130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. The chaplain for today is Pastor John O'Neil of Knobs Hill Baptist Church in Tower Hill, Illinois. Pastor O'Neil is the guest of Representative Noland."
- Reverend O'Neil: "Shall we pray. Dear Heavenly Father, we thank You today for the Lord Jesus Christ. We thank You for Your goodness, mercy and grace. Dear Lord, we thank You for the opportunity that we have to approach Your throne this morning on behalf of this Assembly. Dear Lord, I pray that Your will and way be done. Give these men and these Ladies leadership of the Holy Spirit, Dear Lord, in making the right decisions. Father, we know that the responsibilities are great. Father, we thank You for those who have dedicated their lives to serving our state and our country. And we just ask You, Dear Lord, that You might have Your will and way to be done. Give them wisdom. And Lord, we'll love You and thank You and praise You for all that you do. In Jesus Name, I pray with thanksgiving. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "Led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of American and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect on this side of the aisle the excused absence on official business, Representative Jim Keane."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik, do you have anyone?"
- Kubik: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, would the record reflect that Representative Stange is excused today."

130th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1990
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 116

 Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present.

 Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to rise and point out to all of our colleagues that the Chicago White Sox beat Oakland last night and now are one game out and having the second best record in baseball. So, I just want everybody to remember that the Chicago White Sox are also playing in Chicago."
- Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1930, offered by Representative Wennlund; 1931, DeJaegher; 1932, Weaver; 1933, DeJaegher; 1934, Dejaegher; 1935, Dejaegher; 1936, McAuliffe; 1937, Weller; 1938, Black; 1939, Black; 1940, Leitch; 1941, Preston; 1942, Preston; 1943, Preston; 1944, Preston; 1945, William Peterson; 1946, Johnson; 1947, McNamara."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, both sides of the aisle have examined the Resolutions. They are agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 161, Parke. Senate Joint Resolution 122, Topinka. Senate Joint Resolution 131...strike that...no Sponsor. Senate Joint Resolution 153, Capparelli."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Olson.

 Myron Olson."
- Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the House Republicans will have a conference in Room 118 immediately. House Republicans 118 immediately for

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

about a half hour."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. The Gentleman has asked for a Republican caucus in Room 118. And we will stand at ease until approximately 10:15."

Speaker McPike: "Come to order. Special Order of Banking, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1488, Representative Cullerton. the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2083. Representative Hicks. Education, Second Reading. Representative Kirkland. Does anyone on the House floor have a Bill they would like to have called? Environment, Second Reading. Representative Breslin. Representative Currie. Criminal Law. Reading. Representative Munizzi. 1613. Read the Bill. Clerk. Out of the record? Out of the record. Representative Tony Young. State and Local Government. Senate Bill 1617, Representative Steczo. Representative Brunsvold. 1776, Representative Cullerton. Senate Bill 2036, Representative Saltsman. Mr. Saltsman? Senate Bill 2131. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act concerning land in Kane County. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The original Bill involves a transfer of estate property and this adds three transfers of property given to me by Senator Welsh, Senator Karpiel and Senator Barkhausen effecting property in their district. And I move for those to be added...passage of

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Do some of these involve transfers to private individuals, is that correct?"

Kirkland: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "For example, Mallard Vista Hunting Club I think is one of the recipients from the Putnam County Conservation District?"

Kirkland: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Is there any...are there any appraisals on file with regard to the land?"

Kirkland: "At this stage I don't know, but I believe the...let's see does the one involving Putnam County not...hold on one second...right, the one involving Putnam is not a transfer of state property as such, it is our authorizing transfer property by the...by a conservation district, I believe."

Cullerton: "Okay, the rule says that...the rule 34(g)...it talks about no Bill authorizing or directing the conveyance by the state of any particular interest in real estate to any individual, other than a governmental entity may be voted on unless we have a certified appraisal. So, the question is, 'Are there any transfers from the state to someone other than...to someone other than a governmental entity?'."

Kirkland: "In these three that combination does not exist in any of these three transfers."

Cullerton: "Okay. Well, let's just go through them. The...it talks about the Director of Corrections conveying to the Saint..."

Kirkland: "Going to a municipality."

Cullerton: "Is that the City of St. Charles?"

Kirkland: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Okay. And then authorizes the Lake County Forest

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Preserve District, which is not the state, to convey property to a bank in Waukegan."

Kirkland: "Correct. In fact..."

Cullerton: "So, there is no appraisals, but do we have any idea how much the transfers are for?"

Kirkland: "I'm sorry. Say that again."

Cullerton: "Do we know how much...we know that the property in St. Charles is for \$660,000. What about the other? The value of the land in the other two parcels."

Kirkland: "Both of those transfers I believe are...are, one side is transferring property to the other. In turn in exchange for property being transferred back to the first entity."

Cullerton: "It's a trade?"

Kirkland: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "So, the bank of Waukegan has got some land that the forest preserve district wants?"

Kirkland: "That's the way I read it. Yes."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2171, Representative Keane. Human Services, Second Reading. Representative Phelps, Senate Bill 2277? Insurance, Second Reading. 2099, Mr. Countryman. State Government Administration, Second Reading. Representative Stern. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1904. Senate Bill 1904."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1904, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Campaign Practices Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Stern and Rice."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1904 is the bipartisan agreed Amendment that adds three items to Senate Bill 1904 as follows: that we will if we pass this have deputy registrars at the Secretary of State's Drivers Licensing Examining Facilities able to register voters in the county in which that facility exists and in adjacent counties insofar as the...employees are able to arrange their residence. There is a portion that deals with unconditional resignations from public office being non-withdrawable, that's probably not a legitimate word. And there is an item which says that if you sign the Fair Campaign Practices Code and you do in fact say an unkind thing about your opponent you are subject to criminal prosecution. That is the total Amendment, and I ask your support."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2299, Representative Munizzi. Labor, Second Reading. Representative Kulas, 1501. Civil Law, Second Reading. Representative Cullerton, Senate Bill 2267, Senate Bill 2308. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2308, 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?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 basically embodies a Bill we passed out of here, Representative Cullerton's Bill, which was House Bill 3220, but makes some minor technical changes relative to the way notice is sent to a debtor in a wage deduction action. They are very technical. And I would urge its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say
 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is
 adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor amendment #3 offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Amendment #3 is...mirrors House Bill 3112, that we passed to the Senate, which was delayed in Rules and it clarifies a distinction between a wage deduction affidavit and a bank garnishment affidavit. And this is also a technical Amendment to clarify the Act. I would ask its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Amendment #4 also mirrors a Bill we sent to the Senate, and it...in a wage deduction action would say...it would state that all fees and costs are to be paid

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

by the debtor. The only difference between this and what we passed over to the Senate was that we indicate in here that if a court in its discretion determines that the costs are inappropriate, such as a cost by a typographical error, etc., that the court can void those costs. Otherwise, it's the same Bill we sent to the Senate."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment 4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

This is the same as House Bill 3114, which was delayed in Senate Rules. This clarifies the \$2000 personal property exemption. It got almost 90 votes when we passed it out of here. It states that the personal property exemption does not apply to wages. The only difference between this and the Bill we had sent to the Senate is that I agreed with the people negotiating on this legislation that it...we would try this for a test period of one year, so that we can see particularly in Cook County what affect this change will have on the wage deduction procedures and I move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Amendment. The law has been unclear in this area, but one thing is certain. What this Amendment will do, it will allow a greater exemption for those who have more assets and more wealth than most poor people, who need help will not be able to apply the exemption to income. The courts have been using this provision to allow those with the least amount of assets to

