132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Rebecca Dees of the United Methodist Church in Windsor, Illinois. Reverend Dees is a guest of Répresentative Noland. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Reverend Rebecca Dees: "Let us pray. Dear Creator God, who hath formed us and fashioned us from nothing into something. are awed in Your presence, You are bigger than all that we can imagine. And yet Your personal love for us, touches us deeply. That love flows freely out to us as delicate as a spider's web and as magnificent as a mighty oak. You are reflected in the beauty of creation. God, we know that You are everywhere, we know that You are in this place today. You hear the needs of the persons gathered, You hear of their pain, their loss, to death, divorce disappointment. You hear the struggles they face on a day to day basis. You hear, also, the joys and the high points of their lives. Lord, we know that You hear and understand all that we bring to you. Go with us this day as we into greater faithfulness to You, called joyfully to places of greater good and greater justice all of society. Let these persons know that they are appreciated and loved by the Body of Christ, that they a part of the constantly unfolding will of God. Free them to really know the great reward and the fulfillment there is in being true disciples of Christ. Help us, dear Lord, to know that as disciples we are not so much to be served as to serve, not so much to take as to give, but to be people faithful to Christ and Christ's teachings above all. To follow the great Commandment to Love our God with all our heart, mind and soul and our neighbors as ourselves. Pour Your unconditional love and acceptance down upon us,

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- renew and refresh us in the name of the risen Christ.

  Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Goforth."
- Goforth et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible with Liberty, and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich, do you have any excused absences?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, there are none on this side of the aisle."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik?"
- Kubik: "The Republicans are all here, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Take the Roll. 118 Members answering the Roll Call a quorum is present. House Bills, Third Reading. Representative Balanoff. Representative Giglio, do you have any Bills you would like called, Sir? Representative Giglio."
- Giglio: "I think, Mr. Speaker, we should have a caucus on both sides so that we can find out what's going on here and then we could really roll."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio in the Chair. Representative Giglio in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "On the Special Order Calendar appears House Bill 1512, under Education, Representative Steczo. Would you like to run that Bill today? Senate Bill. Representative Steczo, Senate Bill 1512. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1512, a Bill for an Act relating to drivers license. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. Senate Bill 1512 addresses an issue that this House and this

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

General Assembly has looked at on a few occasions in This Bill would amend the Vehicle Code and the School Code and it would authorize the cancellation denial of a drivers license for failure to maintain school attendance. This Bill provides that no license would issued unless a student is in school or is progressing toward a GED or an alternative education program. For first time, the first time the student would be in school and would drop out and would have the license taken away upon reentering school, upon starting completion of a GED or starting an alternative education program. That student would have his license...his or her license restored, however, the second time it would happen that license would not be reissued until the student was eighteen years old. This Bill has a July 1st, 1995 repealler. It is...many of the provisions have been worked out, we have...with the state board of education and others. It is a good Bill for the State of Illinois and a good concept and one that has worked in other states, I would answer any questions, Speaker, and I would urge the passage of Senate Bill 1512."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I reluctantly stand in opposition to this Bill. It seems to me that we are always trying to find some means by which to keep young people in school against their will, and that is not necessarily a good thing either for them or for the other students, particularly if the person who is there unwillingly becomes disruptive. But most of all, it seems to me that when we take our oath of office here it's a very simple thing that we swear too. We swear to support the Constitution. And I would remind you that in 1988 the Supreme Court of this State in the case of People

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

vs. Lindner held that the state cannot deny drivers licenses to people for non-motor vehicle related reasons. This is a non-motor vehicle related reason, it is unconstitutional and therefore we ought not to pass it. Finally, I ask you to think of the student who really does not want to continue in school, and was able to get a job but has no way to get there. If you take away that young person's drivers license, you have imposed an unspeakable burden upon that young man or woman, you have made it impossible for that person to go out and earn a living. But, once again, the essential reason is this Bill is unquestionably unconstitutional. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund. Representative McPike in the Chair."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I also rise in opposition of this Bill and to point out that if you don't believe Representative Cowlishaw about the courts ruling, certainly you'll believe page 3 of today's Tribune which very vividly points out that the courts have ruled that driving privileges can be enjoined only for driving related offenses. Since the papers never lie, certainly you've gotta believe that. This Bill is absolutely and totally unconstitutional on its face, be defeated. It would be ridiculous embarrassment to send this Bill out of the House its current form because it is totally unconstitutional and unenforceable. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yeah."

Ropp: "Representative, is it not true that this Bill allows students who have opportunities to work to be able to be exempt from the not having to take their drivers license

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

away, but as long as they have a job and are working that they will be able to have a drivers license and still work?"

Steczo: "Representative Ropp, you are correct the Bill does make provisions for that. There are exemptions in the Bill that allows that to happen."

Ropp: "Okay, so the statement that one of the previous speakers said is not absolutely correct..."

Steczo: "You are correct."

Ropp: "Is is not true that this Bill now has a sunset provision that allows for, I believe, five years of operation and then we take another look at it?"

Steczo: "Representative Ropp, not only does it have a sunset provision of July 1st, 1995 it also calls for reporting of information with the state board of education. So that it can be determined whether or not the program is working."

Ropp: "And is it not correct that it is the responsibility of this Body to help encourage people to stay in school so that we don't have to continue to provide them monies for being on public aid or unemployment or in the illiterate area?"

Steczo: "Absolutely."

Ropp: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Body, this is an attempt that, once and for all, we have a chance to encourage by this vote young people to stay in school because we feel that education is a number one priority and that students should get as much as they can out of school and at least graduate from high school so that they are prepared to go into the workforce. This Bill allows for those people who are the rare exceptions may have other un...may have illnesses or some unacceptable kind of excuse for them being out of school. That is taken care of. It also includes for those students who have work...jobs at

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

hand, it allows them to retain their drivers license. It is a good provision, a sunset provision, we ought to support it, it's time this Body begins to say to people throughout the state of this age, education is important, you should finish school it's our responsibility. I urge a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland. Mr. Kirkland, you're
   on."
- Kirkland: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Can you just describe in more detail the exemptions. Does the Bill describe a number of different exemptions and then just by the law allow them or does it set up some process by which a youngster and or his parents have to go to court or seek permission from some person, you know, about his specific situation?"
- Steczo: "Representative Kirkland, let me just indicate that in terms of exemptions, the Bill provides that pupils with extraordinary circumstances of economic or medical necessity or family hardship as determined by the local superintendent of schools can provide that exemption. So economic hardship, medical, what have you is taken care of."
- Kirkland: "All by a decision though of the local superintendent of schools."
- Steczo: "Yes, by the local scooperintendent...local superintendent and with the approval of the school board as well so there is a little local input there and local decision. In addition to that, we also provide an opportunity for a student that drops out of school to be able to immediately get the license reissued if he doesn't fall into the categories where the superintendent or the school board have authority, by reentering school or by progressing toward a GED or by enrolling in an alternative

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

education program. So the first time that that student drops out and then becomes enrolled or takes one of those three options. Immediately, the Secretary of the State must reissue the license. The second time around, if it happens, the second time then there is a limitation and the license cannot be reissued until the student is eighteen years old."

- Kirkland: "Alright, let me ask another question. This will apply to Chicago schools?"
- Steczo: "This applies to everybody."
- Kirkland: "Alright. And did you say the board of education also makes the decision along with the superintendent?"
- Steczo: "The Bill says, 'determined by the local superintendent of schools subject to the approval of the local school board.'"
- Kirkland: "So that means in my district or in Chicago the school board would have to make the final decision on every single case where an exemption was sought."
- Steczo: "If, in fact, they did not take the...provide the authority to the superintendent or at least have some final say. But the school boards meet often enough where I don't think it would be a burden or hardship."
- Kirkland: "The last question, just curious do you have any projections as to how many applications for exemption there might be in say the City of Chicago or statewide?"
- Steczo: "Representative Kirkland, I don't think we are in a position really to limit the number of exemptions. When you're dealing with economic hardship and medical necessity..."
- Kirkland: "Alright, I don't mean to limit them I just wonder if you have any...from a burden point of view I just wonder if you have any idea have a sense of how many application there might be. Considering the number of dropouts there

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

are and so forth."

Steczo: "Representative Kirkland, I'm not certain. I think you'd have to look not only in Chicago, not only at the number of dropouts but the number of students that have automobiles and vehicles available to them."

Kirkland: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the previous question is put. Representative Steczo to close. Everyone else can explain their votes. Everyone else can explain their vote."

"That's fine, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In closing, Senate Bill 1512 addresses an issue that other states have addressed and other states have found successful. This is the first time that such a Bill has had the support of the state board of education, because it contains the appropriate number of protections as well. If any Member of this House is familiar with teenagers and those approaching the age of sixteen you know how important it is for those students to get their drivers licenses. Their entire world revolves around getting the drivers license, yet, in order for to make that drivers license worth something, we need to tell them it's important to stay in school. important to graduate from school. Senate Bill 1512 is the perfect vehicle to do that and I would urge your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Sutker."

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

I really wanted to talk on this Bill. I'm sorry it

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

was...the debate was concluded. This is a conceptionally flawed Bill. This Bill should be rejected by this House overwhelmingly, let's not be beguiled by the talent of the Sponsors whom I respect...I expect all of us respect greatly. This Bill would create a cumbersome procedure involving the superintendent of schools, it would create a cumbersome procedure with respect to each and every school board on each and every exemption. The Bill is clearly unconstitutional, it's badly contrived, it's poorly put together, it should be renounced. I can't believe that there are going to be 55 or 60 people voting for this Bill under these circumstances, it should be rejected."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to vote red on Senate Bill 1512. We be about the business of trying to keep our kids in school, not trying to hurt them due to the fact that for whatever reason they drop out of school. We are going to deny them a right and a privilege to drive. This Bill should basically be about, what can we do to keep our kids school. We always want to react on the wrong side of any Daycare, Headstart, those kind of programs we don't want to fund. But yet when the kid falls on bad times, we want to tell him that because you've fallen on hard times your not gonna have a right to do this. Your not gonna have a right to do that. We need to see more red votes on Senate Bill 1512."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm so happy to talk to the Sponsor of this legislation over here. I have great respect for the Sponsors. However, I do not believe a drivers license would be a necessary inducement for education. I think one of the problems we might have today

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

is that young people are not being given intrinsic value of education and we want to continue and give them extrinsic value which obviously does not work. If we're going to have people on the road without drivers licenses, that's exactly what's gonna happen. Where gonna increase criminals in the State of Illinois. Young people who would never commit a crime, young people who would never have anything to do with the criminal justice system will all of a sudden be forced into being arrested for driving without a license. If we're talking about educating children, let's separate driving and having drivers license from actually doing things to keep young people in school. Let's talk about changing the curriculum and make them interested in what's going on. You know, when young people are interested in something they hang around a much Let's look at the curriculum, let's design some programs that will make them want to be in that Let's stop looking at the highway and the roads to increase our school system or improve it. Driving will not improve your school system or not driving a car. A drivers license is not gonna make a child want to learn. Let's look things that will make him want to learn. An improvement in the curriculum, an improvement in the delivery of those services. Let's change what we're requiring them to know. Let's change the method that we deliver those services to them and take education off the highways."

Speaker McPike: "Repre...Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

You know students can't stay in school for a lot of
different reasons. I think some stay there because
intrinsically they want to learn, they want to get an
education for it's own sake. Others stay because they know
that education today in this day and age is really

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

imperative to get a good job. You can't have one without the other. Other students who may not do so where...do so well want to play sports and want to be involved in other activities in school, in order to do that they have to stay in school as well. And some students, I strongly believe, will stay because they need a drivers license. In this day and age obviously you cannot really cope unless you have that facility and the license. And I think that students who may be at the bottom rung may, in fact, stay if they in fact have to be there to get that license. that's what it takes unfortunately to get those kids educated then that's what we should do in the General Assembly. We've tried a lot of approaches over the years and some of those have not worked. The dropout rate statewide especially in our urban areas, like mine and Chicago and other places is phenomenal. We, in the General Assembly I believe, have to do all we can to change that dropout rate, and try to help kids stay in school. If it takes for some kids taking away their license and making it hard for them to get that license without staying in school, we should do that. And therefore, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a very serious infringement upon one group of people's rights because of the failure of another group. The reason that we have dropouts is the failure of the educational industry to provide the necessary training and in a fashion that young people can enjoy and become interested in. We are, right now, planning to introduce another form of psychological corporal punishment to instill upon the young people of our state for their failure to conform to what the educational community thinks they should be doing. The

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

fault is not with the young people. The fault is totally with the educational community and their inability to relate to some of these students. In my district we have very few dropouts. And it's because we have excellent teachers. In other areas we have lots of dropouts and it's because of inferior teachers. But it is not the students fault that the teachers are not able to reach them. It's the teachers' fault that they're not able to reach the students. We should very definitely vote 'no' on this. It's not only unconstitutional, it's even unthinkable. Thank you all very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. As a previous speaker said, we should be in the business of keeping kids in school. How could a Bill be unconstitutional when we all know that driving is not a right, it is a privilege? And one that we can take away to keep kids in school. We in this General Assembly have attempted to pass several measures to help solve this problem. No one seems to want to support these. We don't want to keep kids in school till they are eighteen, now we don't want to take their drivers licenses away. I those who oppose this kind of legislation, you'd better come up with some alternative proposals because meanwhile we are sitting here in Illinois with over twenty five percent of our kids dropping out and it's а disgrace. Those of us who vote green want to do something about the dropout problem and we see this as one way to do that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. In addition to the very eloquent remarks that Representative Davis made concerning why this simply doesn't work. Can you imagine

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

what would happen if we had students who didn't want to be in school, who absolutely were committed to dropping out, but let's say in your community it may have worked and a child may actually have stayed in high school only and solely for the purpose of getting that drivers license. Can you imagine the kind of disruption that a student who has no interest in being in school, isn't lookina diploma, but is only looking as a means...at a means to drive a car around the block, what kind of disruption that students going to cause to the educational process and to the ability to learn of the other students in that class? Such a student is not a benefit to a school system it's a detriment to a school system. Monique Davis said it the very best, we have to make our schools a place where students want to learn. Where they can learn, where it is safe, where it's conducive to the educational process. urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 57 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. The gentleman ask for a poll of those not voting."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Levin. No further."

Speaker McPike: "Postponed consideration. Now the Chair would encourage the Members of the Body to call their Bills. The deadline for Third Reading Bills is Friday. But if the House is not in Session on Friday, then the deadline will be tomorrow. So the House would...the Chair would encourage you to call your Bills. Because if we're not in Session on Friday. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I have an inquiry of the Chair then in that case."

Speaker McPike: "Yes?"

Leverenz: "Would that be interpreted to mean, now?"

Speaker McPike: "Now."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Leverenz: "Praise God."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 1523, Representative Turner. Senate Bill 1523, Representative Turner. Senate Bill 1591, Representative Levin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1591, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1591 is a vehicle Bill, in the event that we need to do anything with respect to Chicago school reform. The intention is simply to put this Bill in the Conference. If the Supreme Court comes down with the decision before the end of the Session with respect to school reform. You know, then we can talk about whether or not we need to do something. Otherwise it's my intention that we not do anything at all this spring on the subject. But as I say there is nothing in this Bill in it's current form and we simply want to move it on so that it can go in Conference and be in posture if we need it."

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? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'no'. Senate Bill 1591, having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps. Representative Brunsvold Environment, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1838, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments number 2 and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Brunsvold and Novak."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 is a redraft of number 4 which was out of order yesterday. And it's a clean up of the Pheasant Stamp Bill we passed last year. It simply would say that birds raised on game farms that are raised and killed on the game farms do not require a stamp. This is in line with the duck stamp that is not required at these game farms also. Which the pheasant stamp was patterned after, it was mis...miswritten when we put the stamp on the game raised birds, at the public hunting...at the hunting areas. So it's a clean up technical Amendment, and I ask for your support in the adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill...Senate Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1838 now the underlying Bill contains an increase of 10 to 14 days of deer season instead of the present 6 to 10 days as is written in law now. That was the underlying Bill. Amendment #1 was defeated on the House floor. Amendment #2, of Representative Phelps a Bill we passed last year on handgun hunting of deers allows the Department of Conservation to set up the guidelines for that. Amendment

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

#3 was the Rock Cut debate we had yesterday. Amendment #4 was withdrawn and of course 5 was just added. So I'd ask for your support and answer any questions you might have."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question please?'

Speaker McPike: "Yes...Yes."

Currie: "On handguns for deer hunting, could you explain to me exactly what kind of handguns were talking about and why?"

Brunsvold: "Okay, this...we passed this Bill last year with over 80 votes and it's the same Bill it simply adds the word handgun and would allow the Department of Conservation to set up the season, the types of handguns which would not be the simple saturday night specials that we sometimes think about here. There is 41 other states that allow handgun hunting."

Currie: "But what kind...my understanding was that a lot of handguns would not be very effective against a deer. What kind would be? Assault weapon style handguns?"

Brunsvold: "No, this would simply be a handgun that, I would assume the Department of Conservation would not go any lower than probably a 357 magnum and up, and they usually have scopes on them. So it's a specialized tool for taking deer and they're used I said in 41 other states."

Currie: "And the Department of Conservation still opposes the underlying Bill?"

Brunsvold: "Well, they didn't oppose it last year but this year they're not really."

Currie: "This year they opposed the Bill in committee, and they still oppose the Bill?"

Brunsvold: "I don't know what the change has been, Representative."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Goforth."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Goforth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

  Representative you still got that handgun in there. That
  was that Amendment. wasn't it?"
- Brunsvold: "That was Amendment #2, Representative."
- Goforth: "Now, I want to get this right because basically I like your Bill. But I don't like this Amendment and I didn't like the other two Amendments on it. You leave it up to the Department whether or not we can use handguns is to their discretion or not?"
- Brunsvold: "No, the Bill simply inserts the word 'handgun' in two places in the Code. Now that simply allowed the handgun hunting. They would have to set up all the parameters for the type of weapon, the days of the season and so on. It is totally left to the discretion of the Department of how to regulate the hunting."
- Goforth: "Well, you know as I've talked to you before I just thing that you're wrong. I think if you turn people loose with handguns, it's bad enough we have handguns running around all over. You turn them loose in the woods, and I'll tell you there ain't gonna be a leave on a tree because everytime one of them breaths your gonna have guy 'boom, boom, boom' like that there quick drawing, and I just don't think it's the way to go. We've got bow and arrow season, the muzzle loader we're gonna introduce. We've got the shotguns and I just think it's too dangerous of a thing and I just, I'm sorry, but I can't support Bill as long as that Amendments on it."
- Brunsvold: "Wayne, I think as you and I have discussed in my view probably the safest hunter in the woods would probably be the handgun hunter. Because he is the most expert with his equipment."
- Goforth: "I understand what you are saying, if the guy is qualified and that and I know there is a lot of people

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

around that can do that's the most safest thing. But you're opening a door and there is a lot of people not qualified to use those handguns and their gonna be in the woods with them. And I just don't think that's something we ought to start."

Brunsvold: "As we also discussed the Department of Conservation would be allowed and I suggested that they do this. That if they are concerned about this than they ought to set up a special day situation where they would have to perform and then get their permit to hunt. And Conservation can do that under this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you, Representative, with the adoption yesterday of
Amendment #3 what's now the position of the Department of
Conservation on the Bill as amended?"

Brunsvold: "Well, they don't like Amendment #3 which is the Rock

Cut deer hunting that Representative Leverenz put on
yesterday."

Black: "Well, I appreciate your candor and I think you and I could probably agree on why they wouldn't like it. I guess the problem I have with Amendment #3 and you might wish to address this. It would appear that we might set a precedent that this Body could then come back and micromanage hunting in any area of the state as we've seen fit. And I'm not sure that this Body should be doing that."

Brunsvold: "We set up a lot of guidelines for hunting in areas.

Thirty other parks and I'm just trying to remember what the debate was yesterday from Representative Leverenz. But thirty other parks do not allow deer hunting and this has

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

become a an issue between Representative Leverenz and Director French so you know I hope, I'm hoping that they will resolve the situation and get both of them together so that this Rock Cut situation can be worked out and we could withdraw this Amendment. That's what I'm hoping, Representative."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now, the Gentleman has worked very hard on this Bill, but I think Amendment #3 takes what basically is a pretty good underlying Bill and really throws a monkey wrench into the works now want these questions to come back to this Body every year where we're gonna micromanage hunting rules and regulations anytime somebody has a problem with what's going on in this part of the state. Then go ahead and vote for this. Otherwise. I in all due respect to the Sponsor a think 'present' or a 'no' vote on this Bill might be the thing to do. Let them get it straightened out over the summer and we can come back and address the situation next year."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes; "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Barnes: "Representative, I'm not a hunter but I have a question for you. There is something that bothers me about the Amendment with the handgun. If someone comes in with a very small type of handgun will they just be injuring the animals or will they really be killing them outright?"

Brunsvold: "The balistics, actually the balistics of the handguns that would be required and I'm just assuming that Conservation is going to set the guidelines so that they will have the caliber needed and I'm sure that they will do that. But actually from 50...from zero to 50 yards a

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

handgun and a shotgun are probably as accurate and have approximately the same stopping power. At fifty to a hundred yards actually the handgun is more accurate than the shotgun. From the discussions I've I had. So I would say..."

Barnes: "Well, these guns based on...based on what Representative Goforth is talking about about some people, you know, just pulling out something strapped to their legs and going 'bang, bang' and not really killing the deer. That...that really disturbs me."

Brunsvold: "No...no that's not the problem. The handgun is not going to be that type of a weapon that you're going to injure the deer. I mean you have just as much situations with shotguns as you would with the handguns. There's really no difference in...in the type. If you hit the deer and take the deer properly, it's...both are going to do an excellent job."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I must rise in opposition to this Bill also. It just seems to me that we are singling out a group of recreational hunters on behalf of somebody feeling that they're moving in the right direction and a whole group of people are being punished because of a some kind of a disagreement. I agree with Representative Black that I think that we should vote 'no' or 'present' on this Bill and let the two parties get together and come up with a compromise rather than shoving this down...down the throat of bow hunters. I think this is bad precedent for this Body to set because if this Bill passes today, next spring we will have another one trying to exempt or replace another group of people that are doing something in

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

recreation and will continue to do that and affect people because of someone's personal misunderstanding with an agency or with a group. And so, therefore, I must respectfully rise in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this Bill. Unfortunately we have a lot of non-deer hunters as Members of the House. These deer hunters who hunt with hand weapons are highly specialized weapon built with scopes and used by relatively few people. But it is a growing sport across America. It is not any more dangerous than hunting with a rifle or type of a weapon. It is a growing sport and it's a group of sportsmen who deserve coverage and deserve to...to hunt deer with...with handguns. highly specialized and there are very few of them but it is growing sport across America. And...and they...they deserve the right to hunt the same as anybody with a rifle. It may be a few inches longer but just as deadly and just as useful in the sport of deer hunting. So I urge votes on this Bill. It's a good Bill that the underlying Bill is...is a responsible Bill and the extension of season and...and pheasant season is responsible legislation. I urge 'aye' votes. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. For those of you who do not realize there are 41 states that have adopted both of the provisions to allow deer hunting with the black powder and, also, the handgun. If we...I think this is legislation that would prove to the citizens and the deer hunters of the state that we are allowing every possible option that is safe and that is very effective in

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

killing the deer that we are overpopulated with. And most of you would travel with me in my district on a average of a week, I dodge or hit two or three deer with my vehicle just going in my southern part of my district. So we do have an overpopulation. This is a...offers some alternative ways of which we can do it in a sportsman way, safe way and also a way that we do not cripple or wound the deer. I appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

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

Most of the debate has been with regards whether it is right or wrong to hunt deer with a handgun. It probably was no accident the other day that on the...on the board, deer was misspelled and it was spelled dear and I want to make the point that we are not only talk about hunting deer. As far as I'm concerned, any time you put more handguns in the hands of more people, that's a mistake. And it is true that they will not only hunt deer, deer, but there are going to be some, dear. Some dear people that are going to be killed. This is a bad Bill. It's a bad concept. We should have less handguns in the hands of

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold to close."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to disagree violently with my rowmate. I think that is absolutely ridiculous to say that the people now that have the handguns and want to hunt deer are going to be more violent. That's...that's not right. That's absolutely not correct. Now that's not going to happen. These people are target shooters now. They use those guns for...for target practice and simply a different way like muzzle loading, deer hunting or bow hunting, or crossbow hunting with a handicap. It's simply their way of their...obtaining a deer. That's all it is.

people not more handguns. And I oppose this Bill."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Forty—one other states do it and I would ask for your support in the passage of Senate Bill 1838."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this legislation...I...I might remind the Members of the Body that this is extending the number of days in the season and the number of hunters will be scattered out more. And it will probably make safer hunting conditions through out the State of Illinois. Those hunters that hunt will be allowed to use the muzzle loading and pistols will be a season. The bow hunters are still hunting in the shotgun season. It's scattering out the hunters we have to harvest the deer population over a longer period of time. And I urge more green votes."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I may agree with the underlying Bill that's been suggested by the Sponsors. The Amendment that was passed yesterday in which we are attempting to micromanage the Department of Conservation is sufficient to cause the defeat of this Bill. I hope that the Bill is defeated with that Amendment on it. And I hope the Sponsor will recall it again. Table that Amendment so that we can pass the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 56 'ayes', 47 'nos'. Poll those not...not voting."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: Homer. Krska. And Terzich. No further."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this does receive the required number of votes, I'd like a verification of the

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Roll Call."

- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Brunsvold. Joe.

  Representative Homer votes 'aye'. Representative

  Brunsvold. Postpone Consideration. Environment, Third

  Reading. Senate Bill 2110, Representative Hicks. Read the

  Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2110, a Bill for an Act in relation to oil and gas. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Now or never. Out of the record. 2253,
  Representative Currie. Might not be getting back to this.
  Criminal Law, Second Reading. Representative Munizzi...on
  Senate Bill 1613. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1613, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is identical to Senate Bill 2020 which passed the Senate I believe with 33 votes. It makes it unlawful to keep a loaded firearm in a manner or location accessible to children under 14, since every year between 200 and 300 children are accidentally killed by...."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton, excuse me.

  Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of Order, pursuant to the Parliamentarian's rulings yesterday regarding germaneness, it is my unshaken belief that this is not germane. You stretch any definition by holding otherwise and consistent with your rulings yesterday. This clearly

٠.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

is not germane and let's have a prompt ruling and get this out of the record and bury this where it belongs."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken are you referring to the U.I. Amendment that amended a new Act? When you were referring to the rulings of yesterday?"

McCracken: "No, no, no. There was more than one ruling yesterday and..."

Speaker McPike: "The Parliamentarian was curious as to what your reference was."

McCracken: "Well, he's the one who did it."

Speaker McPike: "Okay."

McCracken: "This is not remotely related."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, the Parliamentarian says it is clearly, clearly germane. The Bill amends the Criminal Code and so does the Amendment."

McCracken: "But it is not horizontally germane, the underlying
Bill relates to a nonspecific intent crime,
recklessness...or reckless homicide by DUI and the
Amendment amends a different portion of the Code in a
matter unrelated by subject matter."

Speaker McPike: "It's horizontally germane. Representative Cullerton, proceed."

Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, this is identical to Senate Bill 2020 which passed the Senate with bipartisan support obviously it would have to to get 33 votes it makes it unlawful to keep a loaded firearm in a mannner or location accessible to children under 14. I mentioned earlier that between 200 and 300 children are killed accidentally by firearms that's the theory behind this legislation. Similar legislation was enacted in Florida. My understanding was it was enacted with the support of the National Rifle Association and that makes sense, too, knowing what we know about Florida that it

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

would not have passed without the NRA's approval and the sale of locking devices increased dramatically, and that's what the purpose of this Bill is, to increase the sale of locking devices so that we don't have accidental discharge weapons that kill children. So it makes unlawful keeping a loaded firearm accessible to children The Child Gains Act says to a firearm stored in violation of the Act the responsible person is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor that is the lowest misdemeanor we could come up with and that is indeed the lowest misdemeanor that exists in our statutes. Now, if the child uses the firearm to commit what would be a forcible felony or kills someone then the person is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. exempts access to firearms because of a person's unlawful entry to the premises, the owner of the gun may be civilly liable for three times the amount of damages caused by firearm with minimal recovery of \$100 damages and attorney's fees. It does not apply to gun owners, whose guns are illegally obtained and subsequently used to injure Now, I'm sure that most of you have heard about someone. this Amendment because, as I indicated, the Senate did pass the Bill. And it passed the Bill with the support of some people who normally vote with the Rifle Association, and I think one of the things that happened in the Senate was they Amended it and took all the civil causes of action out and they reduced the penalty from a felony to a misdemeanor. Now it's true that there is a criminal penalty involved with failure to have these guns protected and the opponents are gonna say, why would you want to make a criminal out of someone who has just had a tragedy happen to their child or someone in their family?' Well, the fact of the matter is the purpose of this criminal penalty is to encourage behavior. It's to encourage people to go out and

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

get the locking devices for the weapons, and I would hope that no one would ever be charged with this offense, but rather people would go out and purchase these locking devices as they did in Florida. That's the purpose of the Amendment, be happy to answer any questions and would appreciate a favorable vote on the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman."

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

Representative Cullerton, this was posted several weeks as
a Senate Bill in the Judiciary II Committee, was it not?"

Cullerton: "Yes, it was."

Countryman: "Did you ever call it in that committee?"

Cullerton: "No, I reached an agreement with Representative...if you want me to get into this I'll be happy to..."

Countryman: "No, I just want to know if we in the Judiciary II

Committee of the House had an opportunity to review the language."

Cullerton: "Well, I'll tell you what, since you raised it, and since your gonna, since you raised it let me tell you why I didn't call it. I agreed to not call this Bill in the Judiciary Committee in exchange for not having a political and a potentially parliamentary fight with the Republicans over the replacement of one of your Members on the Judiciary II Committee, against that person's will. And the question was whether or not that violated the Rules of the House, and but rather than get into that fight, I chose not to call the Bill and chose to have a debate on the floor with this Amendment. Do you question the ability to have Amendments..."

Countryman: "Now, on the...."

Cullerton: "...drafted and offered..."

Countryman: "No, no, no. I just wanted the Members to know that we hadn't had a debate in committee on this. Now when you

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

look at the..."

- Cullerton: "We did not have a debate in committee, I did not present the Bill in committee."
- Countryman: "So the first, well in the first paragraph, subparagraph A there are three things which you would have to do if you had a loaded firearm in your home and one of them is to have a secured...secured by a trigger lock mechanism, is that correct?"

Cullerton: "Right."

- Countryman: "Now if you had a barrel lock mechanism though, it wouldn't comply with the law would it?"
- Cullerton: "If you had a what?"
- Countryman: "A barrel lock, something that went down the barrel of the gun and locked that wouldn't comply. It had to be on the trigger."

Cullerton: "Right."

- Countryman: "Any other sort of mechanism would be a violation of the law and you could be found guilty, is that right?"
- Cullerton: "That's right."
- Countryman: "So, I mean, I guess I don't understand why the drafters of this Bill wouldn't have put it in a more generic sense to say some sort of lock mechanism that makes the gun inoperable."
- Cullerton: "Well, it's unfortunate we couldn't of had that debate in committee, because maybe I could have amended it to accomodate your wishes there."
- Countryman: "Alright, but then the second paragraph says that you would either, the gun could be loaded without any locked mechanism and you can put it in a secured locked box or container, but it doesn't define what that locked box or container would be, is that right?"
- Cullerton: "That's right, now do you want me to explain why not?"
  Countryman: "Yeah, sure."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Cullerton: "You know, I normally don't get involved with Bills dealing with weapons but I did about eight years ago, and I worked with the National Rifle Association and the Illinois State Rifle Association, and I passed a Bill with their approval and it dealt with transporting weapons outside your home or place of business in an automobile, and up until that time it was legal to walk down main street with your unloaded gun in your holster without any violation of any statute. And the NRA and the Illinois State Rifle Association and I came to an agreement and we passed a Bill that's on the books right now, that says when you transport a weapon it has to be in a secured locked box or container when it's in a vehicle, and I assume that the drafters of this legislation in the Senate chose that same analogy with regard to keeping their homes...keeping their weapons in their homes. But that's the theory behind it and that's the same, similar type of language that's found with regards to transporting it in a vehicle."

- Countryman: "Alright, and then it then the third alternative to ...keep you from being held under this law would be that you've placed the loaded gun in some other location which a reasonable person would believe to be secure from a minor under the age of 14 years. Does that mean it would be high in a closet or...?"
- Cullerton: "They tried...I would suspect that the Senate drafters tried to make this Bill so reasonable that it would be embarrassing to vote against it and that's probably why they put that particular paragraph in there."
- Countryman: "Do you think it will withstand a challenge of court scrutiny? As it sufficiently describes the conduct to reasonably apprise the public of what's unlawful conduct?"
- Cullerton: "As long as the lawsuit, you know I passed a law that required everybody to have a seatbelt on when they are in

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

an automobile and, Representative Brummer voted against that Bill and then when he became a judge he was the judge that declared it unconstitutional. So if you think that you yourself when you become a judge might have to rule on this, I would suggest you recuse yourself when that matter comes before you since you've raised this question on the House floor."

- Countryman: "Well, I'll tell you if you're the attorney you could raise that by Motion. The last point or last question I have for you is when it talks in subparagraph (b) 1, subparagraph (a) it talks about the cause, it says if a minor under the age of 14 years of age gains access to a loaded firearm and causes the death or great bodily injury with the firearm, but it doesn't say that the firearm has to actually be shot, the person could take the firearm and strike somebody over the head for instance causing them either great bodily injury or death and still be liable even though the firearm was not discharged."
- Cullerton: "I think we can clear that up with legislative intent, because it does say loaded firearm, so clearly the intent there is to have death caused by the discharge of the firearm."
- Countryman: "Well, yeah, that's what I was going to say shouldn't it have been the discharge of the firearm? You know..."
- Cullerton: "Once again you raised a good point that it's unfortunate we weren't allowed to call...we did not call this Bill in committee we could have raised that issue then. But I think there is not a big problem because it says loaded firearm and the intent clearly is to have it discharge and I think we could state that for the record."
- Countryman: "Now is this a, you know, you and I over the years have added a lot of criminal Bills and you've added 'knowingly' to a lot of Bills, is this a negligence

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

standard? I mean, can somebody be guilty of this offense by just being negligent or is there an intentional knowingly standard in this legislation?"

Cullerton: "Let me review the Amendment before I answer that, okay?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I'm answering a question. I'm just taking a moment to answer a question from Representative Countryman."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, alright."

Cullerton: "Well, I guess the mental state as stated in the Amendment which was the same as Senate Bill 2020. It's a Class C misdemeanor for a person to store a loaded firearm. If the person knows or has reason to believe that a minor under the age of 14 is likely to gain access. So I think it is certainly not a negligent standard I think there is a mental state there of having knowledge that..."

Countryman: "Well, doesn't reason to believe create some degree of negligence, I mean it's that what a person should have known sort of thing?"

Cullerton: "You know when you shoot wildly a weapon in a...let's say you stood in the center aisle and you started shooting around here you would have reason to believe that someone might be hit by that weapon. I think that's clearly a type of a thing which is criminal action and it's not a negligence standard right now under the current law. So I think that's the analogy."

Countryman: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill and the reason for my opposition is simply the fact that both the City of Oak Park, which I represent in part, and the City of

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Chicago, which I represent in part, currently have laws relating to handguns, and it's been my experience over studying this situation over the last several years handgun laws in both Chicago and Oak Park discriminatorily enforced against black people. In case after case, after case. Oak Park has a total ban on handguns. Each time in Oak Park a handgun is used in a legal manner and the only crime is the fact that there was a handgun present if it's someone who is white who uses the gun, then there is no charges brought and the handgun is confiscated. If there is someone black then he is charged with violating the handgun ban. I have the clippings here for anyone who doesn't believe me, but just a quick litany of some of the cases that I've been personally On March 14th, Daniel Perry who was white shot at a burglar in his house. The Oak Park Board said he was a victim and the law was not intended to prosecute victims. The gun was confiscated, he wasn't charged. On June about two months later a black man, Lamar Richardson, who wasn't even home, his house was broken into, his handqun was taken and used to shoot at his own son, he was prosecuted over a two year period even to the point where the young man who broke in his house was called in to testify that he found the gun in his house, and for that the charges against him were released...reduced. While Mr. Richardson, was being prosecuted for violating the Oak Park gun ban, a man named Eugene Manion was driving through Oak Park saw an altercation on the street, got out of the car with his handgun, hit a potential robber over the head and received a commendation. In Chicago ...in Chicago one of the most shameful instances I've ever seen, a man named Robert Holloway..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Deuchler. Excuse me for

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

interrupting but, Representative Deuchler is seeking attention for some reason."

Deuchler: "Inquiry of the Chair. We don't have this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "You don't have the Amendment?"

Deuchler: "We do not have the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "I think everybody else on your side of the aisle has the Amendment, Representative. So maybe you could borrow a copy from Representative McCracken. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Representative Young, proceed."

Young: "I'm glad you did because I don't think I have the complete attention of the House. But let me just relate four or five cases that happened in a row in the City of Chicago, regarding it's Handgun Ban Law. On April 11, 1987, Peter Silverely, who was white, shot a home invader no charges was filed the gun was confiscated. Four months later on October 4th, Robert Holloway, a 72 year old black man, his burglar bars were torn down in the middle of the night someone came in his house and he shot them. The shooting was justified but he was charged with illegal handgun use, his case lasted over two years, ten court appearances, he was charged to the fullest extent of the law. Six or seven..."

Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Young. Representative McCracken for what purpose do you rise?"

McCracken: "Yes, I'm sorry to interrupt but our pages have checked and apparently this has not been distributed, my copy is the floor file copy which gets to me before it's distributed generally. Would you check with your page and see if this has been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Clerk informs the Chair that it has been printed and distributed."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: " Representative Young, proceed."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Young: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll just conclude by saying the current laws we have are discriminatorily enforced against black people, this law will be even worse than the what will happen is someone whose child accidentally shoots themselves with a handgun will have the grief of a child who has injured themselves and then will be charged with this law that will make them a criminal because they were negligent. And it's my fear that the only people who will actually go to jail and be charged with negligence and be charged with criminal activity, because their own children were hurt are black people. For those reasons this is another series of bad handgun Bills and it will be discriminatorily enforced. doesn't make sense, it will not stop people from owning quns and all it will do is add another punishment to a situation. For those reasons I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Whatever way you want to veil this Bill. This Bill is gun control pure and simple. Every sportsmen's group in the State of Illinois and beyond the State of Illinois opposes this reason, this Bill and for reasons perhaps stronger than they opposed Bills in the past. The fact of the matter is that there is a number of activities in the course of life that cause more of a threat to individuals than the access of firearms. Various chemicals that are unattended, household items such as knives and otherwise that are left unattended, the fatality rate and injury rate is vastly greater from those than it is from firearms. fact of the matter is that in the last 20 years the number fatal accidents resulting from firearms has dramatically decreased. There is two more real

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

points to make. One is that the reason that parents and individuals have firearms available to them in in a good many cases is for access in the case of, in the case of home invasions and otherwise for self-defense This Bill as a practical matter renders those purposes. firearms completely unusable and eliminates the self-defense aspect of owning and possessing firearms. The right to bear arms so to speak, and the pure fact of the matter is that what could be a better Act for gun control without calling it gun control than making the reason people use and possess firearms unavailable and unusable so that the practical effect of this is that for the few fatal accident results who knows how many more greater, greater number of individuals their death or injury or otherwise their intrusion has been prevented by the availablity possible use of firearms. And the last thing is this, how are you gonna get to this ultimate determination somebody committed a criminal violation, by possessing a firearms accessible to children? There is one of two ways and both of them should be condemned by this House. The first way is a violation of every concept of civil liberties that we have. Are we gonna have the gun police that make random checks and check people's houses to make sure that they have their Drano and their guns properly controlled? That's a violation an intrusion of somebody rights, too, against unreasonable searches and seizures. The other way is the ultimate test of this Bill. The other way is in those few unfortunate cases, where there has been a firearm fatality were somebody's been killed or injured then the police find out about it and you have this scenario. You have somebody come into court four after they've lost their child in an accident, and the judge looks down at them and says it's unfortunate that

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

happened and I know your feeling pretty bad right now, but your gonna feel worse in the next few minutes because we are indicting you for an additional criminal offense, while the person sits there having just concluded a either a funeral or a visitation to a hospital. They said now your a criminal offense as well. quilty οf reasonable, that's not reasonable in any sense of the word, it's not reasonable with the history of this country and the reason that these people possess firearms and in the long run this Bill works contrary to the purposes that I know this is the Sponsor so sincerely believes in and for that reason this Bill...this Amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Al
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Ronan: "Representative Cullerton, this is an interesting idea but it's not really a new idea. I understand that action similar action has been taken in the State of Florida, is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "That's right, in the State of Florida, I understand the National Rifle Association drafted the Bill and supported it. The only difference in that in the State of Florida, however, Representative is that the penalty for this offense is a felony, whereas here in Illinois it is a Class C misdemeanor which is our lowest misdemeanor."
- Ronan: "So then in the State of Florida which I from my recollection is not the most liberal state in the union.

  In fact, I understand many Members of the General Assembly wear a sheet when they go into their official duties down there, they are now the liberal bastion that's leading

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

forth with this kind of a concept, enact it into law and then make it a stiffer penalty than we're proposing."

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Ronan: "Do you have any idea why the NRA in Florida must be more liberal than the NRA in Illinois?"

Cullerton: "Well, I think maybe the NRA in Florida decided that they realized the value of this Bill as a safety device so that people, little children would not get killed so they could grow up and be fine gun lovers and users."

Ronan: "So then the NRA in Florida have a lot more faith in their children then the NRA in Illinois have with their children. It's a tragedy, all you have to do is look at the current newspapers. Yesterday in Taylorville, a young kid gets killed in a shotgun incident, down in the Breeze Courier a young fellow gets killed the day before with a shotgun. appears that the evidence is overwhelming that we're not doing the proper job here in the State of Illinois, I remember when we had the Automatic Weapons Bill up year and the NRA lead the charge to support mandatory guns in everybody's house. I think it's time that we stood up as Members of the General Assembly. Let's at least worry about the kids in this state. Let's do something right for a change. I know it's a difficult vote for many Members, but I would hope that we have become as progressive as the Florida General Assembly and move forward and pass legislation. I wholeheartedly support the concept."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Well, I'm not embarrassed to oppose this Bill and nobody should be embarrassed. This is not a reasonable Bill, although that's the Bill of goods that has been sold to the media. You know more children die from poison recklessly or negligently stored in a home than from guns.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Guns are used for self-defense, and by definition they're a location away from the child, unloaded if necessary, with a trigger lock if necessary, defeats the whole purpose of having them. Nobody says we want guns left carelessly around. No parent is going to do on purpose, or even negligently, something like that. Now let me tell you what this is, this is a first attempt at gun control. That's the real value of this, nobody is arguing that we don't want guns left around willy nilly and children to get hurt from them. But this is not what that Bill does, this is a first step, as Representative Johnson pointed out undoubtedly be discriminatorily applied as Representative Young points out. And this differs from the Florida the Florida law required reckless conduct, contributing to the child's misuse of the gun. This law does not reckless conduct. This law in effect reasonableness or a violation of reasonableness that makes negligence. Negligence is the crime that's being punished here, not recklessness. not specific intent to harm the child. The same person who brings you this Bill today is the same one who stands up and doesn't criminalize negligence in the normal case. In addition to all of that, this Bill allow the child to sue and get treble damages, that is three times actual damages. Attorney's fees will have to be paid. Now, if you think that is a wise public policy that the child be allowed for treble damages and attorney fees, then maybe you should look at this Bill carefully. That's what this does in addition to everything else. This is a bad Bill. It does not resemble the Florida law, it is a bad Bill. the Florida law there was a large education component, that education component is not here, this is nothing but a first step, and frankly the media publicity supporting this

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Bill, I think is not well founded. If one reads the Bill, one can see the real purpose of all this, and that is a first step toward gun control. We should vote 'no' on this and defeat it decisively."

"Representative Currie, the Lady from Cook." Speaker Giglio: Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. T sense a basic inconsistency in the opposition to this Amendment. People tell us that on the one hand we're not in favor of parents casually leaving handguns around so that children might inflict damage upon themselves, but on the other hand their not in favor of making sure that the parents have put the handguns in a place where the children are not likely to find them and cause harm to themselves. That inconsistency of course is the whole reason for proposing this Amendment. It is criminal careless reckless behavior for parents to leave guns where the children do and will get into them. Unlike baseball bats, unlike knives, guns tend to end in death. The kind of that's done by a handgun is much likelier to result in serious permanent harm and death than the kind of is done by other kinds of weapons. People talk here as if the issue is racial discrimination, in the first place it is not clear to me that anything in the Florida experience suggests discriminatory application of similar principles already in the statute books there. Secondly, what this Bill really is about is the civil rights and the civil liberties of our children, our children black, brown, and white. Handguns are epidemic in minority communities, it is minority children who are most likely to suffer because the handgun was where it shouldn't have been in the first place. Handguns available to protect us, nonsense. The statistics are clear, the handgun you buy to protect

yourself is more than six times more likely to kill a

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

friend or a family member than it is to ward off intruder. The point of this measure is not to put criminal parents in jail, not even to fine the parent who is criminally reckless and endangered the life of that the point of this measure is to say let's educate and inform the citizenry, we try to help parents become parents, this Amendment makes sure that our parents will treat with respect the most basic of safety rules and regulations this Bill is about protecting our youngsters so that we don't find six year old, Carlos Fleming of Brighton Ashley Antiquon of Quincy at the age of four it's already over for her. Alpha Thompson of Chicago. Wayne Delbin of Eldorado, Tyon Myond of Chicago, a nine year old Franklin Park boy, Jason Burez at the age of Damain Waldrof of Peoria, the list is lengthy down, these are our kids we're talking about and the concerns the sportsmen have nothing to do with the issue of safety for our children and the use and the safety of guns in home. If we do care about our kids, and we all as politicians on the campaign trail say that we do. Let's take this opportunity to offer them some basic protection that they have a chance to live to grow to become adults. The right vote on this Amendment is a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Doederlein."

Doederlein: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the point has been made that this Bill did not get a fair hearing in Judiciary II. There were people that came twice, June 1st and June 7th to testify and they did want to testify to the specific accounts that the Wisconsin information that was passed out was wrong, or it was partly wrong because it was a newspaper clipping and was taken out of context. I think that you were afraid to allow this information to be contested. I think you

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

should vote 'no' because these people came to testify against the Wisconsin Bill information that was put out. But today, I am here as a mother and a grandmother who concerned with the safety of all children. This concern is not focused on any one hazard a child might encounter. And you know and if you're a parent you know that you can't anticipate all the accidents that will happen to children. Firearms in the home are no more dangerous than or actually are less dangerous than other things and items the home. More children die every year from ingesting prescription drugs and the common household cleaners than they do from firearms. Yet, it has not been found necessary to pass laws requiring parents to keep poisons under lock and key or to face criminal charges. Therefore, parents criminally liable in firearm accidents is also the wrong approach to this problem. In either case the parents mentally punish themselves far more than what we could do if an accident happens. The proper approach in any hazard in or outside of the home is education, and early education warns the children about the danger of playing with matches, of climbing ladders, of talking to strangers and the parents are the best teachers. I believe we should leave it into the hands of the parents to educate their children. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly, I agree with the previous speaker in terms of, we are not about to pass any law dealing with putting the parents in jail because they leave matches around, and there is a number of young people that get burnt up each year around this state because the parents have left matches where the youngsters could get ahold of them and start a fire. We should not be about the business

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

punishing parents on some accident that has occurred. Certainly, I could see it if it were some type educational opponent attached to this Bill. There is nothing educational attached to this Bill. There is accident that occur in the home and then the police come, and they tell the parents after their son or daughter been maimed or killed say, well we gonna have to arrest you and put you in jail. Isn't the grief enough that the child has been injured? We should not be about the business of passing this legislation. This is another form of gun control. As Representative Young pointed out, people in my community will suffer as a result of this. We passed gun legislation a few years ago in Chicago, but it hasn't taken the guns off the street for those of you who talk what a wonderful piece of legislation this is. We can't sit on our porches in Chicago, not from the good people there are those ride by shootings they are the people who ride-by and shoot at our youngsters on our porches. We cannot legislate guns off the street, the criminals is gonna have those guns and we must be mindful of that. And I'm gonna ask everybody here to vote 'no' Amendment. This is a bad Amendment."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Any time a child dies it should never happen, whether it's an accident or for any other purpose. Yet, the liberals in this Body would want to single out a gun as the reason for an Amendment to go on this Bill. Yet I didn't hear on these liberals an Amendment filed to put parents in jail because they may have left matches out. I haven't seen an Amendment by the liberals in this Body putting out an Amendment to put parents in jail because they let children swim in unprotected areas. I haven't

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

seen the liberals file an Amendment that says because the child dies because they have suffocated in a plastic bag that may have been left out, that we should put parents in jail for that, 'no'. They want to elicit an emotional response on a gun issue, and I say that this is a Amendment for that purpose. They say, well Florida passed some kind of an Amendment like this, and I say because Florida made a mistake, Illinois should not make a mistake in addition. Now, I know my mother told me a time ago that two wrongs do not make a right and passing this Amendment would be a wrong, and I agree Representative Young, that this will just be another Bill on the books that can be interpreted discriminatorily interpreted one way or another, and I say we don't need any more Amendments like this, and I will tell you that it is wrong to consider putting parents in jail after they've lost a loved one because they've made a mistake and now you want to punish them in a courts and put them in jail because they've lost a loved one. And I want to point out to this Body that the liberals again want to try and pass a that it takes away the individual liberties of individuals because they think government knows better, and say we should defeat this because the liberties that we possess and desire as a society must be maintained. This Amendment should be defeated and let's move on to more Bills that are make more sense to this Body."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The real sad thing in this debate is the number of people against this Amendment who are basically ready to admit that one of the big reasons we possess firearms is for self-defense. That's unfortunate

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

and as a legislative Body we shouldn't be...put ourselves in the position to encourage that. Somebody asked me just before this debate started whether this would put somebody against the law if they were to have a loaded gun in effect beside their bed or something for self-protection. quess the only answer to that that I can think of is this, if people are insecure enough to have to leave a gun around loaded and in such a way as to endanger children, then they've given up on the law for their own protection, and I think we have too if we continue to allow the law of Illinois not to address this very dangerous issue. Burn, in a column on May 22, 1990, addressed the issue of the question of how difficult it is to punish a parent if a child gets shot from a dangerous handgun without this...with this law. And he said but look at it this way, say parents living on the tenth floor of a high rise remove a balcony railing because they don't like the way...because they...excuse me, because they didn't like the way it looked and while they we're waiting for the replacement railing their kid fell to his death. We wouldn't sit back and just say gee, too bad. So, why should we when a gun is It's not uncommon that a parent is found guilty of child abuse and neglect because his child got poisoned is exposed to cocaine, marijuana or something else. why should someone who has exposed kids to the dangers of guns not be subject to the same consequences, and Burn concludes the question answers itself. Being reckless enough to allow a child to be shot by a home gun to have that situ...to make that situation possible to me is the ultimate form of child abuse. And let me just add finally that I believe anyway those who would say that one of big reasons we need firearms is for self-defense I would suggest that they must take the kinds of precautions that

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

this Bill requires, I'd be amazed if they didn't. And I think what they know as reasonable they should allow the law to impose on others, and I think we should support this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. First I think we owe John Cullerton some thanks for livening up an otherwise dull morning. To the Amendment. the requirements of this Amendment are only measures that any responsible gun owner would take voluntarily. pointed out earlier in Florida, this Bill passed with the support of the NRA because its provisions are so obviously reasonable. And I talked to a number of gun owners in my district who do agree with this Bill. When this Bill was passed in Florida more gunlocks were sold in one month than they had sold in the entire previous year. And let's remember what prompted the Florida law. The fact that four children were killed by other children in a ten day period. This Bill isn't asking for any extraordinary measures. It's only asking that gun owners protect their children or pay the penalty. At least once a month in Illinois a child is accidently killed or maimed by a playmate. This event is equally tragic for the child who pulls the trigger, who is emotionally scarred for life. Finally, the American Academy of Pediatricians released statistics showing that 4500 children die of gunshot wounds each and every year. And 20,000 more are wounded. A majority by guns brought into their homes by their parents. T f parent takes note of this law and if it saves the life of just one child, then it certainly would all be worth it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Did he say he would? Okay. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Pedersen."

