we'll help them out.

Williams: "Okay, no further problems."

Mays: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Levin: "Would this have any effect on either the Supreme Court or the Attorney...Registration Disciplinary Commisssion?"

Mays: "I wish. This Bill does not."

Levin: "So are you saying it will have absolutely no affect?"

Mays: "No, and it doesn't even affect the corporate outgrowths

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

that have already been established by the agencies. We figured that's a separate battle. We just want to stop the proliferation."

Levin: "Would this effect the foundation of the University of Illinois?"

Mays: "No, that's already in...it's already been formed. This is prospective not retroactive."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Hultgren: "Would this prohibit the establishment of a branch university campus without legislative approval?"

Mays: "If they establish a branch, I'm sure they're going to have to come through the appropriations process and so on and so forth. I don't see how it would impact that."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays to close."

Mays: "Well I appreciate the discussion we've had on this Short

Debate Bill. It's like I said, what we're trying to do is

limit the proliferation of these outgrowths so that we have

some control and if it's a great idea, by golly the

agencies can come to us and we'll be more than happy to

help them go. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2032 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 'ayes', 1 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2032, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2145, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2145, a Bill for an Act to amend the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a
 Bill that would merely require DCCA to provide public
 reports on a monthly basis of the decisions that are made
 with respect to projects, grants, loans and so forth. The
 Bill passed out of committee with the unanimous vote. It's
 on the Short Debate Calendar. I would appreciate your
 support."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to the Bill? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2145 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2145 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House 2272, Representative Mautino. Mr. Mautino. the record. House Bill 2345. Out of the record. Bill 2439, Representative McCracken. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2439, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to advocacy for children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McCracken."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This requires counties to adopt a protocol for the treatment of child abuse victims.

 It requires them to set up an advocacy center for that purpose and if they desire by front door referendum only.

 may impose a levy up to .004 percent for the purpose of funding that center. It is a front door referendum only.

 I move the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. Does anyone rise in opposition? Question is, 'Shall

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

House Bill 2439 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 2439, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2528, Representative Hasara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2528, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2528 requires the Departments on Aging, and the Department of Insurance to conduct a public awareness campaign on long term care insurance. This is the result of people who are not aware that there are such policies and if they are aware, what to look for in a policy and how to go about finding a good policy."
- Speaker McPike: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 2528, and on that Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Yes, does the, are there any, do you have an idea of what this particular program will cost in order for the department to conduct this awareness campaign?"
- Hasara: "I believe it's something like, they estimate 60 thousand dollars."
- Williams: "Has there been a fiscal note request of any sort or any sort of fiscal..."
- Hasara: "No there hasn't, but it was in our staff analysis."
- Williams: "Is this a...that's the minimal cost, the nominal cost
 you're saying is approximately 60 thousand, and how long
 will the program...Is the program ongoing forever or..."
- Hasara: "The departments would have some discretion as how to handle the campaign. It could even be that it would be part of a...program that they were sponsoring. It could be

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

- a pamphlet that they would produce."
- Williams: "What about...how does this play into the CHIPS Program? Isn't that long term care, sort of...different."
- Hasara: "It's totally different, and that's one of the problems

 Representative. People are confused about what is out
 there."
- Williams: "So, this...I guess what you do is just analyze all
 long term insurance companies..."
- Hasara: "Right...what I'm trying to do, Representative, is to inform, particularly middle aged people that there is such a thing as long term care insurance and that you should not wait until your 75 years old to think about purchasing it."
- Williams: "Okay...thank you, very much. I do appreciate your honesty in admitting the cost."

Hasara: "Thank you. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara to close."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have had occasion to work with families, families who have aging parents and also people who are now faced with nursing home costs who really need help, in not only choosing a policy, but in knowing that there is such a thing. Just yesterday I had a call from a friend of mine who's mother is now in a nursing home and she saw that I had this Bill and was wondering if I could put her in touch with someone who would help them with the possibility of being able to purchase. some insurance. So, it is such a new field. I think it's very important that we all become aware that it is there and what is involved and looking and purchasing such insurance. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2528 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', 1 'no', none