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

take full extent of the law. What this Bill is actually going to do is it will make people on low incomes quit their jobs and go on public aid, rather than try to pay some of their obligations. So, if you want creditors to be in a position to be able to garnish some money rather than drive working people on to public aid, you'll vote against this Amendment. I ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I vociferously oppose this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Vociferously? Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I rise in support of the Amendment. I realize that this is something which...tugs at the heart strings of many people who represent a poor constituency. But the converse is that a creditor can in some cases never get any relief. And this law had never been intended to shield debtors from any type of relief, or from any...obligations they may have incurred, and that's how it's being used today. The courts in Cook County have construed the law to give a new exemption for every single occasion in which debt is incurred. It has proved unworkable. It has proved unjust. is a silly...problem that brings us back here. would think the courts would be smart enough to error of this type of interpretation, but that is precisely what brings us back. This restores some sanity to the law. You must remember, in all occasions, there is already an eighty-five percent exemption of all wages. This wild card exemption is on top of the eighty-five percent exemption. Its use in every single instance on behalf of a single debtor has resulted in creditors having no ability to satisfy their judgments. This is how the law always should have been. It is how the law was always intended to be."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Williams: "Yes. I rise in opposition to this because it is my understanding that the Sponsor doesn't want this on his Bill. It is not the merits that we are arguing here, it is the right of the Sponsor to have the Bill in the form that they wish. On that basis I rise in opposition to this particular Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Section of the Act we seek to Lang: amend discusses personal property exemptions. This Act was only intended originally to deal with persons...with someone's personal property, so that the creditor couldn't take your bed or your furniture or your refrigerator or something you needed to live on. It never intended to apply to wages. And because there is a hole in the statute and has been for some time, this Amendment merely seeks to close that up. We're not attempting to take away an exemption that someone has. We're merely attempting to clarify the Act, so that creditors are paid and debtors know what they are supposed to be paying, and I move its adoption."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

 voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the

 record. On this Amendment there are 63 'ayes', 43 'nos'.

 Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 is identical to House Bill 3404, which is sponsored by Representative Steczo and Myron Olson, which passed 110 to nothing. It's a request of the Supreme Court dealing with deposits in the court, and it was tied up in the Senate Rules Committee. So, we're

130th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1990
- affording the Sponsors of the Bill a ride with this Bill and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All those in favor say
 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the

 Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Wolf."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment simply incorporates the provisions of House Bill 2918 into the Senate Bill 2308. House Bill 2918 passed out of this Assembly by a vote of 109 to 1. It simply changes the terminology from 'pension plan' to 'retirement plan'. And I would move for adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "It is a change in terminology only. And that change in terminology does not represent an intent to change the law in any way...can you hear me?"
- Wolf: "I can't hear you, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I just want to make the point that the change in terminology...terminology does not represent a substantive change, is that correct?"
- Wolf: "No. It does not."
- McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment was brought to me by a former Member of the House of Representatives, who is now a judge. And in his experience as a judge he has discovered that some attorneys have been delaying the court process by using...or perhaps abusing the current law with regard change of venue. And this Amendment is designed to address that situation. And it basically says that once a case has been assigned to a judge for trial or assigned to a trial call that a Motion...a petition for a change of venue shall not be granted if the trial judge has ruled on a Motion for a Continuance. So, what's happened is that a case is set...assigned to a judge for trial, the...even though the party had answered ready for trial, when they get there they ask for a continuance. the iudae denies the continuance, then they say okay, well I really want a change of venue. And that's just a way of getting around judge's turning them down in their Motion for a Continuance. So, the purpose of this is to say you cannot use that subterfuge. Now, it should be clear in our legislative intent that we are not talking about a case say in outside of Cook County, where it is first assigned to a judge. We're only saying that when the case is assigned to judge for a trial, as in a situation where it has been indicated by both parties that they are ready for trial. It's only in that case where this Motion for change of venue shall not be granted, if they have already moved on a Motion for a Continuance. Вe happy to answer any And I would appreciate your support in the questions. Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge."

Younge, W.: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Cullerton: "Absolutely."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Younge, W.: "Would this Amendment have the affect of changing the presumption that if a defense counsel asked for a change of venue after it had been assigned...the case had been assigned to the court, then the assumption would be that it is merely dilatory in all cases?"

Cullerton: "No. No, not at all. If you are assigned to a court for trial, you still have the right to ask for change of venue and that shall be granted. It's only if you are going...it's only if you answer ready, you're assigned to a court, you ask for a continuance, which is turned down, then you can't ask for a change of venue. So, if you want to a change of venue, you just have to make sure you ask for it. Rather than first trying to get a continuance."

Younge, W.: "Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be inappropriate for the General Assembly to assume that there would be no circumstances that would arise after a...an attorney asks...announces ready, that he would need a change of venue for his client. I think it would be inappropriate to believe that there would be no circumstance that would come up in any trial that merely because the attorney had at one time announced ready for trial that he would not need a change of venue. It think it is a...imposition on the rights of the defendant to then say that in all cases that act of asking for a change of venue is dilatory. I don't think that it is appropriate for this General Assembly to take that right of change of venue, which is a very, important right to a defendant because you do get prejudiced judges against clients. You do get situations where it is only fair and just. Ιt might even be a situation for example like that in...there's a newspaper article and that we will be in a situation where a defendant is a...subjected to trial by newspaper. could all...there could be various reasons why it would be

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

appropriate if we really want to guarantee a fair trial to a defendant, it would would be appropriate to ask for a change of venue in a circumstance where the lawyer had thought it was appropriate that he be ready for trial, and I think that to adopt this Amendment and take away the right of a change of venue from a defendant here on the House floor is just so totally inappropriate, because it...usurps the individual situations of each trial. It goes to the heart of our system of jurisprudence in that a person has a lawyer, a person has a judge and the state has its prosecutor and to wipe out all of that and bring that to the House floor is inappropriate, and this matter should be voted down resoundedly."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

"Thank you. I rise in support of this. This problem which this addresses to my knowledge occurs only in Cook County. Now, it is possible that maybe Madison County has the same system, I don't know. In Cook County it is possible for a judge never to have ruled on any pretrial yet be the trial judge. And that's just because Cook County court system is set up in the way it is set up. All this Bill does is say, if by the time the case has to the trial judge as opposed to a pre-Motion or a pre-hearing Motion judge, then you shall not be granted, if judge has previously acted on a Motion for All this does is tell the court in Cook continuance. County by the time it gets to trial, and if you've ruled on a Motion for a Continuance, venues are out. Now. let me tell you in the rest of the counties I am familiar with, venue has to be acted upon very, very early in the system. Very early in the life of the case. And that is because any judge who is the trial judge who will also have heard pre-trial Motions. And the current law addresses only that

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

later situation. All this does is recognize the practice in Cook County. It results in no injustice, as a matter of fact it is in response to abuses of the system that the judge makes this presentation...or I should say Representative Cullerton makes this presentation on behalf of a judge. I rise in support of this. There's nothing wrong with it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in opposition to this Amendment. Yes, it does apply to Cook County mostly. It may apply to other counties as well, but what a...what this has to do with is if you as an attorney representing a client discover that the judge is or may be perceived as being biased one way or another in this case asking for a change of venue, so, your case could be heard before a judge who nobody could suspect of intentionally or unintentionally being biased against your client in a case. When you ask for a change of venue, what you are in essence doing is wanting to be certain that you get a fair judge, who does not have a preconceived notion as to what the outcome of the trial may be. And I don't mean there is something heinous here. A judge have known some relative of one of the litigants, a judge may have prior to becoming a judge been in business with the attorney on one side or another of litigation, and where the judge may in fact not be biased one way another at all, still a client may feel that he or she is not getting a fair trial, and what every litigant right to is to feel they are getting justice out of the courts. And that's what change of venue Motion deals with. So, I think that simply having ruled on a Motion for Continuance, if after that Motion is ruled upon, an attorney hears that there is a potential conflict

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

interest, that this judge may have and therefore ask for a change of venue, that makes perfect sense. I would ask you to seriously consider...consider this Amendment and to defeat it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. I think I'm going to...since people are...don't understand what the Amendment does either because I didn't draft it properly, or I didn't explain it properly, I'd like to withdraw the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. And the Chair passed over a few Bills. And the Members are now asking that they now be called. For what reason do you rise, Representative Brunsvold?"