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, I'd be happy to answer the question."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Pedersen: "Yes. Representative, I was kinda surprised when you talked about the beneficial deterrents in the effect of this Amendment. You know that a lot of people talk about the beneficial deterrents of the death penalty. How do you feel about that?"

Cullerton: "I don't think it has any detrimental effect on..."

Pedersen: "You don't think the death penalty has any beneficial any deterrent effect?"

Cullerton: "Right."

Pedersen: "Well, if you don't feel it has a deterrent effect with someone who's, you know, gonna to die, how do you, why do you feel that if people feel it's important to have a gun in the house why do you feel that this will have a deterrent effect when you're only talking about a minor criminal?"

Cullerton: "Because we have an example in Florida where the similar law passed and people went out and all bought locking clips. If you'd like me to I can quote from a Washington Times article and I'll quote from a assistant manager of the Taintment Gun and Ring Shop in Miami. 'We used to sell maybe four or five trigger locks for every 100 guns. Now it seems everyone wants one. There's a whole new awareness about guns that can only lead to less accidents.' That's what happened in Florida. So we have an example of a deterrent effect."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Pedersen: "So you're really saying that of all the guns that are owned in Florida, with children in the family, that this represents a major attempt to do something about it?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Pedersen: "That's pretty kinda hard to believe. The other question really is, suppose, you know kids are pretty resourceful, they snoop around the house always looking for things. If a kid really wanted to, he could sure find the key to these locks. Now, if you got yourself a parent who's really careful and try to comply with the law and has locked the guns up the way you want them to and the kid finds the key the parents would still be responsible, right?"

Cullerton: "No."

- Pedersen: "Well, it says here that you know, if they get access.

  The kid finds the key and he gets access I don't know how you could say no."
- Cullerton: "That's not an accidental killing, Representative. If they put the trigger lock on that's sufficient to have them comply with the law. Let me explain it to you, Bernie. I'd love to match wits with you. On this one let me just explain it to you. If it's secured by a trigger lock mechanism, then they've complied with the law. If the child goes and unlocks the trigger lock mechanism then there's no violation of the statute."
- Pedersen: "But the parents have left the key in the place where they'd been able to find it."
- Cullerton: "That's not covered by the statute. If they leave the key next to the trigger lock mechanism I guess they would, those bright intelligent parents would not be charged with this offense."
- Pedersen: "Well, that's hard to believe when you figure all those liberal judges are out there, but that's all the questions

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

I have, Thanks."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. First all I'd like to say as a liberal I, too, oppose this legislation. And on this historic occasion on which I agree with Representative McCracken, I think all of us with children who are concerned with children and who recognize the rising crime rate in the City of Chicago and the rest of this country had better be opposed to this legislation. Because legislation such as this it plays right into the arms and the interest of the criminals across this country. They know that you are hampered in the protection of your family, they know that you are hampered in the protection of your home and your property. I don't ever want to be in a situation in which this in this city or this state, where criminals are aware that they certainly have an upper hand on me in my home. Surely all guns should be out reach of children whether there are safeties on them or no safeties. They should be up and out of the way. And also believe children should learn what and how guns are used for. And we should obey the Constitution of the United States of America and stop trying to change it at the state I'm opposed to this. I'm really opposed Representative Cullerton putting an Amendment on a Bill this side of the aisle that serves to undermine the freedom and the liberty of all people who want to protect their families. And in this, this Bill didn't even go through the committee structure. It bypassed the committee because they knew it would be a great deal of opposition and it probably wouldn't have made it to the floor. Now the most significant thing about this Bill is it plays into the arms of those who want to constantly wave the gun issue as one of being supportive of children and the American way

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

when actually, if you look at it what it actually does, it undermines and denies freedoms to certain people. I also agree with the argument of Representative Young. That one individual in protecting himself is charged with a crime for protecting his family, his business, his property and another individual is justified in using those same means. I urge a 'no' vote on this legislation and we pray to God never to see it again."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp." Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition of this Amendment. To me, no one is in support of accidents occurring and the way that we resolve that is attempting to educate young people. Being one who has grown up in a family with a father who was a collector that educational process started very young and so should all kinds of learning experiences. Ιt me that if this is a precedent that we begin to attempt to establish. To attempt to save the lives of every child or every person which is certainly notable in well being we would be in fact be legislating as to what you will eat, what you will wear, what you will dress, where you will work, when you will get up and when you will go to bed. seems to me that government has no place in getting involved if we talk about freedoms of opportunity, freedoms that we have to live and move and operate within the State of Illinois. I think this is attempting to go too far attempting to address absolutely a serious problem, but I don't think government needs us to get in the position where we're telling everybody what to do every minute of their lives."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, the bottom

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

line really here is, are you in favor of gun control or are you not in favor with gun control? That's the bottom line here and the underlying issue. The last several years we've had somewhat of a working agreement in which there been a number of Bills introduced on both sides from different people on both sides of this issue on different points that they want to make on the issue of gun control. And every year we get to the Judiciary Committee and in the Judiciary Committee usually those Bills don't get out of committee because of the agreement we will pull our...we won't be pushing our Bills if you don't push your And then suddenly every year we get to this point of the Session and suddenly there's Amendments that dealing with the gun control issue and this being another one of those issues and they get heard and they get debate on the Floor. And yet the issues, that those that are like myself, or the people that I represent the I represent are downstate, they like to hunt, they like to fish and they like to do all those things. And I don't like to make criminals of those people. Whenever we sit here and say they can't own handguns or they can't shotguns or they can't hunt deer the way we'd like to see deer hunted in this state, the way 41 other states in this country hunt deer. I don't like to make criminals out of those people. Every time we turn around we here in the Illinois House are trying to find another way to make somebody a criminal. It's another one of those ways. It's a straight vote. You're either for gun control, or you're against it. One way or the other make that choice, let's vote and go on. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question but I guess it's not proper for me to do so so I withhold that."

Speaker Giglio: "You're correct. It's not proper. So you're not

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

recognized for that Motion. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. You know usually you can stand on the House floor and find that has an Amendment or a Bill is really intentioned. I think if that were the case Amendment it would include all possible ways that harm could come to a youth. As a pharmacist I can tell you that when we fill prescriptions for drugs that, if they were taken be a child or even a small youth that would cause harm to that youth, we lock them in a container. I wonder why we don't hold those people liable under this Bill who take those lock top caps on the prescription bottle and loosen them to the degree that they can be easily opened by a baby or a young child. I wonder why we're excluding all those other ways that a child can come to harm. Bill were well intentioned, if this Amendment were well intentioned, that's exactly what it would do. It would address all those instances where the child could come under harm. But no, we've let the press get away with it, we've let you get away with it. You've set an agenda that you've said one thing about it but what you really mean is something else. You want to take guns away. That's what this is about. This is step number one, it's wrong. I do not receive your words, clearly, when you try to put this under another agenda and then get it passed knowing that your secret agenda is something entirely different. a pharmacist, as a father, as a gun owner I stand in strong opposition to this Bill and I think that we should beat it about two to one. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones, S.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say that we

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- have a distinguished guest in this House. And is from the 24th Ward, Jesse Miller."
- Speaker Giglio: "Welcome. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Giglio: "You're not recognized for that Motion,

  Representative. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

  Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to confess that I have never heard on issue some more preposterous statements in opposition to it than I have heard on this Amendment. There are reasonable reasons to, perhaps, be against this Amendment. T to be in favor of it. But, when somebody stands up and says I'm a grandparent and love children, and therefore, we don't have to safeguard our guns from children or somebody else says that we are worried about the problem of drive by shooting and therefore we also should not safeguard our guns from being in the possession of children or one of distinguished colleagues said that because a child may actually find the key in which the key to a drawer holds a gun and that key is found and the drawer could be unlocked and that child find the gun therefore we shouldn't try to safequard our guns. We could leave them out in the open because children might find the keys to the drawers anyway. That makes absolutely no sense. The NRA and Illinois State Rifle Association has for decades decades probably from their inception, been absolutely favor of safe ownership and the safe storage of handguns and handgun ammunition. That's what they say on television, that's what they say in magazines and that's what this Bill does. Other states have recognized that

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

not a terrible burden to ask people who take on the burden of owning handguns to just keep them safely away from That's all this Amendment does. You have to keep your handguns safely away from children. And penalty for not doing that is far less than the penalty for doing virtually any other quasi criminal Act society. I don't think a Class С misdemeanor is sufficient, but that's what this Bill calls for. A Class C misdemeanor. One of the lowest. if not the lowest, criminal penalties that you can have. And penalty for what? For leaving a handgun out where a child gets a hold of this handqun and causes harm to somebody else or himself or herself. This is a mild encouragement. To tell people who own a dangerous weapon to keep that damn weapon out of the hands of children. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You didn't recognize Representative Van Duyne for moving the previous question so I guess you just want people to talk on it. So I thought I would put my speak light on and I would speak too. I think Representative Hicks said it all. down here and try to figure out how to make more people a criminal or a worse criminal, and then somebody will hire a good lawyer and get them off or plea bargain it out and they'll dispose of it that way and it will probably never implement what this Amendment does. But the worse crime is that you've spent well over an hour talking about Amendment and all the conversation in the world and all the speeches in the world probably has not changed one vote on this Amendment. So I would just encourage everyone to turn their speak lights off and then maybe we would get to vote and then there wouldn't be anything to do, and then we'd recess for two hours so that we can go to lunch."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Andrew McGann."
- McGann: "Question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Why wouldn't you acknowledge the Representative Van Duyne's request?

  Remember, the question moving the previous question?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Well, the Chair doesn't recall...the Chair doesn't recall that, Representative McGann. Did you care to make a statement towards this Bill? It's a life or death Bill, I'm sure Representative Cullerton would be happy to answer all questions on the House floor."
- McGann: "Could we ask you to answer the question why you are not accepting a request for moving the previous questions? And get us on our way here instead of sitting around like ninnies on this floor listening to all of this garbage?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Well, it's really you, Representative McGann.

  There's nobody else who wants to talk anyway. So, we'll ask Representative Cullerton to close."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think that it is true that this is a liberal versus conservative issue. I think that there's certainly are some people who are viewed as liberals who are in favor of it like for example the State's Attorney of Cook County, Cecil Partee, who came down to testify on behalf of the Bill, and maybe Leroy Martin the Police Superintendent of Chicago who's viewed to be a liberal. was for it. Father Clements from Chicago and Alderman Danny Davis are viewed as liberals, perhaps, and they're for it. But Senator Hawkinson and Rigney and Freedland and McDonald and Barkhausen and Senator Keats are certainly not considered liberals. So I don't think it's fair to say it's a liberal versus a conservative issue. Now, someone say that the real issue here is gun control. This is the first step down that slippery slope. If this Bill

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

passes, my God, then they're gonna take our guns away. I don't think that that is even close to being a rational argument that anybody can make. They're talking about a safety device having to be on a weapon when it's near With regard to a comment that it's different to the Florida statute I say the only difference, difference is the Florida statute which was drafted by the NRA has a more serious penalty. Reckless conduct required a mental state is required in this statute. Someone said that Florida made a mistake. Florida made a mistake when they passed this law. It seems that everyone wants to buy a trigger lock for their weapons in Florida, so Florida made a mistake. The purpose of the law is not to put anybody in jail. As I said earlier I hope no one is ever charged with this offense. And to the argument that minorities are going to be singled out I would hope at least in Cook County that the State's Attorney of Cook County, Cecil Partee, does not use this statute to single out minorities. I certainly don't expect him to. The purpose of the statute is to encourage behavior. criminal, minor criminal offense as low as we could go to encourage the behavior. It clearly has worked in another And what's the worst thing that could happen if this Bill passes? Well, if you look in the newspaper June 18th in Springfield, the headline is 'summer gun play leaves many children dead'. You don't have to go back very far in the clippings to see what happened Tuesday, June 12th. Taylorville boy, killed in shotgun accident. The Breeze Courier Gary Morrison 13 killed today in shotgun accident. This just happened within the last few weeks and it's going to happen throughout the summer. If the passes, people might go out and buy the trigger locks. there might be less children killed. It's a safety issue

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- and that's why I'm sponsoring it and I would encourage you to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. All those in favor of this Amendment will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 36 voting 'yes', 72 voting 'no', and 8 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Munizzi. Third Reading. The Bill's on Third Reading. Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Republicans would like to call a conference immediately in 118 to last approximately an hour."
- Speaker Giglio: "Could you hold that Motion for a minute? I'd like the Chair to introduce Representative Hoffman for an announcement. Representative Hoffman in the Chair."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a distinct privilege of introducing to this Body the 1989 1990 Illinois Teacher of the year, Joyce Carey. Joyce teaches second grade at the Glen Ellyn Benjamin Franklin School. I guess I should correct that. She teaches a combined class of second and third grade students. Joyce believes that it's a teacher's responsibility to nurture the natural love of learning that children are bringing with them to school. And it's indeed an honor for me to introduce to you Joyce Carey, Illinois Teacher of the Year. Joyce."
- Joyce Carey: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I come here today not as 'The Teacher of the Year', but rather as a representative of all of the hard working teachers

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

throughout the State of Illinois. For the past six months I have been traveling throughout the state and I have to tell you we have a lot to be proud of. I also come to you today as an advocate for children. And I ask you today to support us in education and to establish a long term commitment so that we guarantee that all of our children have the opportunity to succeed in our schools in Illinois. I thank you and on behalf of your children and your teachers I ask you for help and again thank you in advance. Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. Representative Olson now moves that the House stand in recess for one hour so the Republicans can go to caucus in Room 118 and the Democrats will caucus in Room 114, immediately for one hour. So the House now stands in recess for approximately one hour."
- Doorkeeper: "Could I have your attention please? Would the Democrats please go to room 114 for a caucus? Republicans in 118. Yes."
- Speaker Giglio: "The House will come to order. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Miss Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills the following titled to wit; House Bills number 1055, 1632, 2685, 2872, 2967, 3001, 3042, 3074, 3109, 3143, 3152, 3153, 3171, 3183, 3231, 3264, 3271 and 3338. Together with Amendments the adoption in which I'm instructed to ask concurrence to the House, passed the Senate as amended June 20, 1990.' Linda Hawker, Secretary."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Representative McPike in the Chair. Representative Ryder, Representative Stephens, Representative Leverenz, Representative Bowman

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- will you come to the floor so we can call the Approp. Bills? Appropriations, Second Reading. For Senate Bill 1489, Representative Bugielski. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

  No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Bugielski: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1489 appropriates \$781,000 GRF to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for the expenses associated with locating and operating trade offices in Poland, Hungary and Zaire."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 105 'ayes', 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1489 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1535. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1535, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the General Assembly. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendments #1 offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment would add \$23,183,715...thousand dollars. Vote for the adoption of the Amendment."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'

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

  and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1335 (sic House Bill 1535), a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "The Bill now would be at \$23,193,715. Move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 101 'ayes' and 6 'nos'.

  Senate Bill 1535 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Woolard is in the Chair."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure this evening to introduce to you the Art Teacher of the Year in the State of Illinois, she's from Marion Illinois in my district, Kathyrn Kay Howell. Kathyrn."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. Senate Bill 1536. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the cost of Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the cost of Members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "The Bill has a total of \$9 million, I'm sorry...\$8,909,000. I move for the passage of the Bill...and we appreciate your support."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1536 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1537. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1537, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies.

  Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment would add \$51,000 to economic and fiscal, \$20,000 to intergovernmental, \$400,000 to electronic data processing, \$89,000 for legislative reference bureau. A reallocation of \$271,800 amount to the printing unit and it would reallocate for the research unit and a increase of \$5000 for the Citizens Assembly. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1537, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "This would provide \$10,919,835 plus the Amendment #1.

I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes', 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1537 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declare passed. Senate Bill 1589. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1589, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1589, a Bill for an Act to appropriate funds for the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates one dollar at this stage. It's effectively a vehicle Bill. We hope to work something out in conference. Appreciate a favorable approval."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

record. On this Bill there are 106 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1589 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1784. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for education, higher education and education grant programs. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #3 and 5 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for education, higher education and educational grant programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr...Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move passage of Senate Bill 1784."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. I think it will be helpful for the Body if the Sponsors could just indicate the amount of money and what agency it's for. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk would take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1784 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1785. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1785, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Board of Trustees. Second Reading of the Bill. No Floor or Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1785, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the appropriation for the University of Illinois. It includes a 1.8 percent allocation for new money for personnel and about \$3 million for opening new buildings and I move the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

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

  On this Bill there are 111 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1785 having received the Constitutional Amendment is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1786. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for Southern Illinois University. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the allocation for SIU's annual budget, the \$236,476,200. I move for the passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 104 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1786 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1787. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1787, a Bill for an Act making

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

appropriation to the Board of Regents. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Floor or Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1787, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Board of Regents amounting to \$247,743,000 for this fiscal year."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1787 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1788. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1788, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Board of Governors. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1788, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Board of Governors State Colleges and Universities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Governors' system. I move for it's adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes' no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1788 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1789. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Student Assistants Commission. No Floor...No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Illinois Student Assistants Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the funding for...the what we used to call the Illinois Scholarship Commission. I would ask for your favorable support of the Senate Bill 1789."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 115 'ayes', no 'nos'. Senate Bill 1789 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1791. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board.

  This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and Trustees of the State Community College of East St. Louis. Third Reading of the Bill."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Community College Board. I move its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 118 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1791 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1792. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1792, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1792, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "No. I don't have my script here Mr. Speaker. But I'm sure it's right on the dollar amount whatever it's supposed to be. Let's move it."

Speaker McPike: "If there is a Sponsor..."

Black: "It's the grant rate Bill. It's the same every year, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "If the Sponsors of the Bill could just name the agency and the dollar amount it might help some of the Members. So this is for the Community College Representative Black?"

Black: "Yes. It's the grant formula request. As per the law."

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

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes', no 'nos'. Senate Bill 1792 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1793. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1793, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain retirement systems. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1793, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain retirement systems. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hultgren: "Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1793 appropriates \$99,340,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State University Retirement System. I move for its passage. You have a question, Representative?"

Hultgren: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Is this appropriation at the level which would be required by Senate Bill 95 that was passed last year?"

Stephens: "No."

Hultgren: "And could you tell me how much it fails short of that statutory amount."

Stephens: "You want to know how short it is?"

Hultgren: "Yeah, of that statutory demand."

Stephens: "\$35,307,000."

Hultgren: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear his response."

Stephens: "\$35,307,000."

Hultgren: "Thank you very much."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "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 105 'ayes', 7 'nos'. Senate Bill 1793 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1794. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State University Civil Service System. This Bill has been read a second time previously.

  No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of State Universities Civil Service System. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1794 appropriates \$894,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State University Civil Service System. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1794 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1795. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

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

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

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Abandoned Mine Land Proclamation Council. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$20,794,900 for the ordinary and contingent expense Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Council."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1795 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1796, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1796, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Asbestos Abatement Authority. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

  No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1796, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Asbestos Abatement Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Asbestos Abatement Authority \$4,595,000."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 'ayes' and 5 'nos'.

  Senate Bill 1796 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1797.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the commissioner of banks and trust companies. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1796 (sic - 1797), a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the commissioner of bank and trust companies.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Commission of banks and trusts, \$13,341,900."

Speaker McPike: "The 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 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1797 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1798. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1798, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Build Illinois Program. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Committee Amendments #1, 2 and 4 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder, did you have a Motion on this Bill?"
- Ryder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would move to table Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?'

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

  have it. Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Motions or

  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions or Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Wait a minute. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed on this?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments. I'm sorry. Yes. We do."

  Speaker McPike: "The Clerk is in error. The Chair moved the Bill to Third Reading in error. The Bill will be returned to Second Reading. Are there any Floor Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Floor Amendment #5 restores the money from the road fund and for bridge works and it takes the money...it goes back to the Build Illinois funding for road and bridge money and it does away with a plan to create a new instructional facility, and because there is enough ample...there are enough ample opportunities for educational facilities in that area now."
- Speaker McPike: "And on the Amendment, Representative Hasara."

  Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very important vote. So, I would like your attention. What this Amendment does is take out a Member's Build Illinois project. Something that I don't believe at least as long as I've been in of the General Assembly has ever happened before. And that is why I asked

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

you to pay very close attention. I've always tried to be open and honest with this Body. And I am going, as briefly as I can, try to explain to you exactly what this project is and what has happened to it. About six months ago a group from Christian County came to me and asked me to help them find money for a technical training center in the City of Taylorville, which is in my district. The unfortunate thing that happened in regard to that project, and I am going to be very honest with you, is that one of organizers is a manager of ADM, which employs a lot of nonunion workers. He is also a very active person in the Taylorville community, a Member of the Chamber, on the Chamber Board and has been very active in trying to benefit the entire City of Taylorville. I believe that the unfortunate thing about this is that he should not have been active in this project, because it has been perceived by the unions as trying to do away with union labor. asked the city council of Taylorville to take a vote on whether or not they would back this project, because if the community were not fully behind it, I did not want to go ahead with it. There was a 10 - 0 vote by the Taylorville to affirm this project. In fact they have already created a board to go forward and start planning, that as soon as the Build Illinois Funds were signed by the Governor, they could begin the purchase of a building for this facility. What this does will be technical training both for high school and after high school students. can assure you ...Lincoln Land Community 1 College is involved in the training. They are going to do the training. They told me yesterday that their welding classes in Springfield have a long waiting list. In fact there are jobs available. Some of the students leave the class before they even get out, so that they can go

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

stand here and swear to you that I'm get a job. Can I not...that this facility will not train nonunion workers? course, I can't. It is very clear to me that it will training some people who will go into positions. I agree with that. We have tried to work with the unions to get them to sit on the board, to include them in the training. They have refused to do so. What it will do, though, is not only give Taylorville High School vocational ed training, but it will keep local young people in the community. I know that companies are now going outside of that area to hire workers. And I would rather. they are nonunion workers, see them hire local people, rather than go outside of the community. I twenty-five years in a union family. I have supported the unions. I have an eighty-five percent voting record with the AFL-CIO, much to the dismay, I see of some of my colleagues. So, it is never been my intention to do anything to destroy unions or hurt unions. My children have all received a good college education, and I've received a good living because of the Carpenters' Union. There is no question about that. All I say to you is, that is exactly what has happened in this project. Ιf this Amendment is adopted, I don't feel that anyone's Build Illinois Project is safe anymore. I put this project feeling that it was entirely safe, planning has gone ahead, and now I really feel that it is totally unfair to my constituents in Taylorville, who support this project and to me to see this removed at this point. I would urge all of you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1798. This Amendment would restore funds to their original

## 132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

purpose. As you know, in the Build Illinois Program each caucus is allowed a certain sum of money, and then the caucuses decide who in the caucus gets what. Money was appropriated for the purpose of a road project in the previous speaker's district, as I understand. supporters of this Amendment, including me, have no problem with that. That area is nearby my district. And I know many of the people in that area. Their road needs are And to help them get a road is something we would like to do. However, since the Build Illinois Funds were allocated for road purposes there has been a shift in emphasis with regard to those funds. And the emphasis is to use taxpayer dollars to encourage and abet and aid the construction of apprentice schools for trade purposes which are nonunion. I come from a community in which we have a proud tradition of skilled crafts, especially electricians, the carpenters, and the plumbers and pipe fitters. mention the other skilled craft unions. We have in our community, with private dollars, entirely with private dollars, in dollars supplied both by the contractors and the unions themselves, joint work, hand in hand, hand in glove constructed apprentice schools and provided the training for the apprentices in our skilled craft for many, many years. And our plumbers and pipe fitters have a brand new, well not brand new, but a ten or fifteen year old apprentice school in Decatur which does an outstanding job the entire area. That local serves the area in which this rival school is supposed to be built and constructed. The electricians have an apprentice school. jurisdiction area includes the area in which this nonunion trade school is proposed to be built with taxpayer dollars. The carpenters in my area have their own apprentice school, as do the Springfield locals right here in this community.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

They have all constructed those apprentice schools, funded and operated them with private dollars, paid for both by the unions and by the contractors. We in this state want to encourage the cooperation between labor and management. This is an outstanding example of how we have provided the State of Illinois with skilled workers for generations. To shift that tradition now and to encourage the construction of a nonunion trade school with taxpayer dollars is an altogether wrong purpose. I urge a defeat of this Amendment. There should be resounding 'no' votes up there by everyone on this floor. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Does everyone want to talk to this or explain their vote? Representative Daniels wants to speak."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. we all know that the Build Illinois Project was passed with tremendous bipartisan consideration and working. that the previous speaker is dead bang wrong. He's been wrong many times, but he has never been more wrong than he today. To mess with a Member's project that has been appropriated since 1986 and been in the budget since then just irresponsible to its highest degree. This side of the aisle has honored the Build Illinois Projects of other side of the aisle consistently since originally appropriated. And now to come back and tell us, because of some of their own individual feelings or some of their individual pledges, that they want to destroy a very carefully put together program that was approved by Governor, signed into law and been honored year in and year out, is totally irresponsible. And frankly I think the consequences of this action are far more reaching than the Gentleman who spoke earlier or the Sponsor of this Bill wants to deal with. The Sponsor of this Amendment comes in

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

with many projects for his home area, we understand that, that's as it should be, but for him to then set aside an agreement, a Build Illinois Agreement, that has been worked on for years and honored by all sides, I think is irresponsible. I would hope that he would withdraw this Amendment and honor the original understanding and agreement."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The person that occupies the Speaker's chair has been on this floor in the last two days indicating to us that there is a process in which only agreed Bills in the unemployment insurance area unemployment compensation area will pass. Only agreed Bills. And we have to adhere to that, and indeed, we have. However, we also have some other agreements here on floor. One of those agreements, until today, is that each Member has the opportunity to present their Build Illinois Project as they see fit. And that agreement has been honored until this Amendment is presented today. To vote in favor of this Amendment is to violate that agreement. And the Speaker knows, as do others know, that is not the way this game has been played, but it may be the way it has to be played in the future. And I agree with John Dunn. Vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I think the point has been made as
to the violation of the process, but I want you to be
warned across the aisle. If you can play these sorts of
games going back on a four year...three year commitment.
One that was made in 1987, if you want to go back on that,
then I think you should be forewarned that the
administration should take another look at each and every
one of your projects. And I think that is what we should

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

be doing on this side of the aisle, is urging them to look at your projects. That is not a battle that we want to get into, Ladies and Gentlemen. The only thing we have up here is our word. We've asked you to keep your word. You are going back on your word. It is the only thing of value you have. You're making a very serious and long lasting mistake."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And should this Motion get the requisite number of votes, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunn was right even though he did make a legitimate mistake in his excitement, when he said 'no'. He definitely wants a 'yes' vote. And I know he will be speaking for himself. definitely want a 'yes' vote on this program, because throughout the State of Illinois we have many trade schools that are set up between the trade unions and the contractors association that will train these people in a proper fashion to go out and make a legitimate wage for the skills that they have. When you mention ADM, you mention poison in my district, in my area. These people pollute the river. They got millions and millions of dollars of free grain. They got tons of money. They don't need any help. They sweep more than this under the rug every day keeping people's salaries at the lowest rate in the State of Illinois for the quality of work that they do. We can't put any more people back out in industry with their cut rate salaries with the company that has no...for a company that does not have any respect for the workers in the State of Illinois. At this I'm asking everybody to vote 'yes' on this Amendment. It is a very respectable Amendment.

132nd Legislative Day

No further."

June 20, 1990

let's keep our trade union movement going."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi to close."

- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, make no mistake.

  This Bill is aimed at destroying an educational program already in existence. In fact, the local 65 that has that program in existence has a hundred fifty men on the bench. What you are trying to do is go down in that area and build an instructional facility that is going to be anti-labor and going to be funded and run by scabs. This is a very serious labor vote. I want to warn every Member of the House that this is being watched at by labor."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?'

  All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mulcahey 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Giorgi asks for a poll of those not voting."

  Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: Capparelli and Krska.
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Is there anyone that wishes to switch their votes before we start this? Anyone else seeking recognition? Alright. Representative Giorgi has asked for a verification of the negative. Mr. Clerk, would you read the negative."
- O'Brien: "Ackerman. Clerk Barger. Barnes. Black. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Didrickson. Doederlein. Ewing. Flowers. Frederick. Goforth. Hallock. Harris. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Johnson. Hultgren. Lou Jones. Kirkland. Klemm. LeFlore. Leitch. McAuliffe. McCracken. Bob Olson. Myron Olson. Parcells. Parke. B. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Petka. Piel. Pullen. Regan. Ropp. Ryder. Shaw. Sieben. Stange. Stephens. Tenhouse. Wait. Weaver. Weller. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik. Anthony Young.

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 86th GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Wyvetter Younge and Zickus."

McPike: "Representative Speaker Giorgi on...just

minute...Representative Rice is seeking recognition."

Rice: "Would you vote 'present' on that?"

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Rice changes from 'aye'

to 'present'. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Representative Parcells?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here."

Giorgi: "Capparelli?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Representative Johnson?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Giorgi: "B. Olson?"

Speaker McPike: "Which one?"

Giorgi: "Bob Olson?"

Speaker McPike: "Bob Olson. He's here."

Giorgi: "How about Myron?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Giorgi: "Piel?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Giorgi: "Hultgren?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Giorgi: "Stange?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Giorgi: "McAuliffe?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAuliffe is here."

Giorgi: "Harris?"

Speaker McPike: "Harris. Representative Harris? Representative

Harris here? The Gentleman is not. Remove him from the

Roll Call."

Giorgi: "Ewing?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ewing. He is here."

Giorgi: "Both Peterson's?"

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Who?"

Giorgi: "Both Peterson's?"

Speaker McPike: "Both Pedersen's. They're both here. Harris has returned. Representative Harris has returned. Mr. Clerk...just a minute Zeke...Representative Harris returned, put him on as a negative vote. Go ahead."

Giorgi: "Hultgren?"

Speaker McPike: "You've asked for him."

Giorgi: "So I have. That's all I have."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. On this...Is anyone changing their vote? On this Amendment there are 57 'ayes', 57 'nos' and the Amendment...if I wasn't interrupted...if I wasn't interrupted it would have already been...and this Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1798, a Bill for an Act appropriating funds in relation to the Build Illinois Program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$1,505,256,000 to Build Illinois."

Speaker McPike: "The 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. Representative Dunn did you wish to vote 'aye' on this? Mr. Dunn, did you wish to vote 'aye' on this Bill? Did you wish to vote 'aye' on this Bill? On this Bill there are...Representative Shirley Jones votes 'aye'. Representative Cullerton 'aye'. On this Bill there are 107 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1798 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1799. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Bureau of the Budget to the Executive Office to the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$138,314,000 to the Bureau of the Budget."

Speaker McPike: "The 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 115 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1779 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1800. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Central Management Services. This Bill's been read a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This adds \$33,800 GRF to the budget for the Governor's and for the Marzullo Internship Program."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'm for it. 33 thousand."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

CLerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Central Management and Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$1,093,841,000 to Central Management Services."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are lll 'ayes' and l 'no'. Senate Bill 1800 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1801. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Civil Service Commission. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPIke: "Any Motions?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Civil Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$430,100 GRF Civil Service Commission."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "The 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 111 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1801 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1802. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On 1801 I intended to vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Let the record reflect that

Representative Trotter would have voted 'aye' on Senate

Bill 1801. Mr. Clerk, how many Amendments are on this

Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 4 through Amendment 31."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder moves that the House adopt

Amendments #4 through 31. All those in
favor...Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'd like to I believe withdraw Amendment #11."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I want to withdraw Amendment #11."

Speaker McPike: "Offered by Representative Phelps?"

Leverenz: "He concurs."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps withdraws Amendment #11.

Representative Klemm, did you wish to speak?"

Klemm: "Did the Gentleman make a Motion?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, that is the Motion."

Klemm: "Alright. I just wanted to speak on the Motion very briefly. Now I understand the strategy and why we're

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

taking all these for the Conference Committee and that, but I want to just caution our Representatives, both the Democrat and Republican side that there are a number of Amendments that are not individual project Amendments, they're Amendments for a statewide organization. I just hope that when you get there and you look at Amendments 4 through 36 or 31 whatever it is that you take some care that we don't want them just cut up indiscriminately and I understand that, but there are some of genuine concern and I don't want an opportunity to argue those before the Body, I'd just like to at least make that point."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that

Amendment #9 was gonna be withdrawn. Representative

Saltsman? Is he here?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman? Mr. Saltsman? Did you intend to withdraw Amendment #9?"

Saltsman: "Not now."

Speaker McPike: "Pardon?"

Saltsman: "No, not now."

Speaker McPike: "No, he does not. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have a question dealing with Repre...Amendment #25 offered by Representative Leverenz. Just as a point of clarification."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Leverenz on Amendment #25."

Ropp: "Representative, is it true that this money that would be taken from the Fair and Exposition Fund would, in fact, reduce that total amount that would go to the five or six counties that are receiving monies for their operation of their fair? Or is this add on money to take care of the special new fair that would be coming effective in 1991?"

Leverenz: "You are correct."

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- Ropp: "Okay. Just so everyone knows. Whoever's got a county fair that's getting Fair and Exposition Funds you will be shorted by that amount."
- Leverenz: "I would not trample on their rights. And this is a pork cutlet."
- Ropp: "Well, that's...I appreciate that since I am in the dairy business. Also in probably the egg and milk business."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendments #4 through 31, with the exception of the one withdrawn be adopted?'

  All in favor of the Motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendments are adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for reappropriations to various agencies.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "I would move for the appropriation and because of the Floor Amendments I cannot give you an exact amount as to how much is now on the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
  Representative Leverenz asks for an 'aye' vote. All in
  favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have
  all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On
  this Bill there are 84 'ayes', 19 'nos'. Senate Bill 1802,
  having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby
  declared passed. Senate Bill 1803. Read the Bill, Mr.
  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Department of Conservation. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #2 and 3 were adopted in committee."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This adds \$129,600 to the Wildlife and Fish Fund to cover some administrative costs for the expansion of the program. It does however derive fees from additional permits which we believe will provide more income than the amount of this appropriation. I'm sorry if I'm exciting you."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' No, no. The question is, 'Shall this Amendment pass?' 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. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "With the exception of the Amendment that we just added, this appropriates \$187,210,000 to the Department of Conservation."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 112 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1803 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1804. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. This Bill's been

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

read a second time previously. No Floor or Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$6,644,500 to the Court of Claims."

Speaker McPike: "The 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 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1804 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1805. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Employment Security.

This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Employment Security. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Hello. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$203,640,000 to the Department of Employment Security."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- this Bill there are 106 'ayes' and 1 'no'. Senate Bill 1805 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1806. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1806, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "A language clean-up in the Amendment. I move the adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1806, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates after committee action \$1,459,000 for the EPA Trust Fund Commission...Sorry to disturb you."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 112 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1806 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1807.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1807, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency.

This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Curran."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply wish to explain Amendment #6. Amendment #6 takes into consideration the fact that the EPA seems to be planning to spend a good deal...amount of money here in the Springfield area on taking care of the property of a local physician, who frankly has an awful lot of his own money and doesn't need EPA's money to clean up his property. The problem I have is that this Amendment as it is written is probably unconstitutional. And so in order to put the department on notice I have said these words. But in order to facilitate the process and not have an unconstitutional Amendment, I withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Leverenz."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraw. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Ryder - Stephens."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "This Amendment makes no dollar change but it does make a technical change due to a previous Amendment that has been adopted."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1807, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense for the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "This appropriates \$418,475,000 to the Department of EPA."

Speaker McPike: "The 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 111 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1807 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1808. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Illinois Farm Development Authority.

  This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading of the Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Illinois Farm Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$21,417,600 for transfer to the Illinois Agriculture Loan Guarantee Fund for the Illinois Farm Development Authority."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All those

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', 1 'no'. Senate Bill 1808, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1809. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1809, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Office State Fire Marshall, this Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendments #1, 3 and 4 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Ryder and Stephens."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates from the Federal Fire Protection Division Fund for a transfer to GRF as required by Illinois revised statue. Transfer has been recommended in the last two audits of the agency...and we believe there is no objections by the Fire Marshall's Office to this transfer."

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

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

The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McPike: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Leverenz."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Is...question...inquiry of the Clerk. I understand that six is a correct version of Amendment #4, and if that's the case...we then must go to table Amendment #4?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz, it would be impossible...would be impossible for the Chair to determine which of these figures is correct. Is it \$4,342,800 or \$4,378,298? I don't think...Mr. O'Brien, would you

- 132nd Legislative Day

  inform Representative Leverenz which one of these is
  correct."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #4, deletes 4,378,298 and inserts 4,378,196. Floor Amendment #6 deletes 4,342,800 and inserts 4,240,800."
- Leverenz: "I know move to table Amendment #4."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is tabled.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "This is the correct version of Amendment #4, would reduce by one hundred and two thousand. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'

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

  And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading, Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1809, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Office of State Fire Marshall. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the exception of the Amendments just passed. This appropriates \$9,696,300 to the office of the State Fire Marshall."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', oppose 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'no'. Senate Bill 1809, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

- 132nd Legislative Day

  declared passed. Senate Bill 1810. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1810, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Human Rights. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, Floor Amendment #2, offered by
   Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?'

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

  The Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "If I might, Amendment #2 and 3 is the correct replacement for Amendment #1, I would like to move to adopt them both. And there's no dollar change."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 and Amendment
  #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The
  'ayes' have it. The Amendment are adopted. Further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1810, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, this is for the Department of Human Rights.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Appropriates \$5,963,400 excluding Amendments just adopted."

  Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes' and l 'no'. Senate Bill 1810 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Santiago, would have voted 'aye' on Senate Bill 1810. Senate Bill 1811, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1811, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Human Rights Commission. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1811, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1811, appropriates one million two eighty-eight for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. I move...its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'no'. Senate Bill 1811 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1812. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1812, a Bill for Act making appropriation in the Industrial Commission. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

132nd Legislative Day June 20, 1990

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "This appropriates \$12,931,500 to the Industrial Commission."

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 115 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1812 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1813, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Labor. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes,...Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1813 restores \$40,000 for enforcement of the Prevailing Wage Act, which took effect on January 1st of 1990."

Speaker McPike: "In opposition to the Amendment, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was defeated in committee...we don't think it's a good idea. We also don't have the dollars for it, if the Gentleman persists in presenting this Amendment...I would ask my colleagues to consider that this, the Sponsor not available, this is not

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

a good idea at this time. And we request a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "It's a good idea. Vote your conscious."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?

All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The

Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are

60'ayes', 52 'nos'. The Amendment's adopted. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act making appropriation ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "With the exception of the last Amendment. This appropriates \$4,590,800 to the Department of Labor."

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

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

On this Bill there are 109 'ayes' and 6 'nos'. Senate Bill 1813 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1814. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1814, a Bill for Act making appropriation to Local Labor Relations Board. This Bill been read a second time previously Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Floor Amendments?"

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Didrickson."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson. Withdraws Amendment
  #2. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1814, a Bill for an Act making appropriation ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$541,400 to the Local Labor Relations Board. And I reluctantly ask that it be appropriated."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes', 3 'nos'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1815. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Lottery. This Bill has been read a second time previously, Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion that table Committee Amendment #2, by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker...The Motion is to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1815. Now, what Amendment #2 does it takes out the money for a new game development for the lottery. The Department of the Lottery is against this, and I'm sure the Governor's against this. But Mr. Speaker, you know this

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Lottery Bill came along 1973, that's seven and half billion dollars ago. And six hundred and fifteen million errors Mr. Speaker, when the lottery came to Illinois, Illinois was the only state in the Midwest that had a lottery. Now every State encircling has a lottery, our's is growing bigger and better because we knew in 1973, that the lottery had to have some authority to develop new games. Now here's a Legislator that was probably in high school when we passed the lottery in 1973, telling us we don't need any money for new games. Now there's no denying that the Illinois lottery is one of the best in the fifty And inspite of lotteries encircling us, we're doing an outstanding job and we're going to continue doing a outstanding job, I think the Gentleman ought to table his Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not because I'm particularly moved by the presentation by Representative Giorgi. But also because I have an Amendment that's going to restore that amount of funds later on...with a few small caveats.

I'll be glad to table this Amendment. And will vote on my Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?'
All those in favor."

Ryder: "I agree."

Speaker McPike: "It's anonymous...unanimous, we're all for you,

Zeke. Complete. Everybody, you want a Roll Call? You

want a Roll Call? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, you robbed my...I was going to Speak to the Amendment...the Motion, because of my seatmate. You know here's the guy that's father of the lottery, father of the lottery. This guy introduced the lottery, you know how many times he has carried the lottery appropriation Bill?

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Not once, not once in all those years. Now don't you feel sorry for the father of the lottery, you know I handle the education budget. I'm a Democrat. I handled it Republican years, I handled the scholarship commission Bill, I'm a Democrat, handle it in Republican Here's a guy that invented the lottery, he brought it up, never carried it once. Now here's a guy that also has the idea, you know when he introduced the lottery, he wrote into it that the lottery had some flexibility, that's why they are allowed to introduce Horse betting. Do you know, what we're...I never yet put a dollar in the lottery, my first dollar into the lottery. I'm not a betting man, but you know sports betting, what we're doing the For every dollar we're going to get thirty taxpayers. back, for a million were going to get thirty million. a betting man, but that's pretty good odds, Zeke Giorgi as usual is on the right track, the father of lottery. Maybe next year we'll let you handle the appropriation, too, Zeke, you earned it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, did he table his Amendment?"

Speaker McPike: "He's agreeing with your Motion to table."

Giorgi: "Okay"

Speaker McPike: "So you get to close."

Giorgi: "You want me to close, Mr. Speaker? I agree with what Matijevich said but, the point is, Mr. Speaker, when we drafted the lottery Bill, we were told in no uncertain terms that the lottery only thrives if it's marketable has very creative of ideas, has brand new games. A lot of sports betting games over the past...seventeen years. The judgment of the lottery people has been impeccable. We've grossed over seven and half billion dollars. Four billion going to the state, three billion going to the winners.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

We've created over 610 new millionaires. The lottery has been successful beyond all our expectations, we thought in our wildest dreams, we'd earn one hundred million dollars a year. Now we need this money for these new games, and that's the reason why I want to table this Motion."

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

All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have

it. The Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...this is the Amendment where we should be talking about the purpose of the lottery. And next year if I can remember correctly, I'll send the father of the lottery a Father's Day card just so he understands that we appreciate what he has There's no question that the lottery itself is a successful venture, but all successful ventures have limitations. The purpose of this Amendment is to restore to the lottery \$1,300,000 so they can develop new games, but to tell them that until this Legislature says, sports sports lottery is something that we want to do, that they should not develop that game. They can develop a six or another lottery and they can have the weekly lotteries on Tuesday instead of Saturday. They can have different odds if they want, they can have new cards, different colors other new games but to leave sports lottery alone. We haven't said it's okay, this Amendment says, until we say it's okay that the director should not be developing that kind of a game. They need to develop new games we agree, but not sports lottery. That's why this Amendment limits their ability to develop sports lottery games but gives them the ability to develop

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

games at a price tag of \$1,300,000. I ask for your favorable...for your favorable attention on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentarian, on whether substantive language we can place on the Appropriation Bill. And is the Amendment printed, Mr. Speaker? Is the Amendment printed and distributed?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes...yes, it is printed and distributed.

Representative Giorgi, we think the Amendment is in order and it is germane and does not add substantive language."

Giorgi: "Alright, Mr. Speaker...there's also...well Mr. Speaker, Members of this side of the aisle. What the cute Legislator from the other side of the aisle is trying is cut the game...the sports lottery game that's being played in three or four states and is also being developed by other game people, he is trying to cut Illinois out of a lucrative game that could make thirty to forty to fifty million dollars a year for education. So, the proper vote on this is a 'no' vote for this Amendment. 'No' vote on this Amendment against Mr. Ryder. He's trying to cripple the lottery and I'm sure that...the Governor's not in favor of this, the lottery people are not in favor of it understand why the Republicans, the elitist and I don't party, or the elitist group running the Republican Minority are trying to do their Governor in. Let's give the Governor a break this time and vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the Gentleman to...to state clearly that he thinks Representative Ryder's Motion, or for this Amendment would cripple the lottery is just ludicrous. That's absolutely the...the most inane

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

statement I could think of making in reference to this The fact of the matter is that this would Amendment. prevent without legislative oversight and approval the Department of Lottery from going off in a direction that ought to have legislative input. simply says that before that, we would have to sign off on it. That means that each and every one of us as directors public policy in this state would determine the οf direction of public policy in relation to sports betting in Illinois. Some of us have some very serious problems with sports betting, some of us who are sports enthusiast and some of us who think that betting is getting out of hand in Illinois. So the Gentleman is absolutely wrong when he criticizes the Amendment for that purpose. Representative Ryder's Amendment makes good sense it says that going to change the direction of public policy in Illinois, it ought to be the policy makers and not the administrators who do it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the hands. Let's for a moment for a moment let's all get our heads out of the sand, shall we? You know, we're not ostrichs we're human beings who know what's going on day in and day out. You know, Representative Stephens...Stephens I would have believed you except that 20 years ago I was on a series of election contests down in southern and central Illinois. I used to hear this debate on the floor of the House, and think you know, out in those areas they don't know what betting is, and then during our breaks after the election contest we went to a few of those pubs. they called the market square and then I sat there and I saw all these people they were punching these punch boards and they were going into jars and picking out all kinds of

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

tabs and I thought that was all illegal, and I'll tell you could go anywhere in central Illinois and southern Illinois and bet all you wanted to, and here were these guys on the floor of the House that were voting against all these legal betting and I said, well I wonder why? I knew why because they could do it illegally, they didn't have to do it legally. Now, the fact is that in this country there's more betting legally and illegally on baseball that comes first. Second comes football and I understand the NFL and you want to get back at the NCCA what they're doing to U of I, I understand they're opposed to this and I don't know They want to make it look, I guess, like nobody's betting on all these sporting events, when they are. I don't think we ought to restrict the lottery, here we are today sitting near the end of this Session wondering how we're going to balance our budget and right at our feet is \$30 million at least, at least \$30 million lying right at The director of the lottery knows that, we all know that, and for some reason or other we're going to tell people that they can't do what they're already doing, they're doing it in big numbers. So, I think the father of the lottery again, again he proved it before he was right before, and he is right now that we ought to go into this. It's going to mean monies and it will help our budget tremendously. So, I would urge that we vote against this I believe Representative Lottery...the and father of the lottery has an Amendment further on. 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is one case where father does not know best. Education dollars are supposed to be coming out of the lottery. What type of a message do we send to the residents of the State of Illinois or anywhere

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

else where we all of a sudden say that Pete Rose when he gambles is wrong, but when the Illinois lottery, money used for education authorizes on the gambling on sports facilities that's alright? This is precisely wrong message to send. Don't be fooled, this does not develop, this not curtail the development of lottery games except those dealing with sports. It is important that we realize that. It allows the lottery It allows the situation to occur and that all it deters is sports betting. If you're in favor of legalized betting then you vote 'no' on this Amendment. If you're in favor of the right vote the right way to do it then you vote 'yes' on this Amendment and just eliminate the sports betting only letting the lottery continue on development of any new games. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "This is the only likely...be the only vote we cast this year on the subject of sports betting. This Amendment ought to pass, and it ought to pass for a number of reasons. Contrary to the arguments of some when you something in this case legalize betting legalize there's a number of studies to confirm this, you switch people who are now doing something illegal to doing something legal. What you do is you create a classification, a whole new class of sports betters some of which become addicted to betting on sports and...and gambling generally and some of whom use the milk money for the other necessities for the family at the gambling casino or in this case it's the lottery betting a game between the and the Pistons. Any sport nationwide and against studies...so indicate where gambling is involved whether it's horse racing, jai alai, dog racing there's scandal

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

involved. It's human nature and that's just the way Professional sports National Basketball Association in have been fortunate. You interject the possibility of increasing your chances of winning by 400 by throwing two games and you don't even have to win the games to do that, just by shaving two or You're going to find a scandal at some point or points. another along the way and that's going to ruin professional athletics. What you're going to do in addition is to give to the public and the school children and others a very bad example and a bad image. You're going to have a situation at the end of a Bulls game where the Bulls are a three point favorite, and you've legalized gambling through the lottery and the Pistons take a shot at the end of the game and miss, with five seconds to go, and Michael Jordan covers up the ball rather going down to score as he should do, that half the fans who bet on the game are going to be booing the outcome of the game, not because the Bulls didn't win because they did but because they didn't beat the point spread, and when you start interjecting that kind of mentality into what's been a great thing for kids and a great thing in many ways for the whole the economy of the State of Illinois and otherwise, you've really done a major disservice. And contrary to the...comment Representative Matijevich who I think is very sincere and really believes this, you're not going to really be \$30 million to the treasury of Illinois, you're going to be taking away in many, many real ways away from the treasury in the body politic of Illinois and robbing people through a reverse tax of semi-addicted or addicted gambling, gamble alcoholics that really hurt this state economically rather than helping it. Basketball in particular...rather make this a fixable...Basketball in particular and other

