133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "The House will come to order. The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Alan Fanning of the Holy Cross Lutheran Church in Shelbyville, Illinois. Reverend Fanning is the guest of Representative Noland. Will the guests in the gallery please rise for the invocation."

Reverend Fanning: "We bow our heads in prayer. Oh Lord, Heavenly Father, who from everlasting to everlasting, Our God, we give thanks to You that from the beginning of the World You have demonstrated Your loving kindness in many ways. Wе acknowledge with humble gratitude to You the blessings that are ours in this bountiful land. Its heritage of freedom with responsibility, education with truth, individual worth with integrity, law with justice and brotherhood with honor. For the labors and sacrifices of all who have given of themselves for the preservation and maintenance of these virtues. We thank You. For the wisdom You have granted our statesman, for the integrity of just men who hold high offices and lead our people, for the diligence of every faithful public servant, for the incorruptibility of those who defend our laws. We bow in gratitude before You. God, how good, how wise, how loving You are. Grant Your blessing upon our land. Be a guide to every Member of this grand Assembly. That decisions may be made here for good of our people and to Your glory. Send the light of Your love into all homes. Uphold the weak and the afflicted. Protect those who are in danger of body or soul. May Your spirit live in our hearts and increase our faith unto eternal salvation. In the name of Jesus, our Savior. Amen."

Speaker Giglio: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- Hartke 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 Giglio: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, there are no excused absences on this side of the aisle."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Piel. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "There are no excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 to answer the Roll Call, a quorum is present. The House is ready to do its business. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 139, offered by Representative Davis; House Joint Resolution 140, Santiago; House Joint Resolution 141, Hicks Stephens; House Resolution 1970, McPike; 1971, Churchill; 1973, Ropp; 1974, Noland."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we have examined the Resolutions they are agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1968, offered by Jane Barnes.

 House Resolution 1969, offered by Representative Davis.

 And, Senate Joint Resolution 131, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Giglio: "Committee on assignments. Death Resolutions." Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1967, offered by Representative

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Morrow, with respect to the memory of Joseph A. 'Big Joe' Taylor. House Resolution 1972, offered by Representative Tenhouse, with respect to the memory of the Reverend Dr. Larry M. Watson."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of Death Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. It's the intent of the Chair to go down the Order of the Special Calendar and on that appears, Third Reading, Education. Representative Steczo, are you ready? Out of the record. How 'bout Representative Turner? Out of the Environment. Representative Brunsvold - Hicks - Currie. Criminal Law. Representative Hensel. How Representative Munizzi? Anthony Young. State and Local Government. Bugielski - Steczo -Black - Bowman Cullerton - DeLeo - Peterson - Ewing. Does somebody wish to have their Bill called? Representative Bugielski, 1484. The Bill appears under State and Local Government on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1484, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Economic Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Senate Bill 1484, if you remember was passed out of here last week on Third Reading and we had to bring it back. Had a motion to reconsider the vote because of a technical error that we thought was in the Bill. We thought it definitely said that it was within the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. It inadvertently was put out, the Amendment was passed out putting it into the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. And it flew out of here last week. And there should be no opposition

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- because we were all under the assumption last week that it was under the Department and we found out afterwards that it wasn't. So, I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

 'Shall Senate Bill 1484 pass?' All those in favor signify
 by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. This is final action. The

 voting is open. Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Something else, I just was informed, has come up and I'd like to take it out of the record...to have leave to take it out of the record."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to take the Bill out of the record. Does he have leave? By use of the Attendance Roll Call, hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, take it out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading, on the Special Order under Banking appears House Bill 1488.

 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1488, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a Bill which has been agreed to by all of the interested parties in the banking industry. And it removes the five branch limitation imposed upon banks and permits the establishment of ten branches in the home county of the establishing and maintaining bank, and five branches in each contiguous county, and then five in other counties if they are not more than ten miles from the main banking premises. It imposes certain distance restrictions upon location of such branches based upon the county populations. The Bill had passed unanimously out of the Senate. And as I indicated agreed to by all the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