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

voting 'present'. House Bill 2528, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2579, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. House Bill 2589, Representative Hasara. Representative Hasara that's on a Consent Calendar, so we'll pass it. House Bill 2590, Representative Olson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2590, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to services for children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill comes to us from the Department of Children and Family Services. started out with two major elements, technical corrections to the Act, and plus it's sought to remove the Department of Children and Family Services from obligation at a court's order of investigating...child situations in divorce proceedings. Their suggestion was that those who can pay, that was put in by Amendment and also the Amendment was offered that in areas where there are not social services agencies like Lutheran Social Service, Catholic Social Service. The court still direct DCFS to make those inquiries. Also it increases the precentage that collection agencies can receive to 20 percent from 15 percent brings into compliance with the State Collection Act. There are no additional elements to the Bill and I move for it's passage."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair. I wondered if anticipation of some problems next week when we get down to the crunch, if we could ask the Clerk...perhaps the Clerk or maybe the...Chief of Staff, if we could get a list of how many Bills that we've passed out of the House

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

that have been Sponsored by Republicans and how many has been Sponsored by Democrats, so that we can have that ammnunition...not ammunition, we can have those figures available when we get into next week. Because, every Bill, I have no objection to these Bills, they seem like fine Bills, but every Bill we call is a Republican Sponsored Bill and I'm just curious that maybe this week is Republican week and maybe next week might be the Democratic week. I think it would be very helpful if we had that list of which Bills were Sponsored by which Members of which party. I think that'd be very helpful."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If in fact this is Republican week, I have three Bills I'd like you to call right now then...so that I can in fact be happy and take part in this wonderful concession that obviously Representative Cullerton suggested."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson, do you want to take this Bill out of the record."

Olson, M.: "No, I don't."

Speaker McPike: "So we can get to Representative Parke's Bill."

Olson, M.: "He has some wonderful Bills but I suggest we call them about May 2May 28th or something like that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't quite know what Special Order we're on but I did have a question for the Gentleman and I'd like to ask him, will he yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes he will."

Olson, M.: "He certainly will."

Countryman: "Is this your first Bill as a Conference Chairman with your additional salary?"

Olson, M.: "No it isn't. I have had many Bills, I've found that since I have been elevated to this lofty position,

42nd Legislative Day

- May 17, 1989
- Democrats have treated me extremely well, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Well that must be why you get your Bills called, is that right?"
- Olson, M.: "My Bills are called, Sir because they are meritorious beyond reproach."
- Countryman: "Well, talking...beyond what? What did you say this

 Bill did for DCFS having to do reports to the court..."
- Olson: "Well, It makes some technical corrections. And from your prospective as an attorney, if you were serving a client in court and would like to have the court to direct DCFS to make an investigation with their limited resourses, in cases in the wonderful city of DeKalb where you have Lutheran Social Service and Catholic Social Service, you would have to pay for that, you client would have to pay for that themselves. However, if they couldn't afford it, then DCFS may be directed by court order to offer the investigation. Plus in addition to that, if we can avoid doing these unnecessary investigations we can save a hundred thousand dollars a year in DCFS."
- Countryman: "Where are we going to put that cost? Are we going to put it on Catholic charities and Lutheran Social Services?"
- Olson, M.: "No, they will be reimbursed for that...The defense..."
- Countryman: "How do you know that that's going to happen?"
- Olson, M.: "The defense council or the other council will have to pay the cost by virtue of their clients."
- Countryman: "Well isn't the reality that DCFS just doesn't want to do what they're suppose to do. That's their job, and when a court appoints them they ought to do it?"
- Olson, M.: "They have done exceedingly well with limited resources and particularly in your region in the state

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

they've been overburdened with these obligations."

Countryman: "Well, maybe because it's so close to your district that we get those people floating into my district, but you know, other than that, I really think DCFS is an expert in the area and has a job to do and they ought to do it and I don't think this is a good Bill."

Olson, M.: "Does that mean you're not going to vote for the Bill?"

Countryman: "You've got that right."