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

sports as well are immanently fixable sport. It's not a good idea you have a clean sport you have...you have an opportunity for this state to serve as a model by rejecting sports betting and moving forward to do the sorts of things that as a state we ought to be doing raising money in appropriate ways rather than a reverse tax. strongly urge the one opportunity we're going to have year to vote to make sports betting illegal or to make sports betting illegal and assure that it is. And it can't be done through the lottery, is a 'yes' vote on this Amendment. Representative Regan advises me that I should make that I properly...use Micheal Jordan's name saying is that at the end of the game with the Bulls having a two point lead and being a three point the team properly should cover up the ball rather go down and score and, and that's the way to play basketball for a sport if half the people in the stands upset because they did that and played good basketball rather than tried to beat the point spread, they really are there for the wrong reason and we're going to go on and give them the wrong reason and this Amendment ought to pass."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I think it's...we're being totally hypocrites if we say that...we shouldn't allow sports betting in Illinois. We have...we have casinos, we have pull tabs...pull jars and bingo and little lotto and big lotto and before long we're going to have riverboat gambling. I don't know who we're trying to kid. We haven't had a scandal with our lottery, and the director lottery has done a fantastic job. I think we're passing up a grand opportunity here for some revenues for the State of Illinois and for the kids of Illinois, if we...if we...allow the...sports betting in Illinois. So I

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

would stand opposed to this Amendment...I think it's just a bad idea. A simple 'no' is the right vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This afternoon and tomorrow there are those in House who'll ask you to vote on a Bill that will divert \$51 million in road funds to the Department of State Police, a 'no' vote on this Amendment is your opportunity to free up \$30 million dollars in GRF, and in addition to that if wanted to another \$50 million in unclaimed lottery. we're up to \$45 million that does not have to diverted out the road funds , and surely you can find another \$6 million some place to shore up the State Police budget This Amendment a 'no' vote on this that's necessary. Amendment will create \$30,000 hole because it'll put million, a \$30 million hole there'll be \$30 million in the common school fund freeing up \$30 million in General Revenue Funds that can then be used to fund the State Police budget. So you don't have to divert road funds from projects in this state, you don't destroy the concept of user fees. This is your opportunity the hypocrisy by my colleague, Representative Johnson, comments that going to lead to gambling. There are \$28 billion a year illegally bet on sports games in the United States today. agree with Representative Hartke it's total hypocrisy to disallow a dollars a day...a card, and it's not betting it's sports lottery. Here's your chance a 'no' vote on this can avoid the opportunity and avoid necessity of having to raid the road funds of Illinois when we have eight to nine hundred miles going bad every year, two hundred bridges going bad every year and a strong A 'no' vote on this is the proper vote and avoid the hypocrisy."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: 'Representative Giorgi, for what reason do rise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, there's been a challenge raised on this floor by the Representative from Champaign, and I want to take his challenge up. I'm going to challenge him that if knows anything scandalous nature or anything untoward or anything under handed about the way the lottery came into Illinois or bingo or off track betting, or raffles and chances or jars and tabs or charitable games or riverboat gambling, he ought to run to the FBI office or run to his state's attorney office and tell them what he knows. I issue that challenge to Representative Johnson."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Sure it would be easy to \$30 million perhaps to sports betting. But what makes the lotterv successful now because people believe in it. T+'s absolutely based on random chance. Some balls fall out of a...fall out of a bin and numbers are turned up or you pull a tab, it's absolutely based on random chance. The speaker from Champaign County hit the nail on the head, when interject human intervention or the possibility of human intervention into the outcome, you've changed the entire perspective of the way people think about the lottery. That's why the Basketball Association or the National Basketball League, that's why the National Football League are against the idea. The money, the temptation of shaving points of fooling with point spreads is too great. It's no longer based just on random chance let's not fool around with it. Let's state our case clearly right now. Vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, Representative Ryder, to close."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just clarify a couple of items. We voted in the past to have a lottery, we voted in

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

the past to have riverboat gambling. We voted on bingo night...bingo and Las Vegas nights, and we voted on all those things. It was a up yes or no we voted and they passed. But to now say that we're going to have sports lottery, a form of sports betting, without a vote that's the objection. I ask you to vote 'yes' on this Amendment we'll give the money to the...lottery they can develop new games, but if they want to develop sports lottery let them come back. What's wrong with letting us vote 'yes' or 'no' on sports betting? I ask you to give us an opportunity and to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

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? The Clerk will take the

record. On this Amendment there are 77 'ayes', and 33

'no'. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Lottery. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "This appropriates \$433,696,800 to the Department of the Lottery."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Cullerton 'aye'. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', and 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1815 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to the Order of Concurrence on page 12 on your calendar. On this Order

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

appears House Bill 3028, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House House. Ι Bill 3028. Let me explain what the Amendment does. says that the...General Assembly this year will borrow \$36 million in the road fund for FY91. It says that we may pay that money back in FY92, and it goes on to say, that if we do not pay the money back in FY92, that the comptroller will automatically transfer and the treasurer shall deposit from the General Revenue Fund to the road fund the money in So we are taking out either a one year loan or year loan, we're taking it out of the road fund. This isn't an easy choice, we are trying to balance a budget a year when no one wants to raise taxes, and we have cut hundreds of millions dollars from the Governor's budget. And we still find ourselves in a position where we either have to cut more or we have to have new revenues or we have to borrow some money. Given the sentiment of the General Assembly, of both the House and the Senate. It is not realistic to expect that there will be any new revenues, any new tax increases generated to solve this problem, it is also extremely difficult to cut when we have already cut hundreds of millions of dollars. So having no where turn we turn to a road fund, the reason we did it is because the balance in the road fund FY91 is over million. And when I speak to road fund, I use that as a combination of road fund and construction fund. In FY91 the balance will be over \$600 million and in FY92 the balance will \$400 million dollars, in Senate be over Committee last week and the Secretary of Transportation was asked, if this plan would have any adverse effect on the road program in Illinois. The Secretary said, not, it will not slow down one project, it will not cancel

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

one project, it will not result in the loss of one job, it will have no impact on the road program. I've been quoted in the news media, as saying I believe that the tax money we raised last year, from the gas tax should be used for roads. And under this plan it will be, we will borrow some of that money, that is not going to be spent for either one year or two year. But then we will indeed pay it back, so that it can be used for roads. I'm not saying that this is the best public policy to have, but I am saying that at this date in June is one of the few options that we have remaining to us. And therefore, I would ask you to join me in concurring with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2038."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3028. On that question, the

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House. As everyone knows I have tremendous respect for the Majority Leader on our side of the aisle, because of the vision and leadership he's brought forth time and time again establish solid public policy here in the State of But lo and behold we have got an mistake that's Illinois. trying to be perpetrated against the people of Illinois and the Members here of the General Assembly. That better pay attention of what this Bill does, because this public policy, this is horrible public policy. What we're doing is, we're telling the taxpayers, last year we there's a crisis of transportation funding and we addressed that crisis through a gas tax which was long overdue. what we're going to do is take those dollars which we have very carefully crafted and put together in a road fund and stripping it out of those projects. I understand the Majority Leader's arguments that this isn't going to delay any projects, I can't buy that, I think there are projects

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

here in the State of Illinois, that are going to be slowed That means there's jobs here in the State of Illinois, that are going to be lost. This is the kind of public policy, that we should shy away from. What we're becoming is what, the Federal Government is doing, how does the Federal Government talk about balancing their budget. how do they address the deficit, they don't spend dollars on transportation. The Federal Government has bad public policy, that's why our infrastructure crumbling and now we're trying to take the same path here, in the State of Illinois. It's a mistake, it's something that we should stop, we should stand up once and for all and say look it, last year we said the tax was needed, we had the guts to vote for it, we're now generating the dollars necessary. Let's not divert those dollars into other programs that may or may not be necessary, let's cut the fat out of budgets, but let's protect the integrity of the road fund. We are going to rue the day that we established this public policy, cause let's be practical next year the budget going to be hurting again and we're going to continue to gouge the road program, we're going to continue to cost jobs here in the State of Illinois, we're really going to put ourselves back where we were in the 1960's, wrong let's stop it now before we continue down the wrong direction. I urge a no vote on this bad Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, this
diversion creates a real bad precedent in Illinois. Listen
to what it does. Last year we were able to go back to our
districts and tell them that we voted for six cents a
gallon gas tax, because eight to nine hundred miles of
roads in Illinois go bad every year, two hundred bridges in

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

Illinois go bad every year. But you will be able to the results of that tax the more you drive the more you pay. This diversion puts the entire concept of a user at risk and will totally wipe out the concept of a user fee. People in your constituents, who drive down the Illinois, can see their tax dollars that work. with Representative Ronan, it will in fact delav eliminate your projects, and you will see the difference. Every time you have a road project in your district or a street light or a stop light, you will see those projects not being none as a result of this diversion. months ago we went back to our districts and told them look, the roads in Illinois are horrible and everybody agrees to that. I tell you what we passed the six cent gas tax which is going to go right into your roads, let alone the jobs which Representative Ronan referred to, creates another bad precedent. The bad precedent of saying well we borrowed \$36 million or \$51 million in the road fund this year, next year it's not \$51 million dollars it's a \$102 million you're going to be looking at because replace the hole in the road fund. And you gotta replace the hole in the State Police budget. That's number two bad precedent, that this diversion sets and it's a bad one for the General Assembly and for the tax paying public, who drive up to those gas pumps thinking, that is only going to for road projects and cents a gallon bridges in Illinois. Now we have to tell them 'no, it's really not'. It destroys the forty percent cap that we set in place a year ago, and it tells the public in our constituents to look we really didn't mean what we did last year, we really didn't mean that all six cents would be going into the roads and bridges of Illinois. This is a bad concept you should vote against this diversion,

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

tell the taxpayers look when we passed that six cents a gallon gas tax, we meant it and we're going to improve your road and bridges. And I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Edley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, this is...this is just terrible public When we go back to our districts and we meet with our constituents and we try to get people involved in the process and they're cynical about us. Because they don't believe what we tell them. This legislation just confirms that cynicism. The key word in this next selection will be accountability. This diversion of funds from the road fund into the uses and the ordinary business operation in the State of Illinois is wrong. If we have excess funds in the road funds, they should be used to build and repair roads, that's the basis by which we collected the money. think what we're turning the road fund into is a lender of last resort. And that if we keep this up, all we're going to have in the road fund, down the road is I.O.U's all we have to do is think back in the early 1980's when we began to take money from the pension funds was only going to be a one or two year of diversion, and today they are in such bad shape that we can't fully fund them. Even though we put a Bill, Senate Bill 95, that put it...placed it in law that we would fund them. This loan...scheme is something that we won't be held to in future years if our budgets our tight, we're going to be continually dipping into the road fund, if we start down that path. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This Amendment deals as much with philosophy of budgeting government as it

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

does with anything. And I understand we...the Sponsor's attempt to try and find the money whereever he could to balance the budget, but we got essentially two ways balance the budget in this State as required by our Constitution, one is to raise revenues through taxes and the other is to cut spending. But lo and behold we have discovered a third way at that's to borrow from other budgets...as was previously pointed by the Legislator that just spoke...we have a poor record in terms of borrowing from other budgets and paying it back. As per Senate Bill 95 we passed last year, and the very first year out of the gate we have reneged on that promise... I find it a very difficult situation to support an Amendment, that follows that theory or that philosophy of budgeting where we use other state budgets to balance our overall state budget. And then promise we'll repay, we haven't done that in the past, and I think that's a poor record to rely on I think perhaps maybe we ought to reconsider this future. Amendment and try and find some way to cut the budget in other methods. I think a 'no' vote is appropriate."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, Granberg: rise in opposition to the Concurrence Motion. I don't want to reiterate all the issue's that have been raised, but as Representative Ronan said comparing us to federal government in more ways than one Representative Ronan. When we do this we're now doing the Gramm-Rudman response. that we have to make the payments automatically two years down the road. If we can't assume responsibility actions now, why do we have to put in writing for two years? It was just last year that we put in writing that we could not fund the State police over fifty percent, we

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

are changing that now less than a year later. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we have fiscal problems this year and if you look at the economic forecast for next year, what are we going to do to repay? Our fiscal condition is going to be as bad if not worse, so what happens next year? I would submit the possibility exists that we will not only not pay this back, but we might go back to the trough one more time. It's bad policy, I don't think we want to open the door, and I would respectfully ask that we defeat this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think anyone on this floor is arguing of...of...policy. What we're looking at is a necessity to balance the budget, and to have the Legislature balance the budget, rather than the Governor. Now if you listen to some people you would think that have never done a diversion before and that we are doing some evil demonic activity here by moving from one fund into another fund and covering the cost of a purpose for which the road fund already is identified with, and that is the state police. We had never in the past reneged on a diversion, and you can't talk about the underfunding of the petition systems in the same breath as you talk about diversions. You're talking about apples and oranges. you don't understand the difference, you ought to learn what the difference is because you mislead the public, and you mislead your own thinking process by not understanding the difference between the two. So no one is arguing this is good policy, but after you spend some time here you find out you have to make some tough choices, this is one of those times. Frankly, a diversion is much easier to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

with on a payback on this particular basis, than it is to cut money out of education, to cut money out of mental health, to cut money out of public aid, because you have to go where the big dollars are to get this kind of change. And so, I rise in support of the Sponsor of this legislation and ask you to join with him and with me and others in supporting this concurrence with the Senate Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This is a very interesting concurrence, and I send my praise to the Majority Leader for trying to put together a budget, under very difficult circumstances. But what I think is needed at this point in time is a little bit of history. will recall this same language, there...or very similar language was instituted when the RTA was established and there was a diversion of \$80 million and then a Legislator came back and changed 'shall' to 'may' and the \$80 million was wiped out. The University of Illinois in the hospital structure, the same type of legislation was proposed \$80 million was the debt and about a year and a half ago this General Assembly changed 'shall' to 'may' on the payback and that money was all of a sudden gone. What I'm saying to you is in the construction fund, that is a dedicated purpose of that tax, to remove that for administrative In 1978, Senator costs are absolutely wrong. Shapiro all of the problems in the diversification and the digression of funds presented the legislation before us to eliminate the diversions, that was adopted by this House and the Senate and became law. Now we once again, reinvent the wheel with another diversion provision that was before us in 1974, 1978 and then eliminated because of the abuses.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

recommend to you most highly, if any public policy is to be adhered to it should on dedicated funds for specifically the construction fund. I stand in opposition to the concurrence, and I recommend to all of our, at least downstate, as well as collar county and Legislators, that they think very seriously about what they're about to do. And Madam Speaker. i f legislation does get the prerequisite number of votes. I request a verification."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Madam Speaker, fellow Members of οf Representatives, I quess one of the real concerns I have as I bounce back and forth on the rough roads of Western Illinois is the fact there's a real concern about what's going to happen with these funds. I quess one of things we complain about so much here in Springfield are the concerns as far as the trust funds, at the federal level, and I think the real sad point of this whole debate that we're having here today is the concern of what's going to happen if we're going to set a precedent in the State of Illinois and if we're going to be treating our road funds like the federal highway trust funds are being treated. And as a result I have serious concerns about it. your 'no' vote when we vote on this Amendment."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in opposition to the Motion to concur in the Senate Amendments. I been around here a few years and we have had the diversion issue come up more than once. It always comes up when we're short of cash, and instead of facing the problem and doing without and making some cuts, we borrow. This borrows money from the road fund, a road

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

fund, which was the subject of a gasoline tax just a year The voters of this state encouraged us to approve a gasoline tax so we could build some badly needed road projects all over the state, and especially in downstate areas. Diversions, large or small, said precedents which continue on and on and on, this legislation requires repayment by 1993, I recall a time when we had a big to-do like this about telling the education people to do without one payment, and it would be repaid the next year. It have been, but my memory is it was never repaid. Once the pressure is off, once the heat is off, it is the nature of the beast that we do go the path of least resistance, the path of least resistance is to prolong repayment so once this is approved it may be a long, long time before these funds are paid back and it will also be much, much easier to borrow more the second time. This sets a bad precedent, please vote 'no' on the concurrence of these Amendments, and let's get back to trying to be responsible in the appropriation of the taxpayers' dollars. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Mclean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I think this whole process really boils down to the integrity of the legislative process. The fact that even last year, as we have talked about already passing legislation to put monies back into the pension system and then right away not doing that certainly gives the public a bad impression of what we'e attempting to do. I think that we could all concur that the \$35 or \$38 million we're talking about is a mere pittance in the som \$500 million cash balance in that road fund right now. But the fact is we're going to start off the new year then with already \$35 or \$40 million less

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

than what we need in our appropriation process next year is not a good policy to move in. It seems to me that if in fact we feel that there are areas that we needed to fund our budget, then why didn't we take more out of the road fund if it's good...if it's good enough for one then obviously it's good enough to fund other important areas that we legislatively adopted and passed into law last session. To me if we passed one law and don't comply with it, as we did last year, I mean where is the truth, the integrity and the honesty in the whole process. Obviously it has gone."

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

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Members of House, just a few minutes ago we had an opportunity to rise an additional \$30 million in the sports betting area, and now we're trying to turn around and borrow money from a dedicated road fund, in hopes that at some point in time in the next two or three years we may be able to pay that back. The Bureau of the Budget has indicated that we're Economic and fiscal Commission says we're short and things don't look good for next year. And my fear is the same as many of my colleagues downstate, that the integrity of the system is just gone plain wacky. Where are we going the money next year, to pay back this fund and the to get following year? Then we'll turn this thing around Representative Mautino says, we'll change a 'shall' to a 'may' and then where's our credibility. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment, I think it's a bad idea."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know I've gotten this question, and talking with

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

some of you over the past three years. I suspect that it's fair to say that all one hundred and eighteen members of this House had been asked from time to time where does all this lottery money go. Well folks if you pass, if concur in these Senate Amendments you can prepare yourself for a question that your going to hear next year and the year there after, the year there after that and probably for the rest of the decade. And that is where does all the highway money go, you'll have to explain about diversion...that took place in 1990 and maybe the diversion that took place in 1991 and how in 1992 we didn't have enough money to repay. In 1993 how the... House changed the shall repay to may repay and folks I don't want to answer those questions for the next decade, and I don't think you do either. I suggest you vote 'no' on this Motion to concur."

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

McPike: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. There appeared to be quite a bit of exaggeration on this, I have tried to present it as honestly as I can I think it speaks itself when I said that the Secretary of Transportation testified in the Senate that this would have no effect. when I hear people on the House floor, talking about the roads that they're going to lose or the bridges that there going to lose, or the projects that are going to be slowed down. They might as well just call the Secretary and tell him he is a idiot. At least he ought to know what he's talking about. It's very difficult to look at a budget, I'm sorry, an end of the year balance million...on June 30 of this year, \$581 million. We want to borrow 36. Next year they have 625 million and we're paying it back that year. And the following year they'll

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

have 429 million and it's already paid back. Those people that don't want us to do it, it's a lot of budgets left on the calendar, we're only half way through these budgets. It's a lot of budgets left on these calendars, I encourage all of you to go back and draft the Amendments and cut \$12 million out of the Department of Corrections and cut \$10 million out of mental health and take \$15 million out of Children and Family Services and take \$20 million out of Public Aid. Go and draft those Amendments right now, cause that's what it's going to take. You can either cut deeply in this budget, you can raise revenues, or you can borrow some money. After listening to all these speeches, I'll be in the Chair waiting for you to offer your Amendments to make these cuts."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3028?' All those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, around here I've heard the phrase very often sometimes 'you gotta do, what you gotta do'. And then sometimes when you gotta do what you gotta do, you gotta do what you don't like to do. None of us, like to dip into the road fund, it has been done before, we gave the Governor that authority back when we had the days of the recession We are pouring into our road construction program, a billion dollars a year. That is a comprehensive road program, it is not being cheated in the least, but one thing we do gotta do, we do have to balance the budget. We can't go home until we balance the budget, it just happens this year, there is no other way. This happens to be at this time, the responsible way to do it. Nobody wants to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

cut education."

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Matijevich: "If we don't divert in this instance, what will

people say? They'll say the Legislature wanted to protect

road construction contracts, rather than education. None

of us want to be put in that box. We want to balance our

budget and meet the total needs of the State of Illinois.

And, therefore, let's put up the few extra votes we got and

slide away, finish our business and go home."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? The Clerk...the Gentleman from Williamson. Representative Woolard is recognized to explain his vote." "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Woolard: freshman Legislator, sometimes these votes are very difficult. I cast my vote green on this issue, because it has been pointed out to us by many of the Speakers previous that we've got some tough decision to make, I truly believe that, that we will have difficulty cutting some of these very code agencies throughout the state, to accomodate needs to balance the budget. But we have a responsibility as has been pointed out before, and I truly believe that that responsibility is to present a balanced budget. will do my part, I'm sure that there are many others that join with us. Let's raise that number 64, 65, 66. Let's get it on up there, where it ought to be. Let's do the right thing for the necessity of this state's continued good sound balance budget."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. An the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3028. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...oh, excuse me. Representative Mautino asked for a

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

verification of the affirmative. ,Will you Poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Barger. Barnes. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, Representative Johnson ask leave to be verified, Representative Mautino, and Representative McCracken and Representative Stange, and Representative Morrow. Proceed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Buqielski. Capparelli. Churchill. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. Deuchler. Doederlein. Farley. Flowers. Frederick. Giorgi. Hensel. Hoffman. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Klemm. LeFlore. Kubik. Lang. Laurino. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Myron Olson. Parcells. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Phelps. Piel. Preston. Pullen. Rice. Ryder. Satterthwaite. Steczo. Sutker. Turner. Wait. White. Williams. Wojcik. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll, Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "Yes, I have Madam."

Speaker Breslin: "Go ahead."

Mautino: "It's tough to see back in this corner."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. Ladies and Gentlemen, clear the center aisle please. Representative Capparelli, ask leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Clear the center aisle back there, Gentlemen."

Mautino: "Wojcik?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik is in her chair."

Mautino: "White?"

Speaker Breslin: "White? He's on the Republican side of the aisle."

132nd Legislative Day June 20, 1990

Mautino: "Buqielski?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bugielski is in the chamber."

Mautino: "Levin?"

Speaker Breslin: "Say that name again please."

Mautino: "Ellis Levin?"

Speaker Breslin: "Ellis Levin, Representative Levin is in the chamber."

Mautino: "Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge is in her chair."

Mautino: "Williams?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams? Representative Williams? How is the Gentleman recorded."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Martinez?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez is in his chair."

Mautino: "Flowers?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers is in her chair."

Mautino: "LeFlore?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative LeFlore. Mr. LeFlore. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shirley Jones is in her chair."

Mautino: "Capparelli? Capparelli's been."

Speaker Breslin: "He was already given leave."

Mautino: "Countryman?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman is in the chamber."

Mautino: "He didn't vote..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman voted 'no'."

Mautino: "I'm sorry. Representative Davis?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis is in her chair."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Mautino: "Bernie Pedersen?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pedersen. He is in the chamber.

Representative Barnes, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Barnes: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Breslin: "You're recorded as voting 'aye'."

Barnes: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change the Lady to 'no'."

Mautino: "Deuchler?"

Speaker Breslin: "State the name again please."

Mautino: "Suzanne Deuchler?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Deuchler is in the...chamber."

Mautino: "Doederlein?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Doederlein is in the chamber."

Mautino: "Giorgi?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative."

Mautino: "I see him...Phelps?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps, Mr. Phelps. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps.

Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Hasara.

Representative Hasara is recognized. Mr. Electrician."

Hasara: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Hasara to 'aye'."

Mautino: "Ryder?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder is in the chamber."

Mautino: "That's it."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3028 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Reading on page nine appears Senate Bill 1824.
Representative Ryder. Are there any Motions or Amendments,
Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1824, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of State Police. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Representative Ryder indicates there is an Amendment on file. Move the Bill back to Second Reading. Are there any Motions or Amendments filed? Representative Mautino, a Bill cannot move to Third Reading if there are Amendments Representative Ryder indicates there are Amendments filed. filed. Well, Motions or Amendments have to be heard before the Bill moves to Third Reading. So we're going to do that. If the Clerk says that Representative Ryder is correct. Representative Mautino, you are partially correct in that the...the Bill was...rather it was not a Motion or an Amendment on file. But Mr. Ryder, as the Sponsor of the Bill wants to make a Motion on the Bill on Second Reading. Now, you can persist in your...your insistence that we move to Third Reading. But Representative Ryder still has the right to move that we move it back to Second Reading and it takes the same number of votes. So if you want to delay the process we can do that, but then that's not the proper procedure. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My point is you stated there was a Motion filed. There is not a Motion filed, or there was no Amendment filed. You moved the Bill to Third. I have a right as a member of this House, to

- 132nd Legislative Day

  object moving it back from Third to Second. Is that not correct?"
- Speaker Breslin: "I agree that you have the right to object.