interested. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1488 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1488 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Under the Order of Environment, Third Reading. Brunsvold - Hicks - Currie. Representative Currie. Representative Turner. Art Turner. House Bill...Education, House Bill 1523. Out of the record. House Bill 2253, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2253, a Bill for an Act to amend the Toxic Pollution Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barbara Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill as amended in this chamber includes the original provision of the Bill which is improvements in the Toxic Pollution Prevention Act. It also includes language from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources having to do with recycling and waste reduction programs, both in Central Management Services and in the operation of the state university system. And there is as well an item amended to the Bill, at the request of the Environmental Protection Agency, that was similar to a Senate Bill that got stuck in House Rules. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions and I would appreciate your support."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On the Order of Criminal Law, Representative Hensel. Out of the record. Representative Munizzi, the Lady from Cook. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1613, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1613, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1613 amends the Criminal Code that provides for penalty for reckless homicide while driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. It makes it a Class II Felony. This Bill passed out overwhelmingly in the Senate. It was on the Consent Calendar here in the House for an Amendment which did not pass. So, therefore, there is no Amendment on the Bill. I ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "Does the Class II Felony penalty apply only where there is a homicide involved?"

Munizzi: "For this particular Bill yes it does."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Munizzi: "Thank you."

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

McCracken: "Yes, just to say it's a fine Bill. And since it's not amended we're happy to support it."

Munizzi: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Bi 1.1 1613 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Young. Out of the record. The Lady from Kane, Representative Doederlein, for what purpose do you rise?"

Doederlein: "Yes, would you vote me 'yes' on 1613."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk. let the record so Representative Doederlein wishes to be recorded as voting On the Order of State and Local Government there are three Bills. Brunsvold --Saltsman Keane. Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Representative Saltsman, Senate Bill 2036. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act to create the
Tri-County River Valley Development Authority. Second
Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a Second time
previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee,
#3 was withdrawn."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Was 3 adopted or acted upon?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 3 was withdrawn 1 and 2 were adopted."

McCracken: "That would have added Will County, was that done by agreement? Did the Will County Legislators want that or?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, Representative McCracken, the Senate Sponsors, Senator Luft and Senator Dunn agreed to this withdrawal from Will County."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "This Bill's on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act to create the Tri-County River Valley Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates the Tri-County River Valley Development Authority in the Peoria, Tazewell, Woodford County area. And it's mainly, purpose of this Act is promote industrial, commercial, residential service transportation and recreational activities for that area. I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2036 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. 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 lll voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 2036 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Under the Order of State and Local Government, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1484. Mr. Clerk, I believe that we're ready, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1484, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Economic Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're back again. 1484, we've worked it out now there's no Amendments being put on an additional Amendment. It's going to stay just the way it was before just that it's going to be under DCCA for the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Economic Development Board. And I ask a favorable Roll Call."

- "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question Speaker Giglio: 'Shall Senate Bill 1484 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook. Have Representative Young, are you seeking recognition? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Bill Senate 1484 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Steczo, 1617, State and Local Government. Out of the record. Representative Black, 1643. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1643, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative ${\tt Black."}$
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was amended yesterday and the Amendments become the Bill. Amendment #1, simply grants partial immunity to directors, officers and employees of duly organized Soil and Water Conservation Districts which are exempt or qualified to be exempt from taxation pursuant to Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. And an Amendment that was added by Representative Granberg simply prohibits the clearing of trees within 30 feet of a navigable stream. But does allow for a public utility to do so if on their easement. With the exceptions of those Amendments yesterday I'd ask for favorable consideration of Senate Bill 1643."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

- Countryman: "You were going awful fast there, Representative Black. What's this about clearing trees by a utility without the permission of the property owner?"
- Black: "It's...the Amendment is drafted clearly, says that,
 '...if on their easement', Representative."
- Countryman: "Well why would they have a right on an easement, it might be an underground easement, to go in and clear trees?"
- Black: "Well, some of these are above ground lines like in my district. I can think of a power generating station located right on a river and some of the lines go across that river and they have to clear trees so that when these high winds in the spring come up they don't blow down the power lines."
- Countryman: "Well, I mean, have you really...you say some of this but you're giving a blanket authority to all utility companies just to go in an willy-nilly cut trees. I mean, is that good for the environment?"
- Black: "Oh, I certainly wouldn't think so. And I know Representative Granberg well enough to know that he wouldn't offer that Amendment if there was anything willy-nilly about it, absolutely."
- Countryman: "Well, you know, I suppose that's true of Representative Granberg and you. But I've seen you snookered before on some of this stuff down here. Do you know who brought this and why they brought it? And why they want it now?"
- Black: "Well, I believe, the underlying desire for the Amendment was brought forth by the Farm Bureau."
- Countryman: "The Farm Bureau wants to clear trees off of utility