Olson: "You're the one. May I close, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "No, we've got about four other people who'd like
 to talk on this. Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill came up last year and it's hard to explain, but there's a situation that's happening now in divorce particularly where one parent involved in custody situation battles, is claiming sexual abuse of the child. happening more and more and it's certainly a devious ploy, but it's happening. DCFS then is wrapped up in all these internal affairs and certainly it takes the money away from legitimate claims of child protection to take care of these cases. If a person wants to accuse their spouse of child abuse they should be prepared to pay for it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think we've had some fun with this Bill and that's appropriate at this time of day. However, what the Bill does is indeed a very serious matter. Department of Children and Family Services is stretched. It's case load is such that their first and foremost obligation should be to take care of abused children. I think it's only appropriate that we indicate in these situations that the Department of Children and

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Family Services follow that priority. In court battles, in which the parties are contesting custody or sexual abuse or whatever else. In those situations, they should be the ones that should pay and it's only appropriate the Department of Children and Family Services should not be in this business and it should be allowed to go to someone like Catholic Social Services or elsewhere. It is a serious matter and I think it deserves our affirmative vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative John Dunn."

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

I would like to yield my time to any Republican who wishes
to give the Sponsor a more difficult time on this
legislation. They're doing fine, but they need
encouragement."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson to close."

Olson, M.: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This issue is as has it has been described. It is significant to DCFS to be unburdened of some of these unnecessary costs when they might be and as a consequence, we'd like to move this to Senate with 115 or 116 votes, discounting what Representative Countryman had to say. Please pass this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House bill 2590 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes', 3 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 2590, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2613, Representative Hasara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2613, a Bill for an Act to prohibit disturbance of human skeletal remains. Third Reading of

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill that you've all been waiting for. This Bill creates the Grave Robbery Act. It is at the request of the Department of Historic Preservation who seriously has been having a problem...and it asks for a permit when anyone disturbs graves, markers, or human skeletal remains that are not in cemeteries. And there have been a lot of problems in this area with people digging and looking for artifacts that do have historical value. I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara on the Bill."

McNamara: "Yes, on this Grave Robber Bill, I understand in Chicago recently they had some skeletal remains from the fire which were considered historical and the construction workers were involved in it. Would they be fined for digging their shovels in it?"

Hasara: "Actually, some of the construction workers have asked for some legislation because they have had problems and do they finds and they don't know what to do with the remains."

McNamara: "So what we're saying is, is anytime that a person digs a hole in the ground and finds a bone that may be a human bone, then they are liable to be against, or have prosecution because of the fact, if they just keep on digging. Is that correct?"

Hasara: "No, that certainly is not correct."

McNamara: "Then could you exp..."

Harara: "If they would keep them and sell them, make money off of them, they could be fined."

McNamara: "Oh, it's only if you sell the bones?"

Hasara: "That's my understanding."

McNamara: "Okay, thank you."

••

May 17, 1989

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

42nd Legislative Day

Weaver: "Representative, just to clarify a few things in my mind, does this apply to private land as well as publicly held lands?"

Hasara: "Yes."

Weaver: "Does it require that the Act be intentional or can it be accidental? In other words, if a farmer's out plowing, and he digs up a grave site, not knowing that the grave site was there, is he in violation of this Act?"

Weaver: "Okay, can the Historic Preservation Agency, which as I understand is going to be the enforcement agency involved with this. Can they require someone to get a permit to dig, for example a foundation of a house, if they believe that there may be a burial ground there?"

Hasara: "I do not believe so. My assumption is, Representative, that the Department will be promulgating rules if this indeed becomes law."

Weaver: "Okay, I hope you keep on top of that because we've had some problems in the past where the department has gone through communities and labeled buildings and sites as historic, without the owner's knowledge, and thus precluded the owner from making any modifications to the site. So I'll go ahead and support your Bill, but I think you need to keep on top of this to make sure they don't do that."

Hasara: "I will certainly do that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Leverenz: "Representative, you said it talked about graves,
marker and skeletal remains. I want to pick a little bone
with you. Does this do anything other than that? Are
there any exemptions?"

Hasara: "There was an Amendment, Representative, adopted in committee that clarifies that any Federal law that already applies, will not overlap with this Bill. That was at the request of the Cole Association."

Leverenz: "Well, you have not mentioned up until now, fort defiance. Does this Bill have anything to do with fort defiance?"

Hasara: "Not in particular that I am aware of, Representative."
Leverenz: "Does this Bill have Amendment #2 adopted?"

Hasara: "Yes."