Brunsvold: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to let everyone know that my seatmate here is three dozen years old. We have a large cake over here and everyone...want them to know that she's on the diet group for the Democrats, but we'd like to invite first the Republicans to come over who are a whopping 3630 pounds to get the first piece of cake. The Democrats are very slim and only 2985 pounds."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas. Under Labor, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1501, Representative Kulas. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1501, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical and family responsibility leave. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young in the Chair."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 does exactly what the Amendment establishes. If in fact by enacting 1501..."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Excuse me, Representative. Excuse me, Representative. Representative McPike, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- McPike: "Yes, thank you. I'm going to ask that the Sponsor of the Amendment to withdraw this Amendment. And instead of taking a lot of time explaining...explaining it. I'm going to ask him to withdraw it. I apologize for interrupting you, Representative Mautino, but since 1983 we have had a policy on this House floor, that we would not vote on any U.I. Amendments unless they were agreed to by labor and management. And we have stuck by that agreement for seven and a half years. This is the eighth year of that agreement. It has worked very, very well. We have an Agreed Bill process that both Representative Daniels and myself and Rock and 'Pate' Philips, the Speaker have all that nothing will be voted on on this House agreed to, floor unless it is agreed to by both labor and management. And by introducing a U.I. Amendment on the House floor, it violates our Amendment. And therefore, I would ask you to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Would you just take the Amendment out of the record.

 I'd like to talk to Representative McPike."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Take the Bill out of the record. On the Order of Consent, appears Senate Bill 1744, Representative DeLeo. Mr. Clerk, Representative DeLeo asks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1744 from Third Reading to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Read the Bill on Second Reading,

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1744, this Bill has been read a Second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Amendment #1 is just a technical Amendment. It has been agreed to by the minority spokesman and it's been cleared by both sides.

I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1744. On that question is there any discussion? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. Representative DeLeo now asks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 1744 to the Order of Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Hearing no objection, leave is granted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. The Order of Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1512, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1523, Representative Turner. Out of the record. Bill 1591, Representative Levin. Representative Levin, Senate Bill 1591. Out of the record. On the Order of Environment, Third Reading. Appears Senate Bill 1508, Representative Balanoff. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1838, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2110, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. On the Order of State and Local Governments, Third Reading. Appears Senate Bill 1484, Representative Bugielski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1484, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Economic Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. Senate Bill 1484 creates the Economic...Illinois Economic Development Board, which is composed of the Governor, four Legislators and seventeen appointments made bv the Governor representing business, labor, agriculture, education and the general public. The Board is required to develop a long-term economic development strategy for The Board would be doing some of the following Illinois. duties, which would be securing private sector, community and citizen support in the economic planning process, assist DCCA's research efforts in identifying economic growth and diversification opportunities, appropriate state role in new product development, evaluate the performance of long-term benefits of existing state economic development programs, promote...propose new ways of promoting public, private and state and local partnerships to foster economic development. This Bill came over from the Senate. It passed in the Senate 54 - 0. And I ask your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate
Bill 1484. On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,
Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Young, A.: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Black: "Representative, I didn't hear in your remarks. I believe the Bill was amended in the Senate, and as amended, I think the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs now supports the Bill. Is that a correct assumption?"

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Bugielski: "Correct, Representative."

Black: "Thank you very much. That's all I wanted to know."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?" Speaker Young, A.: "Indicates he will yield."

Ropp: "Generally, the state has been somewhat involved in this since we are at least the number one agriculture exporting state in the nation, and the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and Agriculture and Lieutenant Governor all are involved in promoting University of Illinois among other institutions, is involved in research development. What more will this Body be able to do than we currently are not doing in the state?"

Bugielski: "Well, they are going to be working in hand in hand with DCCA and...with the people that will be on the board we're getting a great diversification of people on the board. And they will be letting DCCA know their concerns and what they would like to see and some of the help they will be...you know where DCCA can really work hand in hand helping these new businesses and the existing businesses that are in the state right now."

Ropp: "Yes, but doesn't DCCA do that right now? I mean, when a business is about to go out of business or leave Illinois why DCCA jumps right in there and attempts to retain them, the Legislature attempts to provide economic, financial support. We already have programs that we have loans that are available for small companies to get involved in the...world trade..."

Bugielski: "Representative, currently DCCA form...they currently formulate the five year plan for Illinois. And these plans suffer from a lack of specific proposals and a failure to prioritize these needs, and this is what this board would

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

hopefully be helping DCCA overcome."

Ropp: "Okay, will this board have a staff, then or is it administered in the Department of Commerce and Community ."
Affairs?"

Bugielski: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear it."

Ropp: "Will this board have a bureaucracy, a staff involved with it?...or will it work within the Department of Commerce..."

Bugielski: "No...These people are not paid. It is not a paid board or anything else...It is not a large bureaucracy going along with that."

Ropp: "In other words you might classify them as somewhat professional consultants?"

Bugielski: "Yes. They are professionals, Representative. They...Members will be made up...the board will be composed the Governor, four Members of the General Assembly, one appointed by each legislative leader, one representative of a large manufacturing company employing more than one thousand persons, one representative of small manufacturing company employing less than one hundred people. one representative from a middle sized manufacturing company between one hundred and one thousand employees, three representatives of organized labor, one representative of a major financial institution, representative from each agriculture, education, retail industry and service industry, one economic development professional and five citizens at large. So, it is a wide diversification."

Ropp: "I almost have the feeling though that we are duplicating a number of efforts that we have. And I suppose, let's say, every bushel of corn or every car or every garment or every...ton of steel that we can sell and if this will help it, will ultimately help our economy in some way. I sometimes think that we get overburdened with...innovative

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

programs that we already have programs like them in place. And that's my only concern."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski to close."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the House, you've heard some of the debate on there. You've heard of the whole gambit of the Bill. And the board I think would be a very efficient board. It would really be an asset to the state and to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1484 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 101 'ayes', and 7 'nos'. Senate Bill 1484 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McPike in the Chair. Senate Bill 1571, Representative DeJaegher. Senate Bill 1619, Representative Hartke. Senate Bill 1649, Representative Hicks. Senate Bill 1709, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Nursing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1704 is a Bill that addresses the shortages of nurses in Illinois, which is a...which is exasperating the current health care crisis in our state. Hospitals and nursing homes and home health agencies are reporting vacancies as high as 25 percent. This Bill in essence establishes a loan...a nurses scholarship program. And requires that 10 percent of the monies deposited in the Nurses Dedicated Professional Fund is to be used for nurses scholarships. In addition this Bill will grandfather in 1995, at which time we will reevaluate and check out to see

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

how effective this Bill is going to work. We think it is a good idea. It will help with the nurses shortage. And I think this Body should vote for the passage of this Bill, and I ask for you to join in supporting me in this."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hultgren: "Just a question Terry and I probably should know this, but where does the money in the Nurses Fund go now?"

Parke: "It goes into the Nurses Dedicated Professional Fund and that money is...sits there and is...and this we think is a way that when that money sits in that fund that 10 percent of that fund ought to be used. And the fund, again for those of you, to remind you is...comes from the fees that the nurses themselves provide."

Hultgren: "But what are we using that money for now? That's what

I'm getting at. In other words, we're going to take 10

percent in for scholarships and we're going to take that

away from what purpose?"

Parke: "Well, the...they are used for the Department's expenses and administering the agency's responsibility to nursing."

Hultgren: "So, it's used to pay the operating expenses of the Professional Regulation Department, is that...?"

Parke: "That is correct. And when those annual expenses are taken out, whatever is left, we want 10 percent of that money to be used to supplement and support nurses...people to go into the nursing profession."

Hultgren: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Any further discussion? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Indicates he will yield."

Leverenz: "The question is perhaps maybe next year, could we take

130th Legislative Day

June 15. 1990

part of the dedicated funds and maybe \$50 million could maybe supplement the State Police budget?"