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Easements?"
- Black: "No, I think they are making it more difficult to clear trees within 30 foot of a navigable stream."
- Countryman: "But the Amendment allows the utilities more flexibility in clearing trees on their easements. Is that correct?"
- Black: "Well, I think, the language of the Amendment says vegetation. I don't know whether we could say for sure that means trees or not. I would assume it probably would."
- Countryman: "Does this have to be a real easement or, you know, sometimes you find these things where the power line's been there for more years and they never got an easement. Can they just come into my backyard and say, 'Well, we're cutting down the big oak, Countryman. Because we got this authority from this here Legislature in this Bill that Bill Black sponsored, says we can cut down the big oak tree. Is that what's going to happen to me?"
- Black: "Well, I would hope that Representative Granberg has taken care of that and we could establish legislative intent that they certainly couldn't come into your backyard and do that."
- Countryman: "Well, I'm respectful of the Sponsors of this Bill.

 But I'm just afraid at this point that we get some Bill dealing with the juvenile courts, that deals with taking utilities by utility companies coming in and willy—nilly cutting down trees that are good for our environment. I think it needs more study and for that reason I would recommend a 'present' vote until we have a further explanation of this that can clarify these issues. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Pullen: "Do you believe that this may be the last Bill on which the Gentlemen from Dekalb does his Cullerton imitation?"

Black: "Representative, if it's on my last Bill, I certainly hope so."

Pullen: "Thank you."

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

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hultgren: "Bill, in your explanation of this you indicate that one of the Amendments deals with legal liability for directors and so forth of Soil and Water Districts. And you also indicate that by reason of another Amendment the Bill affects the clearing of trees within 30 feet of navigable waters. I don't seem to find Amendment #4 was adopted yesterday. But Amendment #4 in the synopsis indicates that it deletes everything previously in the Bill, which means it would be deleting Amendment #1, House Amendment #1, which added the language on the legal liability of directors and officers. Is it possible that Amendment #4 deleted the language that you intended to have as a part of this Bill? And I apologize I don't actually have the Amendment here, I only have the synopsis. Do you have the same synopsis in front of you?"

Black: "No, I've got a copy of the Amendment and I see what you're talking about. I appreciate you bringing that to my attention. Mr. Speaker, take this out of the record will you please."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record.

Alright, under State and Local Government, Senate Bill

1617. Mr. Clerk, Representative Steczo, read the Bill."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1617, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Nursing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to bring this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment, please."
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Bill's on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo on Amendment #8."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Amendment #7 should be put
 first."
- Speaker Giglio: "There is another Amendment, #7."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #7 is language that reflects the identical language of Senate Bill 2113 which is on the Governor's desk. It was brought to our attention by the Illinois State Medical Society and by the Department of Professional Regulation, that Senate Bill 2113 was deficient when it passed the General Assembly and this clears the deficiency in the Steroid Control Act. It makes one reference to the Medical Practice Act that puts the Bill in proper form. And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Steczo."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo on Amendment #8."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #8 is requested by the Department of Professional Regulation and the realtors. And it makes a technical change regarding continuing education. And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9 offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #9, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. The...Amendment #9 was also requested by the Department of Professional Regulation and the pharmacists, to correct a problem in a Bill that's already passed relating to lapsed licenses. It's been agreed upon by the pharmacists and by the Department of Professional Regulations. And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10 offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #10, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #10 is requested to put Senate Bill 1532 in proper form. Senate Bill 1532 deals with clinical psychologists and through an error we did the improper thing when the Bill passed the House just a few days ago. So, this language in Senate Amendment #10 puts the Bill in proper form. I move for its adoption."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to have Senate Bill 1617 heard. Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. The Bill is now on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1617, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Nursing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo." Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 1610, the underlying provisions in Senate Bill 1610 deal with the question of temporary licensure of nurses. have discussed this matter with the Department of Professional Regulation and have set forth provisions in this Bill which renders the Department neutral as opposed to their opposition in prior years. In addition to that this Bill contains other Amendments, that were requested by the Department of Professional Regulations and contain technical clean up and also deal with technical clean-up on nurse agencies, and one provision which requires nurse agencies to require nurses who violate drug and alcohol rules to be reported to the Department of Labor, Department of Public Health or the Department of Professional Regulation. Ιf there's questions about those any provisions or the other Amendments that we put on which were technical, housekeeping Amendments. I would be glad to answer those, if not I would ask for your support in the passage of Senate Bill 1617."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Dekalb, Representative Countryman."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

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

Countryman: "This Amendment #10 has this been cleared with Senator Jones?"