Leverenz: "The reason I asked the question is, a number of state park locations were turned over from conservation to the Historic Sites Operation with Historic Preservation. Now, for some reason, this has Amendment #2 which reverses that action that we did about a year and a half or two years ago and that's what I'm reading in Amendment #2, that fort defiance is going back to the Department of Conservation. Is that correct?"

Hasara: "I'm sorry, Representative. I've forgotten about Amendment #2 that was also adopted in committee. That was actually a Senate Bill that they asked to be put on here and as I read it, yes, that is true."

Leverenz: "So, the Bill does have something to do with fort defiance?"

Hasara: "Yes it does."

Leverenz: "And in fact, goes further than just the disturbance of graves, markers and skeletal remains to create a new Act."

Hasara: "Yes, Amendment #2 was a..."

Leverenz: "I just want to bring out...that we weren't talking

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

about the whole thing, and I just didn't know why the switch was being switched back, and it was not being discussed..."

Hasara: "Right...The reason that Amendment #2 was adopted was because the department had this Amendment #2 as a Bill in the Senate and they were afraid it might not get out."

Leverenz: "Okay, bury this one, Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara to close."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In all seriousness, this Bill does address a problem that the Department of Historic Preservation has faced and addresses the possibility of future problems. I think we are aware that in Illinois we do have...have had a number of significant historic digs and this would make sure that some of those artifacts are preserved. I ask for the...your favorable vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2613 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', 2 'nos', and 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 2613, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2629, Representative Leitch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2629, a Bill for an Act to amend the Voluntary Payroll Deductions Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Mr. Speaker...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2629 clarifies the ability of groups which provide services to eliminate illiteracy to be designated as organizations eligible to receive State of Illinois payroll deductions under the

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

Voluntary Payroll Deductions Act. I know of no opponents, and would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2629. Is there any discussion of the Bill? none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2629 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2629 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Allowing perfunctory time for Senate Bills, Constitutional Amendments, Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 9:30 All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, Senate passed Bills with the following title and passage which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #68, 70, 79, 107, 127, 133, 134, 142, 148, 162, 169, 185, 189, 198, 199, 200, 220, 226, 228, 231, 243, 244, 245, 247, 254, 257, 267, 298, 301, 302, 308, 309, 347, 354, 355, 370, 373, 374, 375, 383, 388, 389, 472, 473, 479, 480, 481, 489, 495, 498, passed the Senate May 17, 1989. Linda Hawker, Secretary."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Readings. Senate Bill 50, Richmond, a Bill for an Act in relation to occupation and use taxes on farm machinery. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 354, Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 343, Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create sanitary

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 244. Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 245, Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 247, Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create sanitary districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 185. Giorgi, a Bill for an Act in relation to civic centers finance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 220, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to amend the Conservation District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 79, Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend the Compensation Review First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 134, Dunn, a for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Bill Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 28, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 168, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for licensing and regulation of certain games of chance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 467, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act protect and preserve the taking of records. First Reading of the Bill. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4. RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL. ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Section 8 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: ARTICLE IX REVENUE SECTION 8. TAX SALES Real property shall not be sold for the nonpayment of taxes or special assessments without judicial proceedings. The right of redemption from all

42nd Legislative Day

May 17, 1989

sales of real estate for the nonpayment of taxes or special assessments, except as provided in subsections (c) paragraph (2) of this subsection (b), shall exist in favor of owners and persons interested in such real estate for not less than two years following such sales. The right of redemption from the sale for nonpayment of taxes or special assessments of a parcel of real estate which: (1) is vacant real estate or (2) contains an improvement non-farm consisting of a structure or structures each of which contains 7 or more residential units or (3) is commercial or industrial property; shall exist in favor of owners and persons interested in such real estate for not less than one year following such sales. the right of redemption sale for nonpayment of taxes or special assessments of a parcel real estate which: (1)(A)is non-farm real estate or (2) (B) contains an improvement consisting of a structure or structures each of which contains 7 or more residential units or (3) (C) is commercial or industrial property; and upon which all or a part of the general taxes for each of °2° °5° or more years are delinquent shall exist in favor of owners and persons interested in such real estate for not less than °6 months° °90 days° following such sales. Owners, occupants and parties interested shall be given reasonable notice of the sale and the date of expiration of the period of redemption as the General Assembly provides by law. Amendment adopted general election November 4, 1980. SCHEDULE This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon approval by the electors οf this State. Second Reading the Constitutional Amendment, and the Amendment shall be held on Second Reading. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY 15:26