- Parke: "Well, it is my understanding that that certainly is something that is being thrown around to help balance the various budgets, but I don't think it's going to be even close to what you are alluding to, though I think you are doing it in jest. So, I am sure that innovative Representatives, such as yourself will be looking for ways of balancing the state budget in many, many ways. One never knows what..."
- Leverenz: "What you're asking for is a diversion from that which the original dedicated fund was established for, is that correct?"
- Parke: "Well, if you look at it in the pure sense, that would be correct. But when you look at it in terms that this money is paid by the nurses...the people in the nursing profession themselves, and knowing that these nurses are being overworked and being that there is not enough nurses to man the floors and take care of the ill people in this state, I don't think this is inappropriate diversion of money because they paid for it themselves. And ultimately, it is going to benefit them."
- Leverenz: "Let me rephrase or reask the question. Is what you are doing with this Bill a further diversion in something new and different than that which the dedicated fund was established for in the beginning?"
- Parke: "You know, Representative Leverenz, I'm not sure I know the answer to that question. I don't know what the original purpose of the dedicated fund was. Perhaps maybe in the thinking of the people that established the dedicated fund was that that money might one day be used to help nurses themselves. So, I wasn't there and I can't answer your question, Sir."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Leverenz: "If we allow the nurses to dictate then how their money that they pay into the dedicated fund is spent, would it also ring true that that which state income tax that they pay in to the Department of Revenue that they would want to then tell us how to spend that also?"

Parke: "Well, Representative Leverenz, I think you are confused.

I don't think the nurses are dictating anything. I think this is a good idea, and it has been brought to my attention through the Hospital Associations that are desperately in need of nurses that this would be a good idea. Nurses Associations certainly support it. But I think this is my idea now, and I think I'm asking you as well as a hundred and eighteen other Representatives to determine whether or not this is a good utilization of money. And so, I happen to think that this is a good idea and ultimately we're going to judge that by this vote. I think it is an inappropriate use of terms."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Dedicated funds are established to police a particular agency or profession's activities and in this case the nurses for which...pay in the money ask that the money be dedicated to policing the agency. It was not contemplated that those that pay into the dedicated fund...that those who do not wish to go to school then would subsidize those who do wish to go to school. And this becomes a diversion and a for which a dedicated fund should not be made. I think it is an admirable idea to find additional monies to nurses to school, but the money was raised off the backs of the nurses to police the agency, rather than to benefit a Although the Gentleman's idea may be well founded and admired, this particular Bill should die with your red vote and I would ask that everyone vote in the negative."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke to close."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, one must again remember what this money is used for. It is used for...paying for the administration of the nurses to make sure that they are in compliance with the law, to make sure that the nurses are up to speed on their...under their medical studies, to make sure there is enough information to provide the nurses so that they can continue to do a good job. But one must remember, they are the ones that are paying this money, they are the ones that are putting it in, and after all the expenses of administering this program are done, and we have excess and that is all we are talking about is the excess funds, once those funds are made available, we're only asking for 10 percent of that money to be allocated to scholarships, so in fact we end up with more nurses, who put more money into the dedicated fund. We happen to think that this is the proper approach because of crisis that we have in the health care arena in providing quality nursing. We think this is a step in the right direction for the health of the citizens of this state. And I rise and ask that you support this worthwhile piece of legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill 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 109...Homer, 'aye'...On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', 5 'nos'. Senate Bill 1709 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Bowman. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears SJR 192. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 192.

This is commonly known as the Pay Increase Resolution, or

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

the Rock Plan, which was approved by the Senate recently and responds to the report, which was filed by Compensation Review Board. Compensation Review Board provided in its report two recommendations. were many, but they can be grouped categories. Catagory 1 recommendations are immediate increases in salaries for various elected officials including judges, General Assembly and appointed...and senior appointed officials in the executive branch. Category II recommendations have to do with annual costs of living adjustments. It was the compensation review board's recommendation that we and the executive branch officials and the judges have what amounts to an automatic COLA, or cost of living adjustment year by year, pegged to the employment cost index for public administration occupations. I point out that this index is typically less than the CPI, or the consumer price index, which is very often used in cost of living adjustments. It...furthermore there would be a cap on the cost of living adjustments of 5 percent so that in no year would the cost of adjustment be greater than that. So, Senate Joint Resolution 192 eliminates the immediate increases by rejecting those recommendations and then approving the separate Motions which were contained in the same for the annual cost of living adjustments. So, I believe that this is a fair way of proceeding. I've always believed that this is fair way of proceeding. a Legislators are working people just like anybody else. things...life...would be a whole lot simpler if everyone got annual cost of living adjustment, just like mechanics and welders and clerical support staff and indeed even the...public employees who work as salaried employees for the State of Illinois, under the direction of the General

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Assembly. So, I move adoption of 192. I would just point out this is my last Senate Joint Resolution."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise Daniels: support of Senate Joint Resolution 192, which commonly referred to as a pay increase for state employees. There are over one thousand individuals in this state that work for the State of Illinois that I believe deserve this very reasonable and modest compromise on a pay increase. As you know, it doesn't call for any increase in during this very difficult budget time, but does set forth the measure in which there can be reasonable levels increases. From 1975 to 1988 salaries of Legislators rose less than either the Illinois or national per person or the pay of Illinois state and private sector employees. I believe as to the legislative part of this it is very reasonable. As it relates to the judicial branch and cabinet officials and others that are effected by this I believe it is a necessary item to help attract reasonable and stable individuals that will continue to serve in the highest of fashion of state government. Because of the nature of this compromise, because o f the recommendation bv Senator Rock. and because of the bipartisan compromise that existed in the Senate in a difficult year. I feel this is a reasonable approach to the level of income of employees throughout Illinois. Consequently, I intend to support Senate Joint Resolution 192 and recommend it for adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 192?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Cullerton to explain his vote."

130th Legislative Day

June 15. 1990

Cullerton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. "Yes. In supporting this measure I point out that most of the money that will be used will be used to pay the salaries of judges. And while many people think that the judges make a lot of money. comparison to the amount of money that is made by people out of law school by only four or five years, or known as associates, they are making about the same right now. And when you think about the decisions that the judges make it affects everyone of us, you want to make sure that you have someone who doesn't want to be a because he wants to get a pay raise, but you want to have a judge who's got the experience and the knowledge that is necessary to make those decisions. And I think when you consider the fact that you want to attract the best and the brightest, and you look at a city like Chicago, where an associate makes an average of \$70,000 a year, it's not unreasonable to pass this resolution, which really is in effect a reduction. The pay commission as you know asked and suggested that a 14 percent pay raise be given to the judges. This Motion is in effect a reduction of that, is a reasonable one. For those of us who are Legislators, if we don't want this money we can give There is a precedent set. You don't have to call a press conference, but most people who vote 'no' dough and they don't have to. They can give it back if they want. But the main beneficiary of this would be judges. I think that it is necessary for us to give them this COLA, so that we can continue to attract talented and bright judges."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can truly stand here and say that I am proud to be a Legislator. It is a tremendous opportunity and a real

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

privilege that really few people in the State of Illinois ever have. And the fact that almost anywhere I go, anytime during the day, somebody always asks a question or needs assistance, and I'm proud to be able to say I'm willing to help you. All too many times we are away from our families and that's one of the biggest drawbacks about being a Member of the Illinois General Assembly. But I think there is a certain positiveness that we can feel by being able to serve other people. And the fact that we...frankly, I don't think I've ever turned down an invitation to go at least to two or three meetings every night anytime anyone ever called, and it's a pleasure to go. It's a pleasure to represent and to serve. And in order to maintain good quality people seeking these kinds of positions, so the Legislature...politics can be an honorable profession. I think we need to pass this Resolution to give some slight increase in salaries, as has been previously stated. Body since 1975 up until 1988 have seen salaries throughout the state increase by a 153 percent, for the state employees, which we have in fact voted on ourselves each and not gotten any criticism. We have seen those salaries increase 149 percent. Ours that we have voted on have increased 78 percent. There is some inequity there. but nevertheless, I think this is time to provide in salaries and to provide some kind of an insurance that people will be good and will be honest will seek these kinds of positions in order to serve the State of Illinois. It is a modest increase, but one is fair and I'm happy to stand in support of it at this time."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of all the salary increase
Bills I've seen I think this probably is one of the