Steczo: "Representative Countryman, yes, it has."

Countryman: "And this is what he desires now?"

Steczo: "When we adopted Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1532 there was an error in that Amendment, this corrects that error."

Countryman: "Okay, so this does...still does what we want it to do to work out the problems that we've had in Joint Committee and Administrative Rules. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "That is correct."

Countryman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?" Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Didrickson: "Representative Steczo, does this add any additional requirements with regards to educational training that would be needed by, for example, nurses or nurses aides that are employed by a home health care or a nursing care facility, number one?"

Steczo: "Representative Didrickson, as I think I mentioned the other day, no it does not."

Didrickson: "Question number two, are there any additional fees or cost shifting, with regards to any of the Amendments that you have added here, that would add any additional fees to these such facilities?"

Steczo: "There are no additional fees for those facilities nor any other. The language that we provided in the Amendments that was requested by the Department is strictly clean up."

Didrickson: "So, there are no additional fees that would be requested for things that have been normally picked up by

- 133rd Legislative Day

 the state licensing, there is no additional cost shifting there?"
- Steczo: "No additional costs at all."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I've explained the premise that most of the Bill is clean-up, the other provisions are provisions that are noncontroversial. And I would ask for the support of the House."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1617 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1617 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Cullerton. Senate Bill 1965, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1965, a Bill for an Act in relation to compulsory retirement of judges. Third Reading of the Bill."
- "Take it out of the record. Speaker Giglio: Representative DeLeo. Representative Peterson. Out of the record. Representative Ewing, ready are you on 2084? Representative Tom Ewing. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 2084."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2084, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would make it easier for the lottery to prosecute

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

those people who might try to forge or in some way present a false lottery ticket for presentation. It has been through the Judiciary Committees in both the House and the Senate, has been amended to incorporate into the Bill the suggestions for the wording. The Bill also has on it an Amendment which would deal with lost lottery tickets which are sent in to the lottery. And I would ask for its approval."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on Senate Bill 2084? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2084 pass?' A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Somebody vote Representative Stephens. Have all voted who wish? take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Bill Senate 2084 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McGann, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."
- McGann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have Senate Bill 2075 on this Order to be called. It seems by error or your eyesight, something, you bypassed it. So, I'd like to have it called. If I could."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative McGann, the Chair would never do that to you, never. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2075, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2075, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to mentally ill. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."

 McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

 Senate Bill 2075 is once again working to revise the Mental

 Health Code as a result of the Governor's Commission to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

revise such code. What we have done here is the Bill itself has the changes relative to House Amendment #1, which we did with House Amendment #2, which made a technical change and incorporated more specific procedures for the provision of final investigative reports. All interested parties have worked together and thanks to the Psychiatric Association, and the clinical psychologists and Medical Society and the Department of Mental Health. We've worked together and we have a fairly good agreed Bill here. And I would answer any questions and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion? Speaker Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'ave'. opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. question, 110 voting 'yes', none votina Representative Stange 'aye'. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Bill 2075 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared Representative passed. Capparelli, are you ready? Under Housing, Third Reading, Senate Bill 722. Before we go to the next Order of Housing, there are some Bills under the Order of State and Local Government that the Sponsors wish to have heard. And on that, Mr. Clerk, appears Senate Bill 1847. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

House. This Bill allows the Comptroller to specify and

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

establish the financial accounting and reporting standards to be used by all state government and state agencies. These standards shall, in principal, shall be effective in filing with the Auditor General and shall be maintained and published by the Comptroller. The standards and principals shall be known as generally accepted accounting standards and principals for Illinois State Government. Wherever possible these standards shall be compatible with existing similar national standards for generally accounting principals. The Comptroller shall consult with the Governor, Executive Branch Members, Chief Justices of the Supreme Court and General Assembly Leadership when establishing these standards and principles. I move for passage of this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Bowman, for the purpose of establishing legislative intent, I have a couple questions.

One, in formulating the principles to be used, will the Comptroller or the Auditor General be called upon to require any agency to disclose information that would otherwise be confidential?"

Bowman: "No. This legislation is not intended to provide authority to the Comptroller or the Auditor General to require the disclosure of confidential information which otherwise would not be subject to disclosure."

Matijevich: "Also, as I understand the Bill in your intent Senate
Bill 1847 does not in anyway address the question of
whether agencies or the judicial branch are subject to
audit by the Auditor General. Am I correct in that?"