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1 05/04/90

MAY 17, 1989

HB-0003 SECOND READING	PAGE	119
HB-0021 SECOND READING	PAGE	120
HB-0022 SECOND READING	PAGE	120
HB-0029 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-0032 SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-0036 SECOND READING	PAGE	37
HB-0045 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
HB-0090 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
HB-0101 SECOND READING	PAGE	169
HB-0103 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
HB-0106 SECOND READING		
	PAGE	25
HB-0141 SECOND READING	PAGE	146
HB-0158 SECOND READING	PAGE	37
HB-0165 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	9
HB-0211 SECOND READING	PAGE	30
HB-0247 SECOND READING	PAGE	169
HB-0250 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-0294 SECOND READING	PAGE	
HB-0296 SECOND READING		162
	PAGE	147
HB-0309 SECOND READING	PAGE	162
HB-0342 SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0359 SECOND READING	PAGE	170
HB-0366 SECOND READING	PAGE	120
HB-0381 SECOND READING	PAGE	120
HB-0384 SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-0400 SECOND READING	PAGE	122
HB-0421 SECOND READING		
	PAGE	102
HB-0421 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	94
HB-0462 SECOND READING	PAGE	123
HB-0466 SECOND READING	PAGE	112
HB-0490 SECOND READING	PAGE	17
HB-0490 SECOND READING	PAGE	57
HB-0490 THIRD READING	PAGE	92
HB-0496 SECOND READING	PAGE	170
HB-0498 SECOND READING	PAGE	148
HB-0522 SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0564 THIRD READING		
	PAGE	115
HB-0565 SECOND READING	PAGE	123
HB-0565 SECOND READING	PAGE	144
HB-0572 SECOND READING	PAGE	125
HB-0575 THIRD READING	PAGE	172
HB-0585 SECOND READING	PAGE	118
HB-0588 SECOND READING	PAGE	126
HB-0591 SECOND READING	PAGE	93
HB-0591 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	10
HB-0592 SECOND READING	PAGE	94
HB-0592 THIRD READING		
HB-0599 SECOND READING	PAGE	101
	PAGE	108
HB-0604 SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0648 SECOND READING	PAGE	15
HB-0649 SECOND READING	PAGE	15
HB-0650 SECOND READING	PAGE	126
HB-0677 SECOND READING	PAGE'	127
HB-0713 RECALLED	PAGE	20
HB-0738 SECOND READING	PAGE	41
HB-0753 SECOND READING	PAGE	15
HB-0753 SECOND READING	PAGE	164
HB-0789 SECOND READING	PAGE	
HB-0799 SECOND READING		45
	PAGE	15
	PAGE	167
HB-0809 SECOND READING	PAGE	127
HB-0815 SECOND READING	PAGE	127
HB-0854 SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0854 SECOND READING	PAGE	5

PAGE 2 05/04/90

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 17, 1989

нв-0881	SECOND READING	PAGE	151
HB-0892		PAGE	15
HB-0914		PAGE	45
	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-0946		PAGE	128
HB-0946		PAGE	143
HB-1000		PAGE	111
HB-1019		PAGE	152
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	172
	SECOND READING	PAGE	112
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
	SECOND READING	PAGE	44
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
	SECOND READING	PAGE	113
HB-1148		PAGE	
			22
	THIRD READING	PAGE	172 130
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	45
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
	SECOND READING	PAGE	130
	SECOND READING	PAGE	131
	SECOND READING	PAGE	131
	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
HB-1370		PAGE	45
HB-1423		PAGE	22
	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
	SECOND READING	PAGE	50
HB-1494	SECOND READING	PAGE	103
	SECOND READING	PAGE	153
HB-1523	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
HB-1526	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
HB-1546	SECOND READING	PAGE	160
HB-1555	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
HB-1597	SECOND READING	PAGE	15
HB-1611	THIRD READING	PAGE	145
HB-1626	SECOND READING	PAGE	107
HB-1660	SECOND READING	PAGE	171
H8-1661	SECOND READING	PAGE	107
HB-1662	SECOND READING	PAGE	110
HB-1666	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-1671	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
HB-1673	SECOND READING	PAGE	170
HB-1681	SECOND READING	PAGE	132
HB-1688	SECOND READING	PAGE	45
HB-1754	THIRD READING	PAGE	116
HB-1769	SECOND READING	PAGE	111
HB-1782	SECOND READING	PAGE	104
HB-1787	SECOND READING	PAGE	118
HB-1842	RECALLED	PAGE	39
HB-1860	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
	THIRD READING	PAGE	36
HB-1906	SECOND READING	PAGE	161
	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	173
	THIRD READING	PAGE	174
	RECALLED	PAGE	174
	THIRD READING	PAGE	183
	THIRD READING	PAGE	183
HB-1976		PAGE	182
			-0-