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

fairest, because at least I think it represents a moderate increase for a hard working people. But I'm going to vote 'no' and the reason is I do think...and I'll tell you why. Is because I really think we need a citizens' legislator Body and not salaries that we get to the point that we stay here for the rest of our lives. And I know many of our good friends are here a long time and I've been here a long time, so I'm not critical of that, but I just think someplace we have to have it to the point where we can at least be more responsive, come and go a little bit more to get new ideas and fresh thoughts, and I know elections will do that. But I think when we get to the point of trying to full-time types of salaries for not ourselves necessarily totally full-time work, except when we're going our legislative job, but the rest of the time we are pretty free to come and go and set our own hours. I think salaries are pretty...pretty fair now. And I know many of us if we don't run, and many of you are worried about November, these people are pretty happy to serve at the salaries we're making now or they wouldn't be running. I quess we have the choice, if our salaries aren't enough, I guess we do have a choice as Mr. Cullerton said, we don't have to take them..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, while I have great respect for Representative Klemm, I think he is all wet. I think this...this pay raise proposal is outrageous and yet I have a green vote up there. I'm going to vote for this outrageous pay increase proposal. I think it is way too little, way too late. Four years of no pay raise at all. An this is a cost of living allowance that will take effect a year from now, so that will be five years without any pay raise at all and

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

then that pay raise will in essence ties you in to current For some outstanding Members of the House and Senate and the executive branch of government, all of whom could spend their time much more profitably for themselves and their families and other lines of endeavor, than doing this but as Representative Rock...Ropp indicated it is a pleasure and a privilege to serve in public office and that is why virtually all of us do it. I don't think that is adequate. I think we had a pay raise proposal from the pay raise Compensation Review Board that was adequate and did make sense. And we ought to have adopted that, but I also have a conflict of interest in that my father judge and may be effected by this and I'm running for re-election in November and if I am re-elected I may and would also be affected by this and I don't know if the Supreme Court wants us lawyer Legislators to be involved in conflicts of interest, but taking that consideration I'm still going to vote my conscience and vote a pay raise for the Supreme Court and for all of us."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I would not want my 'no' vote to be misconstrued with regards to my support or nonsupport of giving judges pay increases, the Governor a pay increase. of giving We're aivina ourselves а pay increase. But clearly within Compensation Review Board proposal we have boards and really want to make a point, whereby people either meet and serve on a board quarterly or meet once a month sometimes they phone in their meeting. And they are drawing down salaries of \$35,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 and think that is where there is no merit and that is when a COLA increase is absolutely inappropriate. And I think it is really an issue we need to examine within this Body."

130th Legislative Day

June 15. 1990

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In case there is any confusion about the 'no' votes up there. I think that the record should clearly state, and I think we all understand this, but for the record those 'no' votes are because we just don't want a pay raise. There's...it's not a fact that we want to accept the Compensation Review Board's recommendation. We reject the recommendation. We reject this compromise. We reject the pay raise."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I for one will definitely not receive any compensation out of this increase in salary. But I am voting for it, because there are a large number of people here who do deserve the raise. I do not think that the Legislature is overpaid. I think they are grossly underpaid considering the amount of time that they have to put in. Our time is not limited to the time we spend on the floor. Some of us work seventy eighty hours a week. And I think that it is only fair that those people should be paid more. Now, I'm feeling very strongly that my...the person who will replace me has a right to be properly compensated for what he does, even though I assume he will not do it as well as I would do it myself. But this is a good compromise, and I think it is extremely fair, support it. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I agree with Ralph Barger and I'll vote my age I quess, and be sixty."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich votes 'aye'. The board is still open. Representative Terzich votes 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. DeLeo 'no'. Leverenz 'no'. Santiago 'no'. Any

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990.

further? On Senate Joint Resolution 192 there are 60 'ayes' and 54 'nos'. And the House does the job...does adopt Senate Joint...and the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 192 and this is now law. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the vote by which SJR 192 be passed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I move that that Motion lie on the table."

Speaker McPike: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Matijevich's Motion is adopted. Alright, continuing on State and Local Government appears Senate Bill 1571. Representative DeJaegher. Want to call the Bill? Mr. DeJaegher? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1619, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. Bill 1649, Representative Hicks. Senate 1847. Representative Bowman. Senate Bill 1965, Representative Cullerton. Senate Bill 1994, Representative DeLeo. Bill 2012, Representative Peterson...William. And 2014. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2014."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2014, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by assigning short titles to various Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2014 is short titles being done by the LRB. It is a cleanup Bill. Very voluminous and it's Agreed Bill on both sides of the aisle. I ask for its approval."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. I have an inquiry of the Clerk. Has Amendment #1 been adopted on the Bill?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is on the Bill."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes' and no And House...and the Senate Bill 20...Representative Cullerton votes 'aye'. On this Bill there are lll 'ayes', nο 'nays'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Order ٥f Business appears Senate Bill 1619. Representative Hartke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1619, a Bill to amend the Smoke Detector Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Senate Bill 1619 amends the...is the Smoke Detector Act in the State of Illinois. And makes a change to where it would allow not only the hard wired smoke detectors in hotels and motels, but also those battery operated smoke detectors and I would be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield? I assume he will. What does this Smoke Detector Bill do?"

Hartke: "This would allow hotels and motels in the State of Illinois not only to have installed the hard wired smoke detectors, but also those that are AC battery...or battery operated smoke detectors. Under current law, hotels and motels have to have hard wired smoke detectors in...in all rooms in a certain date. This would allow those hotels to have battery operated...that would work just as well unless there is substantial remodeling done in the motel."

Terzich: "So, you want to basically change the Fire Code with

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

regard to smoke detectors, is that correct?"

Hartke: "That is correct."

Terzich: "And at the present time...that the...these hotels and motels are required to have a wired smoke detector...detector system and you want to allow them to be able to put in battery operated smoke detectors."

Hartke: "That is correct. As well as they could have the hard wired as well if they so desire."

Terzich: "Well, with regard to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, what this Bill is attempting to do is change the Fire Code with regard to smoke detectors. We passed legislation in this House requiring smoke detectors in public facilities. It has proven to be a life saver, and one of the most vulnerable places that could be by fire, is of course a residence such as hotels and motels. The proven best system for smoke detectors have been ones that have been wired and that work on the electricity, not on battery operated. We've seen many, many fires not only in the City of Chicago, but throughout the State of Illinois whereby if the smoke detector was operating that it could have saved a number of lives. For example in many instances the people remove batteries from the smoke detectors or they are making too much noise. The batteries are not replaced and it is extremely dangerous when a smoke detector is required. This legislation simply state that hotels and motels could install battery operated deals, which is to me...would be in violation of the Fire Code and I strongly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Black: "Thank you. Representative Hartke, if I heard you correctly, what your Bill does is to simply say that a...an existing motel, and let's just talk downstate, an existing motel built thirty years ago on one story could keep their battery operated smoke detectors and would not have to convert to a hard wire system, correct?"