  However..."
- Mautino: "However, there was no Motion filed, and I think I'm within my rights."
- Speaker Breslin: "However, the Sponsor, whom we ordinarily afford this courtesy, has the right to move the Bill back to Second by making a Motion to do that. So if you wish to go through that procedure, it's just another Roll Call."
- Mautino: "Why not, I object."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Gentleman objects. So the question is can the Bill be moved back to the Order of Second Reading to allow Representative Ryder the Sponsor of the Bill the opportunity to present a Motion. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "On a point of personal privilege. I believe that I have the right to explain my objection, is that not correct?"
- Speaker Breslin: "You may speak, too. Representative Mautino, we're going to recognize Representative Ryder for his Motion. And then that Motion is debatable. Representative Ryder is recognized on a Motion."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to table...Floor...Committee Amendment #1."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino, on that Motion."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I object to that

  Motion. And let me state the basis for my objection. The

  Amendment that the Gentleman wants to table is my

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Amendment, that eliminated the diversion of the funds where embodied in the substantive language on 3028. Not only is his Motion ridiculous, it's his Amendment that he would not provide or present to the Appropriation I Committee. I presented and passed Mr. Ryder's Amendment. and by moving this Bill back he wants to table his own Amendment that was sponsored by me. I think that's absolutely ridiculous, the Bill is on Third Reading. The budget is there with the provisions for nondiversion. And I think that Representative Ryder was correct in his first assessment, that the Amendment should have been on the Bill. It is now on the Bill, I happen to be the Sponsor of and I object to Gentleman tabling his and my Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There's nothing ridiculous about this. We just spent an hour debating the issue, and what we have in Springfield is called a democracy, the majority rules. We got 64 votes now we would like to proceed; the 64 people that voted would like to proceed to table the Amendment, so we can get on with the process. Nothing ridiculous about it at all."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."
- Goforth: "Inquiry of the Chair. How many votes does this take?

  And also..."
- Speaker Breslin: "60 votes, the same number."
- Goforth: "Okay, how many does it take to get it back on Third then."
- Speaker Breslin: "It will go automatically, and it will take 60 votes to pass. So the question is, 'Shall the House move this Bill back to the Order of Second, for the purpose of

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

hearing the Motion?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino, there is 71 votes...72 votes, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Just a question, if in fact of the Parliamentarian, if
in fact this is taken back the Second, which it looks like
it will be and the Amendment is tabled. Then how many
votes does it take to hear that Bill on the same day?"

Speaker Breslin: "Your question is not timely at this moment."

Mautino: "I will raise it...I will raise it at the proper time, and I hope you will recognize me at that point."

Speaker Breslin: "That's going to be the Roll. As to your question, that's correct. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Ryder is recognized for a Motion."

Ryder: "I move to table Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1824, and this Motion, Representative Mautino, will take only 60...I shouldn't say that...it will take a majority vote to table, since it is a tabling Motion. This Bill can be heard the same day on Third Reading. Do you wish to speak to the Motion to table? Proceed, sir."

Mautino: "Of course, thank you, Madam Speaker. As I mentioned earlier Amendment #1 is the Amendment that denied the diversion from the Department of Transportation, and place those funds in the state police. I think that was the correct Motion in committee, I believe it is incumbent upon us to maintain that in the budget and I personally believe that if the Governor wanted to establish his own funding level in the state police, he should have provided it

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

without the Senate implementing the diversion provision. I feel very strongly about it, it's a very simple matter. The Amendment eliminated the diversion, I ask that this Amendment be retained on the state police O.C.E. And I ask for a 'no' vote on the Motion to table Amendment #1. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker. Members of the House, this is just crazy, you know we spend all this time voting, and now we want to be consistent and then somebody says no you shouldn't be consistent. You know...I think that we voted to say for this extraordinary reason, this Session we just have to divert some funds and then pay back to balance the budget. And now we are saying that we have to table this Amendment, because we just voted in the substantive Bill, we can't stay in a substantive Bill that yes we can do something and then in an appropriation Bill, turn around five minutes later and say no you can't. That's just absolutely crazy. So, I would urge the Members to vote 'aye' on Representative Ryder's tabling Amendment..Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth
- Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. All of you know me, you know how many years I've spent on the state police force. I don't care about the rides of what we're doing here today or not. But let me tell you, we missed a point from this...from the very word 'go'. The state police does not need no \$50 million out of the taxpayers' money today. We can work this out somewhere else. I've heard other guys get up there and say I can go back to my people, like you're standing there looking at me. You know longer gonna be down here, so

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

maybe your people didn't believe you. Let me tell you something we told our people when we voted for that money before, we told them where it was going to go to. Now we're lying to the public back home in our district. We can cut the state police budget, they don't need no \$50 million."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House table
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1824?' All those in favor vote
'aye', all those oppose vote 'no'. Voting is open. A
simple majority is required. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.
On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no'.
And the Amendment is tabled. Are there any other Motions
or Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1824, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Department of State Police. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$208,280,000
for the Illinois State Police."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of On that question, is Senate Bill 1824. there discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1824 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Going back to the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Bill 1816, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1816, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1816, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you , Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$36 million to the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 1816, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes, for a question."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Balanoff: "Representative Ryder, is there any money in this budget or any appropriation for McDome?"

Ryder: "No."

Balanoff: "Thank you very much."

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

Dunn: "I...I didn't hear the answer to the question."

Ryder: "No, there is money in here for the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, which includes the current payments on McCormick Place and, of course, Navy Pier. In the sense that McCormick Place is in this, and I don't know exactly what McDome means, when Representative Balanoff suggested was McDome in here. There is not funds in this appropriation for the proposed expansion of McCormick place or the Dome Sports Facility. There is money for McCormick Place and Navy Pier as we have previously approved."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Dunn: "If this Bill passes on Third Reading, does it go to the Governor?"

Ryder: "Yes."

Dunn: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1816 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote
  'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all
  voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
  take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting
  'aye', 21 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the
  Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate
  Bill 1817, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1817, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Department of Military Affairs. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Harris and Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Harris."

- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a real budget busting Amendment of \$1.4 thousand. That's 14 hundred dollars that's going to be used for the preservation of historical artifacts in the Department of Military Affairs. I ask your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1817. And on that question the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, we agree and support the Gentleman's Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This will...take money and redistribute it in the Conservation...or excuse me...in the Armory Construction Fund currently we are subsidizing the Chicago Park District to use the Boardway Armory, in fact we even pay, they use it rent free, and we have to pay the Since that's not a fair deal at this point, we're asking for funds that are used for that subsidy to be placed in the Construction fund, so we can get three dollars federal matching dollars for every one dollar that we spend. That means that the \$114,800transfer would create a \$460,000 new fund. It is our understanding, that the Department with an intent to use this for construction funds next year in such place as Galva, Beardstown, West Frankfort, Streator, Pontiac , Sycamore, Lawrenceville, Dixon and Waukegan."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1817. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "The question is will your Amendment to delete funds from one line and put it..? Do you know the answer already to the question? Would you really say that this is going to do what we want it to do, or is this a symbolic move, rather than one that would really happen?"

Ryder: "Representative, I've had all the symbolism I need for today. I truly believe that this will do, what it is that I said it would do."

Leverenz: "Then Madam Speaker, to the Amendment."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "It would be my view, that trying to delete \$114,000from one line and shift it to another, would be as symbolic as...in prior years, those folks that wanted to eliminate the state police from patrolling the streets in East St. Louis...they try to delete personal services lines to get the state police out of the town of East St. Louis. And though I might agree with the Gentleman, this Amendment would not do what he wants it to do, therefore, this side of the aisle should reject this Amendment by shouting 'no' louder than he might shout 'yes'. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from...there being no further discussion, The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2...

Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate being recognized,

I disagree with the previous Speaker, I do believe that it
does accomplish, that which I said that it did, and
therefore, I would request a Roll Call vote, please."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those oppose vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Simple majority is required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no' the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1817, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense Department of Military Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appropriates \$11,628,000 for the Department of Military Affairs, excluding the budget busting Amendment of \$1,400."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has move the passage of Senate Bill 1817. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1817 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1818, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1818, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Nuclear Safety. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Madam Speaker, my understanding is that the Department has committed itself to do what this Amendment would do. Which is not to spend any money under...from the Nuclear Fund for institutional advertising, public relations directed at children to convince them that this low level nuclear waste site is a good idea. Given the fact that I've been apprised that the Amendment that I've filed is probably out of order and the commitment from the Department. I'm going to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Amendment #2 has been withdrawn by Representative Levin. Does anyone wish to have any further discussion? No. Any further Amendments, Mr.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weaver, do you still seek recognition?"

Weaver: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to question the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "There are no Sponsors before you. There are no Amendments before us now. I'm just ready to move the Bill to Third Reading. Amendment 2 was withdrawn. Move the Bill to Third. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1818, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nuclear Safety. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It appropriates \$38,164,000 one hundred for the Department of Nuclear Safety."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1818. On the question, the Gentleman from Coles,
Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Ryder: "Certainly."

Weaver: "Representative, correct me if I'm wrong. But it is my understanding that in this budget there is no money for land acquisition and no specific site has been identified.

Is that correct?"

Ryder: "Representative, this budget does not contain any funds for the acquisition of real estate, real property for the low level storage facility for which you question. And as a consequence it is my understanding that no site has been designated. Those funds were withdrawn by a Senate Amendment of which you have knowledge. And no funds have been replaced since that time."

Weaver: "Thank you very much. It's a very touchy and very

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

important subject to not only my district, but this state.

And I appreciate your willingness to work and clarify this situation for us. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1818 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote
'no'. The voting is open. 60 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 108 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 3 voting
'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional
Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1819,
Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1819, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Prairie State 200 (sic ~ 2000)

Authority. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1...2000 Authority...Amendment 1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1819, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prairie State 2000 Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$2,387,300 to the Prairie State 2000 Authority."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the passage of Senate Bill 1819. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1819 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1820, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of Public Counsel. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Office of Public Counsel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$612,700 to the Public Counsel."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1820. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1820 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1821, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to state agencies and certain retirement systems. This Bill has been read a Second time previously.

No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act making

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

appropriations to various state agencies and certain retirement systems. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$49,398,900 for various retirement funds."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1821. On the question, the Gentleman from Macon,
Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "What retirement systems are in this Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Question of the Sponsor, what retirement systems are in this Bill?"

Ryder: "State police, judges and General Assembly."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Ryder: "Any time, Representative."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ryder: "Certainly."

Hultgren: "How many dollars short is this appropriation of the amount that would be required to meet the statutory prescription of Senate Bill 95?"

Ryder: "Just one moment. Representative, I cannot give you an exact dollar amount for the reason that, I'm told, those funds are throughout various and sundry funds. I believe that you were correctly told earlier that we were significantly short in a previous fund. And I don't recall the amount but I think it was about \$35 million at that time. I would indicate to you that that is an amount that travels across various of these budgets."

Hultgren: "So then, if I'm understanding you correctly, the 35 million, that was a question that I asked in reference to university retirement applied not only to university

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- retirement, but to the five state systems collectively?"
- Ryder: "No. I'm in error in that because we are shorting it more than that 35 million. I can get you that exact figure but I do not have it at this point. I apologize."
- Hultgren: "I guess, the bottom...the bottom line though is that there are not enough funds in this appropriation to meet the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 95."

Ryder: "You are correct in that belief."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Representative Ryder, what percentage of pay outs does this appropriation amount to. You know, previously we were funding about 60 percent of pay outs, then it dropped to 50, then to 40. Where do we stand right now on this appropriation?"
- Ryder: "Representative, did you mean for retired fire fighters or retired General Assembly Members?"
- Terzich: "No, the state retirement systems."
- Ryder: "Representative, I'm not able to answer the question because we've changed the method by which we pay retirement benefits, instead of a percentage of pay out to a dollar amount. So, I am not able to answer that question based on a percentage."
- Terzich: "Well, if that's the case, what type of a formula did they use to determine the amounts?"
- Ryder: "I'm informed that we used the basis of normal costs plus a percentage of paying out the unfunded liabilities."

Terzich: "Normal cost and what?"

Ryder: "A percentage of paying off the unfunded liabilities."

Terzich: "And they are reducing the unfunded liability with this amount of contribution?"

Ryder: "Representative, I have indicated to a previous inquiry

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

that it is my belief that we are not funding at the level as established by Senate Bill 95 previously. I would indicate the same to you."

Terzich: "By how many dollars?"

Ryder: "I previously indicated that I was not able to tell you the exact amount except to say that we are not funding at the level required by Senate Bill 95."

Terzich: "Do you know what the amount or the dollar amounts that

were required to fund it in accordance with the funding?"

Ryder: "No, Representative, I do not."

Terzich: "But they do know about the figure of funding it now.

They came up with some figure now, but you can't tell me what type of a formula they used or what amount they were deficient in the funding."

Ryder: "Representative, it's my understanding that Senate Bill 95
 contained that formula."

Terzich: "Yes."

Ryder: "Okay."

Terzich: "And I assume that they calculated that formula to determine the amount of money to fund the systems. But someone else came up with a different formula which is below that, so they must have used some calculation or some formula. So, what is the dollar difference between the proper funding and what you're asking to fund now?"

Ryder: "Representative, as I've previously indicated, I am unable to answer the question as to the dollar amount. I'd be glad to discuss with you or have my staff talk with your staff about the manner in which the funding takes place. But I personally am unable to answer that question. And I apologize to you for my inability."

Terzich: "Well, thank you, because this is an extremely important issue to the many participants in the state retirement systems. And for a number of years we have also been

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

underfunding that. Maybe we should go in the same way with some of these large corporations and file bankruptcy. And let someone else take over the funding because we're certainly short changing them."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I do not have a break down in regard to this Bill versus the other Bills that contain the state pension system. Mandeville, from the Bureau of the Budget, indicated to us at the time of the Governor's budget message, total that would be provided under the formula in Senate Bill 95 is not being met that there is a \$100 million difference for these state systems. And so if we were to fund all of the systems in accordance with Senate Bill We would need at least \$100 million more in this year's budget than we have in these systems. In addition, he indicated that we are in fact providing some \$30 million less of General Revenue to go into these pension sums...pension systems because we are using funds from the Unclaimed Property Act that has accumulated to offset amount we paid last year. So, in fact, even with the use of that \$30 million of one time funding. We are still lagging in our payment for this year by \$100 million collectively on these pension systems. I think that we all need to be much aware of that. We need to know that year's budget should be built on the basis of reserving those funds before we start talking about any kind of program or increase funding to any state agency. It does not serve Legislators well to have this type of continue. Our people who were so interested in passing Senate Bill 95 have now lost confidence in the system, that even getting a law passed to provide for catch up funding

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

is being ignored by the Governor's Office in the structure of the budget being proposed to us. And so I would certainly hope that whoever occupies the Governor's Office next year will take to heart the fact that we have passed Senate Bill 95 and structure the budget to take care of that obligation. It is not something we can continue to afford to neglect."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1821 pass?'

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

  Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Balanoff votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are...take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 96 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1822. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1822, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans Associations. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1822, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Commissioner of Saving and Loan Associations.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$3,553,200 to the Commissioner of the Savings and Loan."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1822. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 1823, Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Labor Relations Board. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$1,446,000 to the State Labor Relations Board."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1823. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1825, Mr. Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Police Merit Board. This Bill

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

has been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Police Merit Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This appropriates \$759,900 to the State Police Merit Board."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1825. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1825 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1826. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1826, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in committee."

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

- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Stephens Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens Ryder.

  Representative Leverenz, are you seeking recognition?"
- Leverenz: "I just wondered if it was the intent of the other side of the aisle to table Amendment #2?"
- Speaker Breslin: "They indicate it is, Representative Leverenz.

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- Thank you. Representative Stephens is recognized for a Motion."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to table

  Amendment 2 first."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment 2. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 2 is tabled. Any further Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Stephens Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens, Representative Ryder is not in his Chair."
- Stephens: "Withdraw."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #4. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Stephens Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #5 restores \$140,000 in state funds and 249,600 in Federal funds for DUI services to indigent individuals, EDP upgrades and toxicology services. I move its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1826. On that question, is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Withdraw Amendment 6, please."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Withdraw."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #6. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment adds no dollars to the DASA budget but it does reallocate \$67,400 from the grant line for alcoholism and substance abuse prevention to the grant line for residential treatment services. The point was to use...was to make sure that the Department doesn't use this funding to add bureaucrats to do training that is today well done by community providers. And I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 7 to Senate Bill 1826. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate...Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Stephens, you're recognized to...Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1826, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1826, excluding Amendments we just adopted, appropriates \$135,891,500 to the ordinary and contingent expenses of DASA. And I move its passage."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption...rather moves the passage of Senate Bill 1826. On this question. there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'ave'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner. Turn off Representative Turner's light there. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared Senate Bill 1827, Representative Stephens. passed. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1827, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, are you recognized? Do you wish to make a Motion? You don't wish to table Amendment...Anybody wish to...Representative Currie is recognized for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to table Amendment #1. I believe that was an Amendment adopted in House Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to table Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1827. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment 1 is tabled. Any further Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Currie."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Withdraw."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative

Currie."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment 3 does what we tried to do in Amendment 1 that was adopted in committee, in that it adds \$2 million to the agency budget per the request of the director and agreement between both the Majority and Minority Members of Appropriations II Committee. At the time that we did this budget in committee we didn't have a clear idea where those additional dollars should be spent. And Amendment 3 would clarify some of those questions. There are still two issues with Amendment 3 as it is offered before you One is that we failed to put in the Drug Free Families Program for \$150,000 that could be done in a Conference Committee Report on another Bill. As well, there is an issue that the Department is not agreeable to in this Bill and that is that the 12 percent rate adjustment would lead to a reduction in daycare slots. advocates of this Amendment and daycare advocates generally would intend, if this Amendment is adopted and the passed, would intend to continue discussions with the Department and with the appropriations people about level of increase for those who provide daycare services and the impact of this Amendment on reducing daycare slots. And with that commitment I would hope that you would support Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1827."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1827. On the question, the

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Madam Speaker, to say this that with the adoption of this Amendment we are at risk of causing some rather severe problems. We estimate that with the adoption of this Amendment, which shifts dollars from one line...from more than one line creating other lines, will cause an elimination of 340 daycare slots throughout the state. Now that is not a direction that I think that we want to be going, Representative. And, as we send this back to the Senate I don't know that there's an agreement worked out and that the Senate is going to sign off on this. If you know that, if you want to tell us that, we'd appreciate it."

Currie: "I think what I suggested in my remarks, Representative, is that I'm sure that Representative Bowman, who was the real Sponsor of this Amendment, and the others. Our intent upon continuing discussions with the Department and resolve that issue in another Bill. I don't think we want to send this budget to a Conference Committee. The bulk of Amendment 3 does exactly what we in the Appropriations Committee, you on the Republican side and we on Democratic side, wanted to do to improve funding levels for the Department of Children and Family Services. most of that is agreeable to the Senate as well. There is. as I say, one sticky issue. And it is my intention and I know it is Representative Bowman's intention to try to work out that problem, work out that sticky issue. So that this Bill could go on to the Governor and the issue could be resolved in another Conference Committee Report."

Stephens: "Okay, then we understand each other. What you're really doing...is that you're willing to risk those 340 slots. We want to work with you and we'll look at it another way. I think we agree. We don't want this to go

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

to a Conference."

Currie: "Right."

Stephens: "And we would support that and we'll try to get the support in the Senate. And...but it's your risk."

Currie: "Fine."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1827, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens. The Bill is read on Third. Proceed, Sir. Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Excuse me. Prior to Amendments adopted on the House floor, Senate Bill 1827 calls for \$469,778,600 for ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. I move its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1827. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and I voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1828, Representative Stephens. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1828 appropriates \$250,400,000 for the...excuse me...\$257,400...got to watch those decimal points...for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. I move its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1828. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens?"

Stephens: "Yes."

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

Leverenz: "What did you mumble?"

Stephens: "I didn't mumble anything. I said rather clearly \$257,400 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. And I move its passage. That's what I said."

Leverenz: "Okay. I've got to do this for the press. We're getting a transcript of this one. So I'm tough on budgets."

Stephens: "I understand. I like your tie."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1828 pass?'

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

Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

take the record. On this question, there are...Laurino votes 'aye'. He is voting 'aye'. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1829, Representative Stephens. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1829, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 restores \$129,000 that was mistakenly taken out in the Senate for positions that had already been filled. I move...It's an agreed to Amendment. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1829. On the question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "A question of the Sponsor, is this the Amendment,
Representative, that gives the agency the OBRA money in a
lump sum rather than in a line item as we did in the
Appropriations Committee?"

Hasara: "Yes, I believe it does."

Currie: "Then I rise in opposition to the Amendment, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. It turned out that last year this agency did get OBRA money in a lump sum and it used a large chunk of the OBRA money for non OBRA purposes. When the agency was before the Appropriations Committee we suggested that line iteming the OBRA money might make sense. The director of the agency seemed to agree. As well this Amendment restores \$107,000 that was cut by the

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Senate in the view of all four staffs that \$107,000 cut made sense. And it's clear to me that the Senate would not accept this Amendment if this budget should return to the Senate for a concurrence vote. I think that we want to make sure the OBRA money is spent to help people who fall under the OBRA provisions given us by the Government. And I think this Amendment will make it impossible for us to meet that trust. So, I hope you will join me in opposing Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1829."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is... Excuse me. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens, on the question."

Stephens: "Southwestern Illinois."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Lady rises opposition for the wrong reasons. Yes, when OBRA became a reality and in which we dealt with it in last year's fiscal year. No doubt we had some problems. The agency has identified that the dollars appropriated by this Amendment are very much needed for the exact purposes that she rises in opposition. If OBRA is going to work, if we are going to be able to accomplish the requirements of OBRA and implement the programs and get the right services to the amount of people that are necessary. It's absolutely necessary that this Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 4...or
Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye',
all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? A simple majority is required for the adoption
of the Amendment. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. Representative Stephens, for what reason
do you seek recognition?"

Stephens: "Verification,"

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. On the question, there are 59 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no'. Representative Currie wishes to verify the affirmative. Poll the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative: Ackerman. Barger. Barnes. Black. Breslin. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Deuchler. Didrickson. Doederlein. Ewing. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Goforth. Hallock. Hartke. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Hultgren. Johnson. Shirley Jones. Kirkland. Klemm. Kubik. Leitch. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McCracken, Noland. Olson. Myron Olson. Parcells. Parke. Bernard Pedersen. William Peterson. Petka. Phelps. Piel. Pullen. Regan. Richmond. Ropp. Ryder. Sieben. Stange. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner. Wait. Weaver. Weller. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik. Woolard and Zickus. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the affirmative,

  Representative Currie? Representative Matijevich, for
  what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Matijevich: "The young Lady in back of me convinced me and I'm going to change from 'aye' to 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "I see. Record Representative Matijevich as 'no', Mr. Clerk. Representative Currie. Excuse me. Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Just request permission to be verified, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative Currie.

  Representative Currie. Black can be verified. And who do
  you question?"
- Currie: "Representative Turner?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner. Art Turner. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Representative Currie, do you persist in your question of Representative Turner?

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

He's a fast sprinter. Representative Currie, you're persisting in questioning Representative Turner?"

Currie: "Representative Hartke?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke. Mr. Hartke. How is the Gentleman recorded? He's here. The Gentleman is in the chamber. Excuse me. Representative Edley, for what reason do you seek recognition? Mr. Edley is recognized."

Edley: "From 'no' to 'aye', I inadvertently hit the wrong switch."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Edley from 'no' to

Currie: "Representative Barnes?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes is in her Chair."

Currie: "Representative Churchill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill. Mr. Churchill is in the chamber."

Currie: "Representative Kirkland."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland. Mr. Kirkland. The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Currie: "Representative Didrickson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson. Representative Didrickson is in the chamber."

Currie: "Representative Regan?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Regan is in his chair.

Representative Pullen, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Pullen: "May I have leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, you may."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Currie: "Representative Wennlund?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund. Mr. Wennlund. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Currie: "Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "Has Representative Turner...Representative Wennlund has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. We never did take Representative Turner off the Roll Call, Representative Currie. Did you wish to challenge him? No, okay. On this question, there are 59 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

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

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1829, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. After the Amendment 5,213,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Guardianship and Advocacy. I move its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1829. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. 60 votes are Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who required. wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. there are 114 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...Record Representative Morrow as voting 'aye'. There are 115 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate...Representative DeLeo, for what reason do you seek recognition? Mr. DeLeo? Do you wish to speak, Sir? No, turn the Gentleman's microphone off,

- 132nd Legislative Day

  please. Senate Bill 1830, Representative Ryder. Clerk,
  read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Prisoner Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representatives Ryder Hasara."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez, your light is
   flashing. Do you seek recognition?"
- Martinez: "Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Breslin: "You must rise to state a point of...to address the Chair. What is your point of..."
- Martinez: "I want the record to reflect an 'aye' vote on Senate
  Bill 1819 for me."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Martinez, to address the Chair you must stand. It is proper form to stand to present any kind of a Motion. So, please do that in the future. Okay? The record will reflect your remarks. On the Amendment #1 Representative Ryder is recognized. Withdraw. Any further Amendments?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This would restore 25,000 to the budget. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment. I understand it might be...is it?...It's agreed...to adopt."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1830. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Excluding the previous

Amendment just adopted this appropriates \$968,500 to the

Prisoner Review Board."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1830. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1831, Representative Stephens. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion 2 was tabled. There are no further Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1831

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

appropriates 213,023,000 for the ordinary and contingent to the Department of Rehabilitative Services...Rehabilitation Services. I move its passage." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Bill 1831. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1832. Representative Stephens. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

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

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions or further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1832 appropriates \$41,669,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I move its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Senate
Bill 1832. On that question, is there any discussion?
Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1832
pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Voting is open. The Chair would like to recognize a special guest, Speaker Bill Redmond, right here in the center aisle. Welcome, Sir. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1922, Representative Madigan. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Attorney General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Bill would appropriate \$29,591,700 for the Office of the Attorney General. And, at this point, I would like to compliment our staff and Representative Ryder and Stephens and Ed Harmire and their staff and ask for everyone to vote 'aye' to pass this appropriation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1922. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative Leverenz, does this appropriation represent a lower amount than was in the budget?"