REPORT: TIFLDAY
15:26

STATE OF ILLINDIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 3 05/04/90

MAY 17, 1989

HR-1994	SECOND READING	PAGE	133
			9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	184
HB-2039	SECOND READING	PAGE	46
HB-2040	SECOND READING	PAGE	46
	SECOND READING	PAGE	113
	SECOND READING	PAGE	113
	THIRD READING	PAGE	186
HB-2171	SECOND READING	PAGE	161
HB-2198	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
		PAGE	171
	SECOND READING		
	SECOND READING	PAGE .	133
HB-2304	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
HB-2314	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	THIRD READING	PAGE	117
HB-2365	SECOND READING	PAGE	137
HB-2411	SECOND READING	PAGE	139
HB-2411	SECOND READING	PAGE	139
	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
	THIRD READING	PAGE	187
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
HB-2447	SECOND READING	PAGE	139
HB-2448	SECOND READING	PAGE	140
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	SECOND READING	PAGE	142
	SECOND READING	PAGE	140
	SECOND READING	PAGE	144
HB-2463	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-2482	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-2485	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	113
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
HB-2513	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
HB-2520	SECOND READING	PAGE	163
HB-2528	THIRD READING	PAGE	188
	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
HB-2582	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	13
H8-2590	THIRD READING	PAGE	190
HB-2592	SECOND READING	PAGE	161
	SECOND READING	PAGE	105
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
HB-2605	SECOND READING	PAGE	141
HB-2613	·THIRD READING	PAGE	194
HB-2624	SECOND READING	PAGE	50
	SECOND READING	PAGE	50
	THIRD READING	PAGE	198
		PAGE	
	SECOND READING		142
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-2657	SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-2662	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	SECOND READING	PAGE	142
	SECOND READING	PAGE	111
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
no-2129	SECOND READING	PAGE	107

REPORT: TIFLDAY 15:26

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 4 05/04/90

MAY 17, 1989

	HB-2765	SECOND READING	PAGE	106
	HB-2781	SECOND READING	PAGE	106
	HB-2784	SECOND READING	PAGE	114
	HB-2785	SECOND READING	PAGE	114
	HB-2786	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	HB-2796	SECOND READING	PAGE	142
	HB-2803	SECOND READING	PAGE	50
	SB-0013	FIRST READING	PAGE	1
	SB-0020	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	SB-0028	FIRST READING	PAGE	200
	SB-0050	FIRST READING	PAGE	199
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		SECOND READING	PAGE	3
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	1
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	2
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	199
		FIRST READING	PAGE	2
		FIRST READING	PAGE	199
		FIRST READING	PAGE	200
		FIRST READING	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
			PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED		2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2 2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2 2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	200
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
	SJR-0058	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
		SUBJECT MATTER		
		•		
)	ORDER-SPEAK	FR BRESLIN	PAGE	1

HOUSE TO ORDER-SPEAKER BRESLIN	PAGE	1
PRAYER-REVEREND WOOD	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	I
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	17
INTRODUCTION-CECIL AND HAZEL PHELPS	PAGE	18
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	20
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	32
INTRODUCTION EAST AURORA HIGH SCHOOL	PAGE	39
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	46
INTRODUCTION RAINBOW COALITION AND OPERATION PUSH	PAGE	92
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	94
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	169
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	199

REPORT: TIFLDAY 15:26

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 5 05/04/90

MAY 17, 1989

SUBJECT MATTER

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	199
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	199
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	201