Hartke: "That's correct, Representative. You know, I think it would cause an extreme financial burden on those motels and so forth, but if they substantially remodel that hotel, then they would still be required to put in that hard wire, or build a new one and so forth, then it has to be with hard wire, but to required all hotels and motels in the State of Illinois to tear out their battery operated smoke detectors and so forth and put in hard wire I think would be totally wrong. I think that is why this legislation is needed."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I think Gentleman has a very reasonable Bill. Without his Bill you simply will drive out of business most every mom and pop motel in downstate rural Illinois. He's addressed a very critical issue to motels who don't even make enough money to pay the cost of retrofit and hard wire. safeguards in the Bill. If they extensively remodel, or build new, the safeguards are in the Bill. I've I've seen there battery maintenance chart. these motels. They are very, very careful...well on occasion I do travel folks, what the heck. I even have my wife here to back me up that we go together, okay? But let me just say...By golly now you've embarrassed her, or was it me? I don't know, but anyway I was called out in my...my district talk to a motel manager who showed me the figures. figures to hard wire would cost more than the motel made in

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

profit for the last two years. The Gentleman has a reasonable Bill to a problem that you cannot ignore. I would urge your support for the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had quite a bit of experience in this field. And I just want to let everyone here know that most of the cities that we represent have already got standards. And probably ninety percent of them have city ordinance that you must have hard wire smoke detector in...in your residence and in businesses. These battery operated ones, if you go to different places all you can see is the screw hanging on the wall where they have been stolen or the batteries have been taken out use on kids toys and not put back. The city code in our city says that every house should a hard wired unit and if you want to put three or four battery operated ones in your house, that's fine. That's what I did. I do have one hard wire unit in my house. But I also have two of the battery operated. And I must say every once in a while myself that the battery operated one...when the batteries are worn out haven't replaced them in time, but I still have the backup. I don't think they are that expensive, the cost of the smoke detector is not any different than the battery operated smoke detector. And what you are going to be doing here now is you are going to be taking some of the cities that you represent and you are going to be voting against their ordinances. So, I think this should handled from the local level. And if these hotels, the ones that can't afford it, these are the ones that people burn up in, because they don't have the safety standards. So, I think we're making a mistake here. Due to Sponsor it's probably of one of the first Bills he has ever had that I've even voted against. But for the safety and

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

for the going back to our units of local government, I think we're going to be voting against them..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this. There are several facilities within the 97th district that I represent that went to great expense to comply with the last edict from the Fire Marshall's office in order to do that which was recommended at that time. And now with the new one coming out that they have to deal with, with the expense that it takes, and all of those problems, this is a common sense approach. It does not...I repeat...it does not place anyone in danger and in fact there are those who would indicate this is a more responsible, a more safety conscious approach, and I'm wholeheartedly in support of the Bill and the position it takes."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke to close."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think we've heard the debate. I think it just makes common sense in downstate Illinois and throughout the State of Illinois that we allow battery operated smoke detectors in the motel and hotel rooms, but as we stated in the law, when...when new construction is done or substantial remodeling then hard wire could be installed in these motels and hotels. In response to the discussion about individual local governments, fire regulations and SO forth. regulations would apply anyway. It...hard wire is much more expensive and would put many businesses...small businesses out of business, and I think that this piece of legislation deserves your support. It passed in the Senate 53 - 0. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

130th Legislative Day

June 15. 1990

On this Bill there are 93 'ayes', 14 'nos'. Senate Bill 1619 having the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2222, Representative Steczo. Senate Bill 2306, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2306, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the demolition of buildings. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill regards to the cost incurred by a municipality or county for the repair or demotion of dangerous, and unsafe, or uncompleted and abandoned buildings. And what the Bill provides is that a notice of lien of those costs must be filed by the municipality and the county in the office of the recorder of titles, within, current law says, sixty days, this Bill says one hundred and eighty days. It is the only change and I would appreciate your vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion The question is, 'Shall this Bill 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 113 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 2306 having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Housing, Third Reading. Senate Bill 722, Representative Capparelli. Out of the reading...out of the record. Services, Second Reading. Appears Senate Bill 2277, Representative Phelps. The Bill's been read a Second time. Mr. Clerk, I believe it was held for a fiscal note."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2277 has been read a Second time.

 Fiscal note has been filed as it is amended by Amendment
 #1."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1649, Representative

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Hicks. Returning to the Order of State and Local Government. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1649."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1649, a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate License Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1649 as amendment...amended with Amendment #1 is a Bill that we will put in place for a vehicle Bill to be used for the fall for any type of federal changes in the Appraisers Act, as we think is going to happen between now and January 1st of 1991. It is my intent to put it into conference and leave it for the fall. I ask for passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall this Bill 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 108 'ayes', no 'nays'.

Senate Bill 1649 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Human Services, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1960, Representative Flowers. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1960, a Bill for an Act in relationship to minority males. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1960 was on the Consent Calendar and the reason why it is off now, is because I had asked to bring it back for the purpose of an Amendment. It deals with the task force of studying black men. As we've heard or read in the newspaper that black men are becoming extinct because of the drugs and the crime. And we are asking that there be a special committee put together to do a study as to the reason why. And to see if we can save our young minority

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

males out there. And I would ask for a favorable vote on Senate Bill 1960." $\,$

Speaker McPike: "And on the Bill Representative Black."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, since the Bill deals with minority issues can you explain to me why Amendment #1 was put on the Bill, that reduces the...from two to one the number of appointments to be made by the House Minority Leader? I mean, we are a minority?"

Flowers: "Representative Black, again with all due respect..."

Black: "Well, thank you very much."

Flowers: "...we're talking about two kinds of minorities here.

And as to the reason why the number was reduced you would have to discuss that with the Sponsor of the Bill in the Senate for she asked me to put that on and that is exactly what I did."

Black: "Well, does it also effect then the Minority Leader's appointments in the Senate? As well as the House?"

Flowers: "In the Bill, Sir, it says that the President of the Senate would select one person appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate as well. And two persons appointed by the Speaker of the House. And it goes on. It is very self-explanatory in the Bill."

Black: "Well, I appreciate that. And you know I hold you in the highest regard, but since we are on the Minority side we are always a little bit...a little bit concerned when our representation is cut down, and I know you can appreciate that."

Flowers: "Sir, again we're talking about two kinds of minorities.

And it is far from being that you are an endangered species."

130th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1990
- Black: "Well, as I look around the floor, I'm not so sure of that. We may be an endangered species."
- Flowers: "That's a matter of opinion. That's a matter of opinion, but that's not pertaining to the Bill, Sir."
- Black: "Well, I'm not so sure that we can separate the issue of minorities..."
- Flowers: "Yes, we can. We can."
- Black: "...but I appreciate your...I appreciate your perseverance in answering the questions, but if we are going to deal, Mr. Speaker with an issue concerning minority issues and studies, then it only makes reasonable sense that you don't cut the representation of the minority party. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Breslin in the Chair. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, on the question."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "She will."
- Ropp: "Representative Flowers, why is it that you are in this Bill discriminating against females?"
- Flowers: "Representative Ropp, I am not discriminating against females. I am talking about minority males."
- Ropp: "Well, them you have to assume then that minority females have no problem. Have no social or economic woes that you are attempting to address by establishing this special task force, is that not correct?"
- Flowers: "Representative Ropp, when I get ready to address the issues of minority females, I would do so at that particular time. But right now this Bill is only pertaining to minority males. Minority males are the ones that are having problems...well, there...all kinds of people across these United States are having problems as far as drug abuse and other things such as that. But right

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

now it has been in the newspapers, it has been on the television, that there is a problem because of the drug abuse, and the killing of one another, and you know about the lack of minority participation in the job force in this state alone. So, there must be a problem. It may have pertained to, Sir, from the time of slavery, but we don't know that, but we are going to try to address the answer to the question."

Ropp: "Well, I think that you have...have a very honorable Bill here. I certainly support it. I might say that in my judgment we already have a program like that. It is called school."

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

Flowers: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I truly wish for favorable passage of Senate Bill 1960.

There is a problem in our community with minority males as far as the problems that we are having, as far as drugs are concerned, as far as schools are concerned, as far as housing is concerned, as far as jobs are concerned, as far as alcohol abuse is concerned. I would appreciate if you could help me address this problem. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 2 voting This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Human Services appears Reading, Senate Bill Representative Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2076, Representative McGann. This is a Committee Bill.