Leverenz: "Yes, it's very good of you to point out that this does have a lower amount."

Cullerton: "So, shouldn't we also congratulate the Attorney General?"

Leverenz: "Oh, I would think that that is the right thing to do.

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- I'm so happy that you took the time of this House to point that out."
- Cullerton: "How does this compare with the Secretary of State's budget? The Secretary of State's budget..."
- Leverenz: "Not so hot, but I wouldn't want to bring that up,
   would you?"
- Cullerton: "No, I wouldn't want to bring it up. So, we should vote for this Bill?"
- Leverenz: "I would implore you to give your strongest green vote for this Bill. In the alternative green vote."
- Cullerton: "What's Neil's position on the road diversion?"
- Leverenz: "Some of his friends are for it and some of his friends are against it and he's with his friends. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder, on the question."
- Ryder: "I wish to thank Representative Cullerton for bringing to my attention the lead that was started by the Secretary of State and that he voluntarily reduced his budget by, I think, 2.5 or 3 percent. And he said in committee, at that time, that it was his intention that if we did that, if all other agencies including the current budget would have accomplished that we would not have had to spend the last approximately four weeks arguing over which budget to cut. So, I appreciate Representative for reminding me of the fine example set by the current Secretary of State."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative, Secretary of State?

  Representative Leverenz, you're recognized to close."
- Leverenz: "I want to close. I want to close. I will close now.

  I don't know who had the first idea but if that last speaker was correct, he did it by Amendment. This budget was introduced lower than the previous year. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate

132nd Legislative Day

Clerk

June 20, 1990

Bill 1922?' On that question, those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Stephens, one minute to explain your vote."

- Stephens: "Madam Speaker, I would like to know, an inquiry of the Chair. Were any of the prior remarks paid for by either the political action committees representing Mr. Edgar or Mr. Hartigan? And I demand that each of them step forward and pay for those announcements."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Ryder: "I just wanted him to know that I did have dinner with Carter Hendron last night, and I did not pick up the tab." Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Zickus, are you seeking recognition? Representative Zickus, you'll have to talk into your microphone. Are you seeking recognition? I'm sorry, you are recognized to speak, Representative. You to change Very your vote? good. Representative Zickus from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Wojcik. Change Representative Wojcik from 'no' to 'aye'. Change Representative Hensel from 'no' to Representative Barnes wants to vote for the redhead. Vote her 'aye'. Representative Barger votes 'aye'. There 104 voting 'aye'. Representative Parke votes 'aye'. Representative Stange votes 'aye'. Representative Tenhouse votes 'aye'. Representative Frederick votes 'aye'. are 108 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 1926, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Leone: "Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

appropriations to the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment would add an additional 2,653,259 to the Bill or maybe that's all it would put in the Bill. Whatever the case, the total is going to go up when we pass the Bill to 3.7. I ask for your 'aye' vote to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1926. Is there any discussion?

There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment 1?' 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?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third, Mr.  ${\tt Clerk."}$ 

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have now Claims for 3,703,796. I ask for your 'aye' vote to pass this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1926. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1926 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1929, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1929, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Second Reading of the Bill.

  There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, being offered by Representative Bowman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman. Representative Leverenz, or Currie, which will? Representative Leverenz to present the Amendment, for Representative Bowman."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment would reduce it to a dollar, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 1, to Senate Bill 1929. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third. Excuse me, Representative Hult...Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 29...Correction, Senate Bill 1929, a
  Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of
  Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third
  Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill would appropriate one whole dollar. Ask for your green vote."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1929. On the question, the Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Excuse me, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

- Hultgren: "Representative, do you have some plans for this later on in the Session. Can you give us a clue as to what you want to do?"
- Leverenz: "Yes, Sir, I could give you a clue as to what we're gonna do. This would appropriate one dollar to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities and then we're gonna put some other wheels on it when we get it to the Senate, and kick it back to the House, and so that we could have a football effect with this Bill. I would ask for your 'aye' vote in support, Sir, and we thank you."
- Hultgren: "If I can follow up on that. You said that you intend to get this over to the Senate and then make some additions to it. You obviously have something in mind. Can you elaborate just a little bit on what you intended to do?"
- Leverenz: "Well, I thank you very much for the question, Sir, but it would be inappropriate now to discuss this in public forum, as we would want to keep this and everyone else in the dark about what we're gonna do with this dastardly Bill, this is gonna be used as a vehicle and we're gonna come back with a budget buster like Representative Harris had on that Bill previously of \$1400, a piece of porkette, and I can't really tell you more than that, but we have to do this in order to keep the process moving and have something in the Senate for which the House can amend, in the Senate and bring it back to the House."
- Hultgren: "Representative, I detect perhaps that your being a bit coy on this. I'm wondering, is it a matter of you don't

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

know what you're going to put on this or you're just not going to tell us what you're going to put on this."

- Leverenz: "The answer to that question is 'yes'."
- Hultgren: "Yes, you do not know what you're going to put on this or yes, you do not want to tell us but you do know."
- Leverenz: "In answer to your first question are you being coy.

  "Yes". In answer to your question of do I know what the
  heck is going on with this Bill, the answer is 'yes'.
  Nothing, right now."
- Hultgren: "Well, Representative. It seems to me that perhaps if you do know, that you could share it with the other Members. In as much as you are asking us to support this effort and send it on to the Senate."
- Leverenz: "Representative Leverenz to close. Thank you, Mr.,

  Madam Speaker. I would ask for your 'aye' vote to pass the

  Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz, the Gentleman has a right to pursue his questions."
- Leverenz: "Did he have another one?"
- Speaker Breslin: "And you have a right not to answer them. No, but Representative Hultgren if you wish to speak to the issue, obviously Representative Leverenz is within his rights also. If you wish to speak to the issue you may."
- Hultgren: "Well, Madam Speaker, I...I'm sure that the Representative has some important appropriations to amend to this vehicle Bill when it gets to the Senate, I guess I am a little bit offended that he would ask us to support that without giving us any indication of what it is he intends to do with that. For that reason on this particular vote I'll be a 'present' but would like to support the Representative if he could just be a little bit more straight forward with his intentions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1929 pass?'

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition? He indicates he does not wish to speak. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', and 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. Senate Bill 1933. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1933, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

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

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1933, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Leverenz: "Representative Leverenz, on Senate Bill 1933. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would appropriate \$1.00 and is a vehicle in its true sense of the word that we must have in the Senate. So, that we cannot hamper our state government. I would move for the passage of House Bill (sic — Senate Bill) 1933."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 92 'ayes' and 14 'nos'. Senate Bill 1933 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And that is the end of all the Approp.

# 132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

Bills. If the Chair could have your attention, please. If the Chair could have your attention, the plan at this point is that we will not be in Session on Friday. The plan tomorrow that the Senate will be calling concurrences on the Bills that we've just passed. And we will be calling Bills on concurrences that came across from the Approp. the Senate. And the budget will be finished except about three substantive Bills and three vehicle Bills that will go to a conference. So, with that in mind and knowing that things could change tomorrow, but they probably will not at this point. We are going to go back to Second Readings tonight, because tomorrow will be the last day to Third Reading. So, we're going to go through the calendar that we started this morning on Second Readings. see if we can at least read these a Second time. Tomorrow will probably be the last day you'll these. Representative Regan."

- Regan: "Mr. Speaker, is there any indication whatsoever about what's going to happen next week? Since I have a lovely nine year old daughter to come down here and page, granddaughter. Can you give me one day when we're going to be in Session?"
- Speaker McPike: "We'll probably be in Session. Monday night at probably about 4:00 o'clock Monday afternoon and we'll be here Tuesday."
- Regan: "Not Wednesday? Our plans are for Wednesday are we going to be in Wednesday? She's really looking forward to it, honest to God. She's only nine years old, she's real cute. You'll love her."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, if there is an adjournment pool, I'd pick
  Wednesday. Mr. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While you're discussing work with the Parliamentarian, wanted to thank the Democratic

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

and Republican staffs for their cooperation and the help that they have given us on the House floor. And to our colleagues, Representative Ryder and Stephens and all the other point people on the other side of the aisle, thank them for their cooperation. And it comes from my heart."

Speaker McPike: "On page 6 of the Calendar, Special Call,
Education, appears Senate Bill 1674, Representative Phelps.
Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Speaker McPike: "Any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions relating to Committee Amendment #1.

Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is legislation that this House twice already establishing the accountability provisions in the educational system. This Amendment provides for school performance recognition/nonrecognition status. student objectives, high impact training services in the Department of Public Accountability, business internship partnership commission, rewards for excellence which will be paid by the private sources for 5,000 per teacher and up to 100,000 per district or school for the accomplishments of those given schools. And it provides for secondary school evaluation committee establishing a committee of local business people to have input into the curriculum. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on this, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. This is an Amendment to introduce

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

into the educational system accountability that we have been looking for the last few years. We've considered this same Amendment as a Bill previously. And I rise in support of this Amendment. It's an excellent Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I think our Representative Mautino had that Bill to have business be the superior body over the State Board of Education. And I think that's why we have a State Board to do the things that business wants to do and as long as the state, they're public dollars. We should continue to have a State Board of Education. And I oppose this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin. Mr. Levin, you're on."

Levin: "Oh. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would join in opposition to Amendment #2. You know, Chicago had some serious problems with its schools and oversight made some sense in terms of correcting those problems. The rest of the state clearly, you know, everybody's got problems, everybody could be better. But, I don't think there's the kind of disaster in the rest of the state that we previously had in Chicago. I don't see any justification for this and stand in opposition."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose Amendment #2.

We're all after accountability in government and in
education, but just adding layer upon layer of bureaucracy
won't do it. Every educational association you can think
of is against this Amendment. And I urge you to vote
'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."
Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
Mautino: "Yes."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Satterthwaite: "Representative Mautino, you indicated, I believe, in your introductory remarks, that this legislation had passed before. But my understanding is that it was not in exactly this form when it passed before, is that true?"
- Mautino: "Representative Satterthwaite, the original Bill which was 2030, I believe, it's different from that form that originally passed. This is the same form that passed as an Amendment approximately three weeks ago, that got 106 votes. It's identical. The Bill was not called in the Senate so it comes back here as an Amendment."
- Satterthwaite: "Were both portions of this included in that legislation? I thought that the Secondary School Evaluation Committee portion of this was not in that legislation?"
- Mautino: "There was two Bills one was 3085 and one was Matijevich and one was Hartke's and the other one was 3299. They're combined into one now. They both flew out of the House three weeks ago."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Phelps: "Representative Mautino, does this provision as in your Amendment would it include the Chicago schools?"
- Mautino: "Chicago's...the Department of Public Accountability is not in there for the Chicago schools as long as they have the School Finance Oversight Committee. It does the same function. So, Chicago in that regard because they have the Finance Authority is not in here."
- Phelps: "Another question, would...cannot...is there anything prohibiting the local school boards from appointing such a committee similar to what you're trying to set up here, if

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

they choose so?"

Mautino: "There's no reason they couldn't do it, but they haven't been doing it."

Phelps: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment, first let me say to Body that I agreed to let Representative Mautino utilize my since it's been the only Bill really available addressing educational issues left in the Session. And I was fair and true to my commitment. I do oppose the Bill on its merit because I feel that this is the duty of present school board. And that if this should be mandated all high schools and unit schools in the state would be in jeopardy of their own local autonomy. And the local school boards can right now if they wish choose to put a committee in place. The term evaluate in this Amendment could mean that the committee could make recommendations of performance of school employees. And I feel like that years ago this was assigned the responsibility administrators and ultimately to the board. And the new evaluation procedures were established and, I believe, are working so this could jeopardize that relationship. So, because of those particular items I oppose the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in opposition. The Gentleman who has this Amendment did put one of his two Amendments on one of my Bills. And it sort of sailed out of here, but both of those Bills on which he did amend, the educational community did not really come in opposition until the Bills came over to the Senate. And then they were very vocal and vehement in their opposition and the Bills were not passed in the Senate because of these Amendments. I don't think that we ought to now, when we haven't allowed educational reform to be implemented yet, that we ought to now start putting in new language

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

into what amounts to educational reform. I'm sure that there are many in the education community that don't like the way DCCA is really promoting economic development. But that doesn't mean that we ought to put a committee of educators on to DCCA or some committee of DCCA to try to reform economic development and the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. I think we ought to allow education reform to work for awhile and then see how it does function before we overreact, which I really think the Illinois Manufacturers Association is doing at this time, they are overreacting. Let's wait awhile and, therefore, let's defeat Amendment #2 and get on with our business."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. this Amendment because in answering one of the questions, the Sponsor indicated that this would put oversight committee over the school districts around the state just like the oversight committee is in Chicago. And what is going on in Chicago is that there are two boards of education, there's an oversight board and there's a regular board. And I think that that came into existence as a result of a lot of interplay, conversation, and talking through with the citizens up there. And I think that it would be quite inappropriate to impose similar mechanism around the state particularly downstate without having talked with the various boards of education the people in the various school districts. think it would be very unfair to proceed with this. It has been resoundingly voted down. It is not wanted by various school districts boards or their superintendents. And for those reasons I think it ought to be voted down."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, is there additional dollars that will be required in establishing this extra layer?"

Mautino: "Not that I'm aware of because the Department of Accountability has already been established in the State Board of Election...State Board of Education...in the State Board of Education here. And I think they had a meeting today."

"Okay, to the Bill, it seems to me and I am one to applaud Ropp: the Illinois Manufacturing Association for their efforts on behalf of business to finally appreciate and express concern in what needs to be in the curriculums for young people who are in our school system. And I think that's a I think by their concern here all of us have come a long way. The concern that I have with this is in fact, that there are any number of groups that are attempting to work on curriculums and programs, to deal with what people need and this merely establishes additional people in a system that is already moving in the proper direction. And I would urge you not to support this because if what we need in government and even in education is bureaucracy, I certainly am not in support of and I think that's kind of what this is attempting to do. Even though well intentioned it does provide for more and more people to get involved with the system when in fact all we need to know is what business really wants. They're now in position to begin to tell educators and I support that move not this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. The unique part about this proposal is that the education community, in some cases, don't want anyone looking over their shoulder. Report cards are provided, they're mentioned and nothing ever

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

occurs after that. Αt least with an outside...outside individuals who will be the employers of those children getting out of school. They should have some input, I believe, in evaluation of those learning objectives of those students. Basically, this legislation requires school districts to achieve or make progress towards achieving student learning objectives which meet or exceed goals established by the state. Basically what we're doing here is right and correct. Employers having input into the product that is the end line product of our school system for future employment. I see nothing wrong with it. passed out of this House in this exact form on House Bill 3299 by a vote of 95 to 15 and also on House Bill 3885 with a vote of 104 to 7. I think, if it was correct three weeks ago, it is still correct and provides input by individuals who will be hiring the students and the line product of what we're doing. And I move for its adoption."

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

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. On this

Amendment, there's 27...Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Yes,

Mr. Piel. Representative Piel would like to vote 'no'. On

this Amendment, there are 28 'ayes' and 79 'nos'. The

Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment deals with a question that's been around a few times. On the community college level...this is a fair proposal with two reasons in mind. One, it suggests ways for the community college board how they would layoff part time people as referred in reference to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

full time status. And how they would...suggest how they would hire a recall. Presently before...right now community college board is different than in K thru 12 classification because they can have the flexibility employ part time people. What this provision will do, before a full time person is laid off a part time person would be laid of in the same area of specialty leaving the option for or the requirements, I should say, for the community college board to put a full time person on, if that opening avails itself because of the part time lavoff. We've seen instances where community college boards could combined several part time positions after and have recalled a full time person to that specialized area that's what we're trying to guarantee in this Bill. I your support."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Amendment, Representative McGann." McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I want the position clearly defined for you. This Amendment was part of House Bill 613. We've spent many hours in the last couple of years working back and forth with the Trustees Association, the College Teachers Union 1608 and the Illinois Federation of Teachers. When addressed the issue we stated we would have more meetings and try and resolve something so that we could come next year. I'm in total support of the contents of the Amendment, because there has been some movement to get rid of qualified faculty in the community college system and replace them with part timers. In fact, there was a court case on this same matter in which it was very clearly defined that we had to go back and do something with the statute. But in all fairness to all the parties that we're concerned about this year, I would like to let everyone know this is still in negotiation. And I'm not so sure

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

whether this is the right step to take now with an Amendment on another Bill. I'll leave that up to your judgment. I believe that something has to be done but I also believe, in the tradition that a person's word is a person's word, and my word was that we would continue to work out. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. appreciate Representative McGann's comments, both he and I have talked about this Bill as it was House Bill 613, terms of trying to reach an agreement. I have not been contacted that there is any agreement. It does place time employees under the Community College Act under the same...it would make provisions with regards to collective bargaining agreements and all the benefits that would go along with full time employment of employees. I think those of us who are looking within our community college districts and how we can afford increasing costs and the burden frequently on property taxes. I don't think this is the right direction to go. They do need the flexibility to able to hire part time teachers in certain instances, for example, real estate, etc. I think it's premature. not aware, as Representative McGann is, negotiated settlement with regards to this issue. would suggest that a 'no' vote would be the appropriate vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in opposition to this Amendment. Again, here's an example of taking away certain kinds of controls from locally elected trustees at community colleges. Also it limits their ability to make the kinds of decisions that sometimes are very difficult to make, when it comes to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

releasing faculty this takes a lot of that judgment away And also it is going to increase the cost of providing the kinds of services that community colleges We have to remember that community colleges have over half the student population, higher population in the public institutions in this state. we're talking about a very large enterprise. And if the parties involved had not come to agreement, we certainly should not be put in the position of making that decision for them. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I move the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's been explained thoroughly. I would just ask that we try to join the K thru 12 board in their rulings of how the effect and look at full time as opposed to part time. The community colleges right now have this flexibility, but they have no certification board for community colleges. And we think that's a disadvantage when it comes to jeopardizing a full time position. Appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?'

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

Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of
Representative Phelps' Amendment. I do so for three
reasons. First of all on the merits of the Amendment, even
Representative McGann who rose against the Amendment stands

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

in favor of the concept. He simply is opposed to going in advance at the conclusion of negotiations. The problem is negotiations have been going on for two years. How long do you expect these people to wait 'til we all leave the chamber? So, I don't think we can expect negotiations to go on forever. Second, this is simply an issue of The question of fairness is obvious when you're fairness. taking care of...when you're hiring and maintaining hiring of full time employees rather than part time employees. There is an obvious opportunity here for finagling and skullduggery when they would be allowing part time employees to be...to continue on the job longer than full time employees. And, finally, I think we have a tradition in this chamber of allowing the Sponsor of legislation to have that legislation the way he wants it. Representative Phelps wishes for this Amendment to be on it. We can vote against the Bill if we don't want to vote for the Bill, but I think Representative Phelps has a right to have his Bill in the fashion that he wants to for Third Reading. So, I think that we ought to give him that right and I think that we ought to change some of those red votes to green."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 43 'ayes', 59 'nos'. The Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraw. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Phelps."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very quickly, this exempts the certificate renewal fee persons to have...who have held the Certificate for Renewal for at least 20 years. Now, originally in the Bill in committee I had the taking out of the regional superintendents fee structure. But now that we asked this to be a separate line item within the Department of Education, so if it's not funded then it doesn't get funded. So, it's to be taken in that spirit."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Is this included as a separate line item in the budget of the State Board?"

Phelps: "No, it is not. It is not."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to be one of the people that would be a beneficiary of this particular piece of legislation. So, I suppose I have a conflict of interest and perhaps I have more of a conflict, because I'm going to be opposed to what would appear to be in my best interest. But I will tell you that to renew a certificate costs you four dollars. Four dollars. Now, it doesn't make sense that we're going to have to go through what we have to go through to avoid people who have drawn over 20 years to pay your four dollars to keep their certificates renewed. And for that reason I stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 75 'ayes', 26 'nos'.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representatives Hicks - Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 is the Minimum Teachers' Salary Bill that we passed out of here on a vote of 77 to 25. Putting it back in here, it never came out of the...the House Bill never came out of the Senate Rules Committee. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #6 for reasons. The first of those reasons is that this is a decision which belongs at the local level. It is not something that can be made in a sensible and reasonable way for the entire state here in Springfield. It is a local issue. It should be decided in the local communities. the second reason for rising in opposition to this has to do with the funding. The Sponsor of this Amendment will tell you it doesn't go into effect for another year or months or you know somewhere off there in that uncertain future where we won't have to worry about where we're going to find the money. We do that kind of thing all the time, Speaker. We promise people scholarships and then we don't appropriate the money. We promise the pensioners that we're going to start funding the unfunded liability and we make that promise just last year in Senate Bill 95 and this year do we do it? Do we keep our word? Of course Now we want to make another kind of a promise. one which don't ever be mistaken about this, which shifts the existing amount of education money from some districts to other districts. You better make sure which districts

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

yours are. The ones that get more money or lose money. But it consists, my friends, of making a promise. Still another promise. And I submit to you that we have already made so many promises, maybe we had better stop and very quietly think that we have miles to go before we sleep. Miles to go before we sleep."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. On Special Order of Business, on this Calendar, we're going to go through all of these and if you want...we're on Second Reading, if you want to call the Bill, let the Chair know. If you have a Bill on Third Reading and you wish to have it brought back to Second for an Amendment, let the Chair know. But we will not be calling any Third Reading Bills tonight, only Second Readings. Senate Bill 1488, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1488, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin. Mr. Levin. Withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. We're not calling any Bills on Third Reading, Representative Cullerton. Alright, on Banking, Third Reading. No, we were just on Second Reading. Education, Third Reading. Does anyone have a Bill they wish to bring back to Second?

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

That'd be Steczo - Turner - Levin. Environment, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1838, Mr. Brunsvold. Read the Bill a Second time, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1838."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1838, on the Order of Third Reading,

  Senate Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife

  Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, take it out of the record.

  Environment, Third Reading. Hicks and Currie, do you wish these Bills brought back to Second Reading for Amendments? Criminal Law, Second Reading. Do you want the Bill read a Second Time, Representative Munizzi? Criminal Law, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1613. Read it a Second time, Mr. Clerk. It's on Third Reading? Senate Bill 2309, Representative Young. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2309, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

  There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "I wish to withdraw Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4."

Speaker McPike: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Amendment #5 incorporates provisions of House Bill 3817 which was sponsored by Representative Kirkland. That Bill passed out of the House 117 to zip, but it died in Senate Rules. This also is the Supreme Court's recommendation to clarify the definition of the term 'probation' in various Acts. And, thirdly, it defines and

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

includes in various Acts the new term 'conditional probation' for those sentences of the court which do not involve a conviction of a defendant. This change is needed to avoid the necessity of the Appellate Court having to interpret on a case by case basis the meaning of the term 'probation'. The use of the new term 'conditional probation' will provide a different and distinct meaning for sentences based upon conviction and contrast deferred sentences. This does not reduce or enhance any penalties for violations of the law. And I move for favorable adoption of Senate...Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 2309."

- Speaker McPike: "There being no discussion, the question is,

  'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye',

  opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's

  adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative
  Anthony Young."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #6 creates a substance abuse treatment program within the Department of Corrections. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "There being no discussion, the question is,
  'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye',
  opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's
  adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, who is it?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "I'm sorry, Representative Young's...Amendment. I defer to Representative Young."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #7 is actually a Bill this House passed that was sponsored by Representative Kirkland and it died in Senate Rules. And I defer to Representative Kirkland to explain the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, this was House Bill 3881 that passed the House 106 to 2 to 3. It increases supervision of released inmates on parole mandatory supervisory release during the critical periods when research shows those inmates most likely to commit new offenses or technical violations. The Bill modifies terms of supervision, reducing same by a third, to reduce parole case loads, allow more intense case supervision by parole agents and to ensure public safety within current restraints. This is a recommendation made by a task force on prisoner release issues that met pursuant to a 1989 Senate Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "There being no discussion, the question is,

'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye',

opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representatives

Pullen — Anthony Young."

Speaker McPike: "Representative...Mr. Clerk, the Chair cannot hear you."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Pullen and Anthony Young."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #8 is the product of much negotiation over the past couple of weeks. And would require the Department of Corrections to provide HIV testing to every inmate before that inmate is released. If the inmate turns

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

out to be infected with the HIV virus, the Department would be required to provide appropriate medical care and to make every reasonable effort to notify the person's spouse, if any is known to the Department. Additionally, the Department is required to counsel the inmate in a way that will assist him in preventing spreading the infection and also in obtaining medical care after release and drug abuse treatment if he has a history of drug...intravenous drug abuse. The Amendment is very much needed. And from discussions that I had with the Department of Corrections today I can tell you that the Department has no objections to it. And I move its favorable adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this? Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Levin: "Representative, are you prepared to support an increase in taxes in order to pay for the cost of implementing this Amendment?"

Pullen: "Sir, I am certainly prepared to support appropriations to support this, but I don't think an increase in taxes is needed. And the HIV epidemic is here and costly whether you like it or not."

Levin: "Representative, do you know how much that it is estimated that implementation of this Amendment will cost?"

Pullen: "I do not have an estimate of the cost, Sir. But I think that it is rather minimal considering that the Department of Public Health...Excuse me...considering that ELISA test kits are now available for \$1.40."

Levin: "Representative, I have a statement from the Department of Corrections that estimates that Amendment #3 and this is very similar to Amendment #3 as far as cost. It is estimated at \$989,640. So, in other words you're talking

#### 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

about approximately a million dollars to implement this Amendment. It would seem to me we need a tax increase in order to be able to afford this Amendment. Representative, there was, previously, adopted a voluntary program in terms of testing of prisoners, is that not correct?"

- Pullen: "There is a law that requires the Department to offer testing to those that have a history of drug abuse not to all inmates, and it doesn't necessarily require offering it."
- Levin: "And, Representative, is there any money in the current budget or in the proposed budget for the next fiscal year to fund that voluntary effort?"
- Pullen: "Sir, the Department does have money for medical care of inmates, and I'm certain that they could use that money for this purpose."
- Levin: "There is no line item in there specifically for the voluntary program."
- Pullen: "I have no knowledge of that."
- Levin: "To the Bill...to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. We have a price tag of one million dollars on this Amendment. The Department either did not seek, because there were other priorities, or the Bureau of the Budget did not feel it was a sufficiently high priority to fund the voluntary program.

  They're looking for money to feed inmates let alone to have a mandatory test. I don't see where we're going to get the million dollars for this program. And I stand in opposition."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Amendment. And to some of the issues raised by the last speaker, this Amendment will not cost a million dollars. Amendment #3 had quite an extensive, exhaustive reporting and statistical record

#### 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

keeping requirements in the Amendment that the Department opposed and that was the costly part of the Amendment. By taking those requirements out of Amendment #8 the Department of Corrections is not opposed to this Amendment. And I urge its adoption."

- Speaker McPike: "Now, the question is...Representative Pullen to close."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that my Cosponsor of the Amendment has covered the points well and I move adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?'

  All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there's 101 'ayes' and 10 'nos'. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? A request for a fiscal note has now been filed. Representative Young."
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Young: "Mr. Speaker, I move that a physical fiscal note is inapplicable...fiscal note is inapplicable."
- Speaker McPike: "And the question is, 'Shall the Gentleman's Motion carry?' All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 100 'ayes' and 8 'nos'. And the Motion carries. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Alright, now we're going back to Education, Third Reading. Representative Turner has a Bill he'd like to return to Second Reading Senate Bill 1523. Representative Hensel, for what reason do you rise?"

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Well, we'll...yeah, you can. But let me finish
   with Education first."
- Hensel: "Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 1523. The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Hearing no objection, leave's granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments filed? No, 1523, Senate Bill 1523. Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1523, on the Order of Second Reading,
  Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative
  Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Amendment #4 is a technical Amendment that was presented to me by the Illinois Community Colleges."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, are there any objections to this Amendment? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Ropp."

  Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This

  Amendment #5 is in essence exactly like House Bill 2998

  that we passed out of here 108 to 0."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any opposition to this Amendment?

  Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be
  adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
  'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative
  Turner."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 simply adds the

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- anatomical gift back to this legislation to make certain that people know about organ donations."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'

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

  The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Alright, continuing down the Calendar is Criminal Law, Third Reading. Representative Hensel asks leave to bring Senate Bill 1515 back to Second Reading. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Hensel."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Amendment #3 is being offered in response to the opposition that Chicago is eliminated from the Bill. This Bill now says, 'That any city having a population exceeding 3 million inhabitants shall report such crime statistics by police districts, but only with respect to those parts of that city which are located in police districts situated within 5000 feet of the institutions campus.' I ask for adoption..."
- Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "So, this is the Bill that was on Postponed Consideration? And this is the Amendment that's suppose to save it?"
- Hensel: "Yeah, well it improves a good Bill, yes."
- Cullerton: "Alright, and what you're doing then is for Chicago.

  You're saying that the crime statistics should be reported
  by police district?"
- Hensel: "If the police district within...if it's situated...the institution is situated within 5000 feet of a...that police

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

district in which it's in, which is approximately a mile."

Cullerton: "So, more than one police...so it applies to private schools as well? The Bill applies to private schools as well?"

Hensel: "Yes."

- Cullerton: "So, in the City of Chicago say at the University of Chicago they would have to report the crime statistics for more, perhaps one police district and possibly more than one police district. Is that correct? Why do you think this improves the Bill?"
- Hensel: "Well, because there was opposition that Chicago was left out and we felt that by reporting all the statistics for Chicago would not be representative of the institution's area. So, we cut it down into police districts."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, I don't know. I don't think it helps you that much with regard to the opposition. I just wanted to find out what your motivation was."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Bill stays on Postponed.

  The next Order is State and Local Government, Second Reading. Representative Brunsvold. Joel Brunsvold.

  Senate Bill 1750. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2036, Representative Saltsman. Mr. Saltsman, Senate Bill 2036.

  Do you wish to call the Bill? Is the fiscal note filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "The fiscal note is filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2171, Representative Keane. Mr. Keane. He's not here. State and Local Government, Third Reading. Does anyone wish a Bill brought

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

back on Third Reading? The first one is Representative Bugielski. He has his light on. Senate Bill 1484 is on Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to bring it back to Second. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?" Alright, let's deal with this Bill first before you turn on any more lights. And we'll get back to you."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1484, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Economic Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Bugielski."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Withdraw #1...Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Bugielski."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 would just put this Board under...within the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor...Someone rise in opposition to this? Representative Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "I just have an inquiry of the Clerk. I want to know if Amendment #1 got on the Bill or not."

Speaker McPike: "It was just withdrawn."

Cullerton: "I'm sorry, we haven't been paying attention over here."

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

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

The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Second light I saw was Mr.

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

Black. Senate Bill...Mr. Black...Excuse me. Excuse me. Mr. Black. Representative Ewing, did you have a Bill here? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "2084."

- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 2084, Representative Ewing asks leave to bring it back to Second Reading. The Gentleman has leave. The Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2084, on the Order of Second Reading.

  Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative
  Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier this Session we passed out of this Body House Bill 3984 with 110 votes. And this dealt with a problem a constituent of mine had collecting on a \$1000 lottery ticket. As you all are aware you can mail your lottery tickets in for collection."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ewing, does anyone stand in opposition to your Amendment? Alright, seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Ewing: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Black asks leave to return 1643 to Second Reading. Hearing no objections, Senate Bill 1643 is on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1643 provides for some

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- protection for the Soil and Water Conservation District Managers and their employees. It provides for...to help them with immunity for..."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this
   Amendment?"
- Novak: "No."
- Speaker McPike: "Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1...Yes, I asked leave to return this Bill to Second Reading. Leave was granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. And there being no opposition to this Amendment, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Granberg and Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg. Mr. Granberg. Withdraw the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Granberg and Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg withdraws Amendment #3.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 allows as a provision to the Act, that states that soil and water conservation districts can, permissible language, can provide provisions prohibiting the clearing of trees within 30 feet of any navigable waterways in the state, which is defined by the Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Waterways. There is no known opposition, I don't believe."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this?

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative McGann, do you have a Bill on this Order?"
- McGann: "Yes, I ask leave to return Senate Bill 2075 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative McGann."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly.

  Amendment #2 as to Senate Bill 2075 deals once again with
  the provision of the Mental Health Code. It makes a
  technical change and incorporates more specific
  procedures..."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, does anyone stand in opposition to this Amendment? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

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

  The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Anyone else on this Order?

  Housing, Third Reading. Representative Capparelli, do you need this Bill brought back? Alright, Human Services,
  Third Reading. Representative Lang.
  Representative...Anyone on Human Services, Third Reading,
  wish a Bill brought back? Hearing none, we're on
  Insurance, Second...Representative McGann, do you want this
  Bill brought back? Alright, the Gentleman asks leave to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

return Senate Bill 2076 to Second Reading. The Gentleman has leave. The Bill's on Second Reading. Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly.

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2076, once again addresses the revision of the Mental Health Code."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this
Amendment? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'
All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Insurance, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2099. Out of the record. Representative Phelps, do you wish that Bill brought back? Alright, going back to Human Services, Third Senate Bill 2277. The Gentleman asks leave to return to Second Reading. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading. Any Amendments. Mr. Clerk? Any Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Withdraw #2."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's getting late, very quickly, this Amendment is a framework that we're trying to move as negotiations are continued with various groups including Public Health. And

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

by the morning, if we can get this Amendment on, we may have something to vote on in agreed form. Appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Stephens: "Have you checked with Representative Hasara on this?" Phelps: "Yes, Sir."

Stephens: "Thank you."

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

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

Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Do you want the Bill left on Second or Third Reading? Mr. Phelps, where do you want the Bill? Third Reading. Alright, Insurance, Third Reading. Transportation, Second Reading, Senate Bill 2239. Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2239, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Granberg."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 amends the section which includes the powers of municipalities and counties to allow municipalities and counties to also contract with churches for the regulation of traffic on their parking lots."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this? Mr.

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- Mautino, do you stand in opposition to this? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much. I stand in support of Representative Leverenz's Amendment which provides for yellow osculating lights."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

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

  The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Hallock."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock. Mr. Hallock here? Mr. Stephens, you want to handle this? The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Transportation, Third Reading.

  Any requests? Children, Third Reading. Any requests?

  State Government, Second Reading. State Government, Third Reading. Any requests? Public Utilities, Third Reading.

  Horse Racing...Representative Mautino, what do you have?"

Mautino: "Insurance, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Insurance, we passed a long time ago."

Mautino: "About five minutes ago, you did mention it."

- Speaker McPike: "Where...what page is it on? Insurance, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1962. Is that it?"
- Mautino: "Yes, Sir, I want to take it back to Second."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 1962 to Second Reading. No objections, the

132nd Legislative Day

June 20. 1990

Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. . Speaker, Amendment #2 simply adds an extension of benefits on medical policies that are issued in the State of Illinois. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment...Mr. Hultgren, I guess you don't have the Amendment, do you? Has the Amendment been printed and distributed? Yes, it has been printed. Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank...Mr. Speaker, the...the other..."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Amendment? No. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 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 #3 offered by Representative

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is the recommendations of the Comprehensive Health Insurance Program Board for cost saving measures. These changes are desired to make CHIP available to more of the uninsurable population without additional funding. We have it capped at 4500 and there are nearly 1200 applicants waiting for coverage. Senate Bill 1962 addresses the question of dumping by making ineligible for the plan anyone who is removed from a group insurance plan from an employer of more than 10 employees. This provision sunsets on October 1st of 1991. I move for

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Anyone stand in opposition, Representative McCracken. Alright, the question...no opposition on this. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. State Government Administration.

Any requests? Alright, we're down to Labor, Second

Reading, Senate Bill 1638. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. 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 McPike."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Clerk O'Brien: "...and Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Changes the title to state, 'An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act by changing Section 1300.' Deletes the Bill..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton, did...this is a conformance to Federal Law Amendment? Is that correct?"

Cullerton: "Yeah, I think that's what it does. Yeah, that's what it looks like it does."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Labor, Third Reading. Any

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

requests? Representative Saltsman, on Senate Bill 1704. The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Saltsman."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. What this does, where Central Management Services, it keeps them in a prevailing..."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any opposition to this? Yes there is, proceed, Sir."

Saltsman: "That this will put them under the printers prevailing wage on the purchases of computer papers and so on like they normally are. They're presently doing it at this time, if we don't have this Amendment it will change it in the near future."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, in opposition, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, I rise in opposition on the merits. And if this
Amendment gets adopted I will demand that it be returned to
Second Reading, First Legislative Day, because it changes
the title. So, I oppose this Amendment on the merits and
CMS is opposed to this on the merits. It changes the title
and I will demand that it be taken back to Second Reading,
First Legislative Day."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Are we debating the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the Amendment, proceed."

Didrickson: "Representative Saltsman, I'm surprised with what you're trying to do here with regards to adding additional cost to how we purchase commodities in the State of Illinois. We've spent all day with regards to

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

appropriations and trying to keep those costs down. Ladies and Gentlemen of this chamber, please understand what this Amendment does. It says that the State of Illinois cannot purchase commodities off the shelf from vendor inventory. They have to be specially ordered and, when they are specially ordered, they are then considered printing items. For example, if we were to buy the last contract for stock computer form paper it adds \$110,000 in additional cost. Telephone message pads increase costs \$18,700."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson, Representative Didrickson, Mr. Saltsman withdraws the Amendment."

Didrickson: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Civil Law, Second, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. Civil Law, Third. Any requests? Revenue, Second...Alright, page 12 of the Calendar under...On page 12 of the Calendar under Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, Senate Bill 2067. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. 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 Saltsman."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. All that this does is change the year that these TIF zones..."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Amendment? Someone does, proceed, Sir."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

- Saltsman: "It changes from '81 to...'80 to '81, one year, include the cities that were there in '80."
- Speaker McPike: "On that, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Maybe I didn't realize what this was when I stood up, this is for your district or..."
- Speaker McPike: "It's for a number of districts, I believe."
- McCracken: "Let it go."
- Speaker McPike: "No objections, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This clarifies the purposes for which the 30 percent capped dollars for reimbursement for interest rates for developers can be used in the TIF project. I move its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, I...I couldn't hear a word you said. Could you tell us what the significance of this is?"
- Currie: "I think it's only a technical clarification, Representative. It's my understanding from the Department of Revenue that this does not make a substantive change in the way those dollars...for what purposes dollars can be reimbursed. But, in the opinion of one of the bond council groups, there was uncertainty and so we offered this language to clarify that ambiguity."
- McCracken: "Has anyone ever thought that maybe bond council make these suggestions so they can sell more bonds?"
- Currie: "And certainly if they're doing this work on an hourly basis, I should think maybe so, but in any case that's the reason for this Amendment. And it's my understanding that

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

it really is just a clarification."

McCracken: "That's fine."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, if no objections, the question is,

'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye',

opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've had agreement from the other side of the aisle, Mr. McCracken, on Senate Bill 2059."

Speaker McPike: "Well, we're not finished with this Bill, yet.

Did you want this on Third Reading?"

Saltsman: "Yeah, I thought it was there already."

Speaker McPike: "No. So, the Amendments have been adopted. No further Amendments. The request is to put this on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Legislative Day. Hearing no objection, the Bill will so be placed. Alright, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "On Senate Bill 2059, I ask permission..."

Speaker McPike: "Where is that, Sir?"

Saltsman: "The House, it's on the table now. We did not put into Interim Study Committee before the committees adjourned.

And I cleared this with Representative McCracken to put it in Interim Study."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, and the Bill Number?"

Saltsman: "Senate Bill 2059."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, thank you. The Motion is to put Senate Bill 2059 into Interim Study. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call is used and the Bill is on Interim Study. The Clerk will read all of the Bills on the Regular Calendar that are on Second Reading a second time tonight during Perfunctory Session and leave them on Second Reading. Representative McCracken."

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

McCracken: "That's fine, can I pull a Bill back to Second and leave it there tonight and then have it called tomorrow?

1905, it's on Third Reading today. I just wanted to move it back."

Speaker McPike: "On the Regular Calendar?"

McCracken: "Yes, on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading for today."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, it's on the Consent Calendar."

McCracken: "1905."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton, do you object?"

Cullerton: "Well, I just wanted to find out what the plan here was. I mean we could do it tomorrow. Do you have a concern about the Amendment not being agreed? Okay, fine.

Why does he do it tomorrow?"

- Speaker McPike: "You just want the Bill put on Second Reading?

  You want to adopt the Amendment tonight? Alright, the
  Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 1905 to Second

  Reading. Hearing no objections. The Bill's on Second

  Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 offered by Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, thank you. I move to table Amendment #1,

  Amendment #2 will account for that. Senate Bill 1905, I

  move to table Amendment #1 previously adopted."
- Speaker McPike: "the Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative McCracken."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Floor Amendment #2 would set the referendum petition

132nd Legislative Day

- June 20, 1990
- signature requirement at 7.5 percent or the lesser of 200 signatures or 15 percent of the registered voters. And between those two the greater petition signature requirement would apply."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion on this? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading and tomorrow it will be on Second Day. Representative McCracken, the Chair failed to ask for leave to put your Bill back on Consent Calendar. The Bill's been amended. Does the Chair have leave. Has leave. The Bill will be back on the Consent Calendar. Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1641, on page 6 of the Consent Calendar, was on the Consent Calendar. It's my understanding objections have been removed. And I'd ask leave to call it. Representative...Representative...It is on Second Reading. Representative McCracken has an Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative, the Chair announced that we were going to read all of these Bills on Second Reading on the Regular Calendar tonight. So, they can be amended and passed tomorrow."
- Wennlund: "Fine, thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Okay. So, with no other business,

  Representative Matijevich moves that the House stand
  adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of10:00 a.m. leaving
  the Clerk perfunctory time for Second Readings on the
  Regular Calendar. Representative Woolard."
- Woolard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement for all of those jovially fat Republicans who are going to be

132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

entertained by the moderately slim Democrats. We will convene at 7:50 at Alexander's, it's the intersection of Jefferson and Bruns Road."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an announcement to the Class of '83 who had our dinner scheduled for Thursday night, that will be postponed until next Wednesday night and we'll go from there. So, dinner for tomorrow night, Thursday night, has been postponed until next week."

Speaker McPike: "And on Representative Matijevich's Motion, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion's adopted. The House stands adjourned.

10:00 a.m. 10:00 a.m. tomorrow."

O'Brien: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1065, Clerk a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1125, has been read a Second time previously. Senate Bill 1504, for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1565, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act to amend the Riverboat Gambling Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1766, a Bill for an Act to allow districts to conduct parental institutes. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1768, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2001 been read a Second time previously. Senate Bill 2056, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2083, a Bill for an Act to create the Savings Bank Act. Second Reading of

#### 132nd Legislative Day

June 20, 1990

the Bill. Senate Bill 2086, a Bill for an Act to amend the Historic Preservation Agency Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2099 has been read a Second time previously. Senate Bill 2171, a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2210, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2229, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to home rule units. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2267 has been read a Second time previously. Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the following Bills together with Amendments, to wit; in the adoption of which I instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit; House Bills Number 3339, 3340, 3341, 3342, 3343, 3344, 3392. 3393, 3453, 3457, 3458, 3459, 3460, 3461, 3462, 3463, 3464, 3465, 3466, 3467, 3472, 3473, 3474, 3492, 3534, 3535, 3537. 3538, 3539, 3540, 3541, 3543, 3544, 3545, 3546, 3547, 3548. 3549, 3580, 3562, 3585, 3645, 3646, 3683, 3695, 3720, 3727, 3755, 3771, 3793, 3838, 3843, 3874, 3952, 3959, 3914, 3994, 4024, 4027, 4036, 4049, 4126, 4129, 4178, passed the Senate as amended June 20, 1990.' Linda Hawker, Secretary of Senate. Being no further business, the House now adjourned."

REPORT: TĮFLPAY PAGE: 001

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

91/02/04 10:33:48

JUNE 20, 1990

ENCE LEADING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	210 210 195 185 58 210 2 13 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	210 195 185 58 210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 61 24 203 210 196 172
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	195 185 58 58 210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	185 58 58 210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	58 58 210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING EADING EADING EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	58 210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING EADING EADING EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	210 2 13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING EO CONSIDERATION EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	2 13 193 192 58 59 59 60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
ED CONSIDERATION READING	N PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	13 193 192 58 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	193 192 58 59 60 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196
READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	192 58 59 59 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING EADING EADING EADING EADING EADING READING READING READING EADING EADING EADING EADING EADING EADING EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	58 59 59 60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	59 59 60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196
READING RADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	59 60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196
EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	60 60 61 210 61 14 24 203 210 196
READING READING READING READING RADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	60 61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING READING EADING EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	61 210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
READING READING RADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	210 61 61 14 24 203 210 196
READING RADING RADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	61 61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	61 14 24 203 210 196 172
EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	14 24 203 210 196 172
READING READING READING READING READING READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	24 203 210 196 172
READING READING READING READING READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	203 210 196 172
READING READING READING READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	210 196 172
READING READING READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	196 172
READING READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE	172
READING READING READING	PAGE PAGE	
READING READING	PAGE	204
READING		
	PAGE	
READING	PAGE	-
READING	PAGE	
READING	PAGE	
ADING	PAGE	
REAUING	PAGE	62
ADING	PAGE	62
READING	PAGE	63
ADING	PAGE	63
READING	PAGE	63
ADING	PAGE	64
READING	PAGE	64
ADING	PAGE	65
READING	PAGE	
ADING	PAGE	65
		65
		66 47
		67 47
		67 68
		68
		68
	,	69
		69
		69
		70
	PAGE	
	PAGE	70
ADING	PAGE	80
	PAGE	81
	PAGE	81
	PAGE	81
READING	PAGE	82
READING EADING	PAGE	82
	READING DEADING EADING EADING EADING READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE READING PAGE

### STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX JUNE 20, 1990 S8-1301 THIRD READING S3-1802 SECOND READING SB-1802 THIRD READING SB-1803 SECOND READING SE-1803 THIRD READING SE-1804 SECOND READING SE-1804 THIRD READING SB-1805 SECOND READING SB-1805 THIRD READING SB-1806 SECOND READING SB-1806 THIRD READING SB-1807 SECOND READING SB-1807 THIRD READING SB-1808 SECOND READING SB-1808 THIRD READING SE-1309 SECOND READING SB-1809 THIRD READING SH-1810 SECOND READING SA-1810 THIRD READING SB-1811 SECOND READING SB-1811 THIRD READING

SB-1812 SECOND READING

S3-1813 SECOND READING

SB-1814 SECOND READING

SE-1315 SECOND READING

SB-1816 SECOND READING

SB-1817 SECUND READING

SB-1818 SECOND READING

SB-1819 SECOND READING

SB-1820 SECOND READING

SB-1821 SECOND READING

SB-1822 SECOND READING

Sb-1822 THIRD READING SB-1823 SECOND READING

SB-1824 SECOND READING

SB-1824 THIRD READING SB-1825 SECOND READING

Sb-1826 SECOND READING

SB-1827 SECOND READING SB-1827 THIRD READING

SB-1828 SECOND READING

SB-1829 SECOND READING

S3-1830 SECOND READING

S5-1831 SECOND READING

SB-1831 THIRD READING SB-1832 SECOND READING

SB-1833 SECOND READING

SB-1832 THIRD READING

SE-1828 THIRD READING

S6-1829 THIRD READING

SB-1830 THIRD READING

\$3-1825 THIRD READING

SB-1826 THIRD READING

SB-1823 THIRD READING

SB-1812 THIRD READING

SB-1813 THIRD READING

SE-1814 THIRD READING

SB-1815 THIRD READING

SB-1816 THIRD READING

SB-1817 THIRD READING

SB-1818 THIRD READING

SB-1819 THIRD READING

S5-1820 THIRD READING

S3-1821 THIRD READING

PAGE PAGE PAGE 85 86 PAGE 86 PAGE 87 PAGE PAGE 87 PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE Page

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

82

83

85

90 91

91/02/04

10:33:48

92 93 93

94 94 94

95 95

96

96

97

97

109

133

133

134

136

137

138

139

140

140

140

140

145

145 146

146

127

132

146

147

147

149

150 153

153

154

155

159

160

161

161

161

162

162

14

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

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

#### 91/02/04 10:33:48

JUNE 20, 1990

SB-1838	THIRD READING	PAGE	15
Sb-1838	THIRD READING	PAGE	186
\$8-1836	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	24
SB-1838	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	186
SB-1905	SECOND READING	PAGE	208
SB-1922	SECOND READING	PAGE	163
SB-1922	THIRD READING	PAGE	163
SB-1926	SECOND READING	PAGE	165
S3-1926	THIRD READING	PAGE	166
SB-1929	SECOND READING	PAGE	167
S3-1929	THIRD READING	PAGE	167
SB-1933	SECOND READING	PAGE	170
S5-1933	THIRD READING	PAGE	170
SB-1962	SECOND READING	PAGE	201
\$8-2001	SECOND READING	PAGE	210
S3-2056	SECOND READING	PAGE	210
SB-2059	MOTION	PAGE	207
SB-2067	SECOND READING	PAGE	205
SB-2075	SECONU READING	PAGE	198
SB-2076	SECOND READING	PAGE	199
\$3-2083	SECOND READING	PAGE	210
\$3-2034	SECOND READING	PAGE	196
SB-2086	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
SB-2099	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
S8-2110	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
S6-2110	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	24
SB-2171	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
SB-2190	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
SB-2210		PAGE	211
	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
SB-2239		PAGE	200
	SECOND READING	PAGE	211
Sb-2277		PAGE	199
SB-2309	SECOND READING	PAGE	186

#### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND REBECCA DEES	PAGE	ī
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE GOFORTH	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	4
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	33
HOFFMAN - INTRODUCE - JOYCE CAREY	PAGE	56
JOYCE CAREY - TEACHER OF THE YEAR	PAGE	56
HOUSE IN RECESS	PAGE	57
HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	57
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	57
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	5 <b>7</b>
WOOLARD - INTRODUCE - KATHYRN HOWELL - ART TEACHER	PAGE	59
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	109
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE - IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	170
ADJUURNMENT	PAGE	210
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	210
MESSAGES FRUM SENATE	PAGE	211
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	211