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

the record. Senate Bill 2113, Representative Didrickson. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2113, a Bill for an Act to amend the Steroid Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2113 the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Bill. Ιt does three things with regards to the Steroid Control Act that we have passed. It expands the list of substances included in the definition of anabolic steroids to include those newly developed steroids. It clarfies the use of anabolic steroids for agricultural purposes, because right now the statute does not apply to persons using such steroids appropriately for agricultural use. And thirdly Department of Professional Regulation and the State Police the authority to conduct investigations under this Act. I move for its approval."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Senate Bill 2113. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2113 All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order...Special Order is the Order of Insurance. Third Reading. Representative...On this Order of Insurance there are Bills sponsored by Representative Wolf and Mautino. Senate Bill 1568. Out of the record. Bill 1962, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1962, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to ... "

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. The next Order...Special Order on Transportation, Third Reading. The Sponsors are:
Hicks, Homer, Novak and Mautino. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1491, Representative Hicks. Mr. Hicks? Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1974, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1974, a Bill for an Act in relationship to transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is essentially a shell Bill that is for the purpose of allowing at a later date in conference committee the implementation of the recommendations of a planning study committee that is now looking into the feasibility of constructing through privatization a toll road linking Chicago to Kansas City. That feasibility study is on-going. We anticipate the legislative recommendations will be forthcoming, and this Bill would go to the Senate and then come back on nonconcurrence to be put in a conference report to be used this fall if in fact the feasiblity study is completed at that time."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1974. On that question the Lady from Cook,
Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I would hope that those people who are interested in diminishing the role of the Prevailing Wage Act with regards to adding tremendous costs on public works, let alone now private commitment with regards to this tollway that is being proposed between Chicago and Kansas City. Yesterday there was an Amendment that was added on to this proposal with regards to the Prevailing Wage Act would have to be in force. And I think those of us who really are

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

trying to make certain that we can build roads as efficiently and as...without additional tremendous cost that the Prevailing Wage Act puts on us. I think this would be a 'no' vote and I would suggest that for those people who are interested. In answering the question, you know 'why are these roads that we are building so expensive?' Well, this is just one simple act right here, the Prevailing Wage that adds tremendous costs on to those. And I think a 'no' vote is the appropriate vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, let me address the...the construction of our highways, was the subject of one of the subcommittees, which we held some hearings on. According to the federal sources that we reviewed, the cost of new construction, less than twenty percent is composed of labor, over fifty percent is composed of material and the approximately thirty percent is for profit and equipment. So, the labor costs, contrary to the conventional wisdom, are a smaller percentage of our construction costs than is generally assumed. So, I don't think this would add significantly to the cost of construction of a tollway between Chicago and Kansas City."

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

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Homer, I realize this is a vehicle
Bill, but could you tell us, let's say the...the expressway
were recommended as an interstate expressway, how does this
fit into the Illinois State Tollway Authority?
Would...would our Tollway Authority be the administrative

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

agency for Illinois?"

"That is one of the questions that would have Homer: to be resolved. it would be the current tollway Whether authority or a newly formed tollway authority is not yet been resolved, and it is not now in the Bill."

Matijevich: "Well, Madam Speaker, I've got some problems with that because what we have done in our area, Tri-state Tollway, which the bonds were...could have been paid off in 1980. Ten years later rather than paying off the bonds what they did was increase the tolls from 30¢ to 40¢ to pay for the North-South Tollway. And now the new philosophy is that tollways can be built anywhere and we will be paying forever in the Metropolitan Chicago area. And now we have this new idea that we are going to have an interstate tollway. What it tells me is that the Highway Trust Fund is now being used to write off the federal deficit, and we are going to be...have to pay twice now for roads. We're going to have to pay through Motor Fuel Taxes and now they are going to quit not only building interstate highways. They are going to not have enough money to repair them, and so we're going to...if we want new highways we are going to have to build tollroads on top of it. It is, I think, irresponsible. The federal government is not using the funds as they should. They are using the Motor Fuel Taxes to write off the deficit, and now we are going to have to pay new tolls. I think it is the wrong way to go. And therefore, even though this is a vehicle Bill. I am going to vote 'no' to show my displeasure with it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer is recognized to close." "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I would hope this Bill will...would not create any problems for a 'yes' vote. This would be a...pretty embarrassing after the federal

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

government has appropriated at our urging and request \$500,000 for a feasibility study. And this Bill is simply being offered and will be put in a conference report held there until the completion of that study to determine which would be available. If in fact the study reveals the construction of a private tollway between Chicago and Kansas City is feasible, that study would then let...specific legislative recommendations. There is nothing in the Bill now that we have to vote on. I t is simply a vehicle to...to allow the possibility of this highway to be constructed through private How can we be against that? This was a program that was advocated twenty years ago. A freeway between Somehow it got put on the back Kansas City and Chicago. burner and was never built. Since then highway...federal highway dollars have withered away. There is no realistic possibility that the federal government is going to build an interstate highway between Chicago and Kansas City. a result all those citizens in Illinois who live along corridor that would benefit from this highway have lost. And so, here is the only chance that we will ever see highway which could bring millions and billions of dollars of economic development to Illinois. And this is simply a vehicle that is there for the purpose of amending with provisions of a recommendation of a feasibility study. you are going let's wait to see what those matters are for heaven sakes before taking a position on the merits of Bill that we don't know what the provisions of which will So, I would urge that we all support this Bill, put it in a conference committee. And let's take a look and argue and debate the merits when the matter comes back before us, if it does in the future. So, I would urge and move the passage of Senate Bill 1974."

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1974 pass?'

 All those in favor vote...excuse me, Representative Ewing.

 The Gentleman has already closed, Representative Ewing..."

 Ewing: "Then I'll explain my vote. Go ahead."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Fine. The question is, 'Shall Senate
 Bill 1974 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those
 opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Ewing,
 one minute to explain your vote."
- Ewing: "Madam Speaker, I think there are some things of importance in here. We have attached the Prevailing Wage requirement to this, which would be a private project. And something some of us may not think is that important. And we have some disagreement over whether twenty or forty percent of the cost of these roads may be labor. I think probably it is more towards the higher number, forty percent than what was said in debate of twenty percent. Keep those things in mind and we can always take care of this matter at a later date."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer, one minute to explain
 your vote."
- Homer: "You know this is just beyond me, how people could oppose this vehicle Bill. You know we in western Illinois have languished for many years without any highways because for one reason or another, neither the federal government nor the state government has seen foot to put...seen fit to put expressways in our area. So, what we do is decide, well, let's get together and see if we can come up with private investor dollars to build a road for ourselves. And let's commission a study and see if it is feasible. So we appeal to the Congress to give us some money to help to determine whether such a road where we build it ourselves, pay for it ourselves is feasible. And you in the metropolitan area that have ample supply of roads, many of you are voting

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

'no' on this Bill. And you were blessed by federal monies and state monies to build your highways, but yet when we in western Illinois want to build it ourselves with private dollars and we have a vehicle Bill that's waiting the results of a feasibility study and you're putting red votes up on the..."

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Your time is up, Sir. Would you like to bring your remarks to a close?"
- Homer: "I'm just pretty...pretty disgusted. Because I think that is unfortunate. I would simply urge you to give us a chance to see if this project is feasible. That's all we are asking to do."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leitch, one minute to explain your vote."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Homer is exactly correct. Indeed, one of the greatest losses we had when we lost Governor Ogilvie, due to his courage, was we lost the supplemental freeway program, some twenty years ago. In that program were both the Kansas City Chicago expressway and Route 121, which finally we're nearing completion. There has been a lot of hard work done to try and figure out a creative way in these times some twenty years later to get the Kansas City to Chicago expressway. And I would like to appeal to Members on our side to help in this effort and pass this vehicle Bill out. I'd appreciate some help."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren. One minute to explain your vote."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my vote. Let me echo what Representative Leitch said. This is not a partisan matter. This is a bipartisan matter that has been worked on by all the folks from central Illinois in trying to get this road

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

built. And I would encourage some of the folks on this side of the aisle to help those of us in central Illinois, who have been active in this project including myself and Representative Leitch."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to explain my vote."

Speaker Breslin: "No. You have already spoken in debate."

Didrickson: "And one of the reasons was that what made this a partisan..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Didrickson. Turn the Lady off. You were recognized because I expected you to ask for a verification, and you are certainly recognized to do that, if you wish. Have all voted who wish? Representative Saltsman, one minute to explain your vote."

Saltsman: "Well, beings you shut her off. I don't have to explain my vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Go right ahead. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no' and 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 2167, Representative Novak. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2239, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2239..."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. The next Order is the Order of Children, Third Reading. The only Bill on this Order is Representative Trotter's Bill. Senate Bill 1593. Out of the record. The next Order of Business is the Order of State Government Administration, Third Reading. The Sponsors are Capparelli, Phelps and Olson...Myron Olson. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1496, Representative

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Capparelli. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1497, out of the record. Senate Bill 1700, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1700, a Bill for an Act to create the

Cave in Rock Township Civic Center Authority. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now as amended this Bill has been used as a vehicle so to speak to authorize creation of several civic centers and to address the Alexander Pulaski Port District question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1700. On that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1700 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2150, Representative Myron Olson. Clerk, read...out Out of the record. The next Order is of the record? Public Utilities, Third Reading. Senate Bill Representative Hoffman...has the only Bill on this Order. Is Mr. Hoffman in the chamber? Out of the record. The next Order on Third Reading is Labor. Representative Saltsman has the only Bill, Senate Bill 1704. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Hoffman? Excuse me, Saltsman? Mr. Saltsman? Out of the record. The Order is Civil Law, Third Reading. Out of the record. next Order is Pensions, Third Reading. Representative Wolf

130th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1990
- has the only Bill, Senate Bill 1951. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1951, a Bill for an Act in relation to retirement and annuities. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1951 was amended in committee for the express purpose of putting this Bill in conference to be an omnibus Bill for pensions. And I would move passage for Senate Bill 1951."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1951. On that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1951 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 voting 'aye'...there are 99 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 15 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order is Criminal Law, Third Reading. The Sponsors are Hensel, Goforth, Weller and Trotter. Hensel. Goforth. Weller and Trotter. The first Senate Bill 1515, Representative Hensel. Out the record. Senate Bill 1702, Representative Goforth. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act to amend certain acts in relation to solid waste. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Goforth."
- Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This

 Bill provides that any person who dumps or deposits any
 place of garbage, trash or refuse on another person's

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

property shall be liable to the owner of the property for the cost of cleaning up and disposing legally of the illegal dump. Then as we put a couple Amendments on, one of them removes...prohibits any action being taken against a land owner, whose land garbage has been illegally dumped unless it was in good faith. And Amendment #2 adds an exemption to the JULIE Act for coal mining activities. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for adoption of Senate Bill 1702. On that question is there any discussion? discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1702 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2066, Representative Trotter. Out of the record."

Speaker Giglio: "Giglio in the Chair. Civil Law, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1736. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1736, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this

Bill as it came from the Senate, sponsored by Senator

Holmberg, amends the Medical Practice Act to revise the law

dealing with the operation of free medical clinics. In

particular it allows the...it allows for immunity to

doctors who provide volunteer services at free medical

clinics. This Bill came out of the Senate with a 55 - 0

vote. it came out of the House Judiciary with a strong

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

vote. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1736 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1736 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'd like to make a Motion to reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 1484 that previously passed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative from Dupage,
 Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bugielski?"

McCracken: "What is the purpose of your Motion? What do you want to do?"

Bugielski: "Yes...we're bringing it back because of an Amendment that inadvertantly was not put on. We thought it was."

McCracken: "And what would the Amendment do? Would it prepare this for a conference committee?"

Bugielski: "No."

McCracken: "You expect Senator Lechowicz to concur in this?"

Bugielski: "It put...it puts this board under the direction of DCCA, which was assumed. We thought it was taken care of, but it wasn't. But it is going to put it under an agency right now."

McCracken: "And you expect Senator Lechowicz to concur?"

Bugielski: "Yes."

McCracken: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Takes a Roll Call. By the use leave for the Attendance Roll Call. Hearing none, leave is granted. And the Motion is adopted. Senate Bill 1484 now is on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

- Speaker Breslin: "Clerk, will you tell me where House Bill 2277 is? Agreed Resolutions. Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 199. Resolved, by the Senate of the 86th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, June 14, 1990, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 19, 1990 at 12 o'clock noon, and when the House of Representatives adjourn on Friday, June 15, 1990, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 19, 1990 at 12 o'clock noon."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions now."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 153, offered by Representative Capparelli. Senate Joint Resolution...Senate Joint Resolution 201, offered by Representative Bowman and Currie. Senate Joint Resolution 175, offered by Representative Weaver and Black. Senate Joint Resolution 197, offered by Representative McAuliffe."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption..."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Also House Resolution 1949, William Peterson.

 And House Resolution 1950, by Weller."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Resolutions."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Any further Resolutions, Mr. Clerk? General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1948, offered by Representative McNamara."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on assignment. Ladies and Gentlemen,
 we just have to finish this business and then we have one
 more Bill, and then we are going home. So, it won't be
 much longer."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 196, Lou Jones. Senate Joint Resolution 179, Ropp. Senate Joint Resolution 162, Flowers."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on assignment. Agreed Resolutions."

 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 174, offered by

 Representative Weaver and Black. Senate Joint Resolution

 201, by Representative Bowman and Currie."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of these Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The next Order of Business, Ladies and Gentleman, is Senate Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Appropriation. Senate Bill 1783. It appears on page 5 on your Calendar. It's Representative Ryder's Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1783, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder asks leave to return this

 Bill to the Order of Second for purposes of an Amendment.

 Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is

130th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1990
- granted. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment...Floor Amendment #10 offered by
 Representative Stephens and Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. I also wish to table Amendment #2, which has previously been adopted. In which sequence would you care those Motions to be heard?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Motion should be heard first. So, present the Motion to table."
- Ryder: "At this time I would move to table Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. On that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #2 is tabled. Amendment #3...excuse me, Amendment #10 is now before the Assembly. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #10 is for the Department of Public Health. Corrects an inequity in their spending authority on the Women, Infant and Children Program so that we can be able to go through the end of the year. It does appropriate spending authority of \$9 million. The funds are all federal funds. Those funds are on deposit. And we would ask for favorable consideration of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 10 to Senate Bill 1783. On that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Amendment 10 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. Any further Amendments?"

130th Legislative Day

June 15, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Ryder now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1783 as amended this same day. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, Representative Ryder has leave if by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third again."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1783, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This makes appropriations to various agencies for fiscal year '90. It is a supplemental appropriation. We have dealt with the Amendments. This has been the subject matter of committee hearings. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Bill Senate 1783. On that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1783 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich now moves the House stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 19th. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And this House stands adjourned until Tuesday at noon, June 19th. We hope everyone has a happy and safe weekend. And Happy Father's Day to all the fathers."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINGIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

90/08/02

15:12:46

JUNE 15. 1990

Sa-1484	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
SB-1484	MOTION	PAGE	56
SB-1501	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
SB-1501	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	17
SB-1619	THIRD READING	PAGE	35
SB-1649	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
S3-1700	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
SB-1702	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
S3-1709	THIRD READING	PAGE	22
S6-1736	THIRD READING	PAGE	55
SB-1744	SECOND READING	PAGE	18
Sd-1744	MOTION	PAGE	18
	THIRD REAUING	PAGE	58
	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
S6-1783	· - ·	PAGE	58
SB-1904	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
S8-1951	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	45
	THIRD READING	PAGE	46
	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
	THIRD READING	PAGE	45
	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
	RESULUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	26
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0199	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	57
	SUBJECT MATTER		

SB-2306 THIRD READING	PAGE	40
SB-2308 SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HR-1948 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0122 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SJR-0153 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SJR-0161 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
SJR-0162 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0179 RESULUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0192 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	26
SJR-0196 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	58
SJR-0199 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	57
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	ı
PRAYER - REVEREND O'NEIL	PAGE	ì
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	16
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	22
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	43
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	55
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	57
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	57
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	58
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	60