Bowman: "You are correct. The Bill simply requires the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

development of standards of principals and in no way is Senate Bill 1847 intended to imply that any governmental entity is required to report to the Auditor General other than as currently provided for by the Constitution and law."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Representative Bowman, with that expressed intent I support this measure and urge everyone to vote 'aye'."

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

McCracken: "Did Amendment #1 get on this Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bowman?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the question."

Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #1, is Amendment #1..."

McCracken: "Has that been adopted?"

Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #1, has that been adopted?"

Bowman: "No. It has not. It wasn't filed until the Bill was placed on Third Reading."

McCracken: "Okay. So, what the Bill does now is set some standard?"

Bowman: "By the way, I did come over to your side of the aisle looking for a Representative who had a key interest in this legislation, in the Amendment to tell him what the game plan was and I couldn't find him."

McCracken: "No, that's fine. I'm glad one's, you knowm I'm happy to do that."

Bowman: "I did check with the relevant parties and there was some resistance to moving the Bill back to Second Reading. So, I left it on Third. The Amendment was never adopted."

McCracken: "Okay. Well, is it your position, this is something that's important for the Comptroller?"

Bowman: "Yes, it is."

McCracken: "And, did the Comptroller suggest it?"

133rd Legislative Day June 21, 1990

Bowman: "The legislation? Yes."

McCracken: "Did he suggest it eight years ago when he took office?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, would you repeat the question again."

McCracken: "Did he suggest it at any time before this year?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, I can't recall."

McCracken: "That's okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Well, thank you very much. This is the ultimate housekeeping Bill. I urge it's passage. This is my last Senate Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1847 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1847 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Criminal Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1515. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1515, a Bill for an Act relating to crime statistics reports. Third Reading of the..."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1515 should be in the posture now that everybody can support it. I've amended the Bill to take care of all of the problems that seemed to have been brought up at the last voting. It is the Bill that creates the college and University Security Information Act. One Amendment...will have it sunset. And we also have...and it allowed Chicago

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

to be in the Bill. And, because it's been discussed before, I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House, the Bill apparently has some problems because it was on Postponed Consideration. The Gentlemen did amend the Bill and, in my opinion, I'm not sure he can prove it...but he made the Bill worse from my point of view. I represent a district which contains portions of DePaul University, very close to Loyola University and the Amendment that affects the City of Chicago is...does improve the Bill at all. It calls for reporting statistics from police districts located within 5000 feet of the campus. We have in Chicago, let's just say that the crime rate varies dramatically from block to block, and that these statistics would not be helpful at all anything they would just mislead people, as to the relative safety of certain neighborhoods. So, I am not impressed with the Amendment that was put on. I think it makes the Bill even this Bill which is on Postponed worse. Consideration. And so, I'm not sure of who the Gentleman conferred with in putting the Amendment on but I find it to make the Bill worse. And I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Hartke: "Representative Hensel, I commend you in what you're trying to do but I really have some problems with...Maybe you'd like to answer some questions. Would you yield for a question? Representative, how often would this report be updated?"

Hensel: "It would be annually. Let me just mention that the crime statistics report will be available and it's not

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

going to be given out haphazardly. It will be available upon request from prospective employees and students. And it would have to be available, it does not say they have to send it out to everybody that they're sending it to. I think that's no more than fair."

Hartke: "Well, I understand that. What do you think this is going to cost our universities to get this information and...with our law enforcement agencies to put together?"

Hensel: "They're already doing it. They already have the statistics. All they would have to do is maybe the additional cost of furnishing it to those that request it."

Hartke: "So, you're saying that the reports are there. It's just a matter of republishing it or getting more copies and so forth and mailing it out. And this report is no more than a year old?"

Hensel: "That's right and the only additional cost possibly would be in the compiling these statistics, putting it into a report form so that it would be available. And I don't think the cost would be that extravagant. I think it would be very minimal."

Hartke: "And this applies to all colleges and universities?"

Hensel: "All four year residential...four year degree colleges."

Hartke: "Okay, so community colleges are exempt in this Bill?"

Hensel: "That's correct. And it's for residential colleges."

Hartke: "Community colleges are exempt in this Bill."

Hensel: "Pardon?"

Hartke: "Community colleges are exempt under this piece of legislation."

Hensel: "That is correct."

Hartke: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Hensel to close."

Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

has been worked on over the past year by Senator Karpiel. The universities that are affected have not opposed it. I've talked to the President of DeKalb out at Dekalb at Northern, they're not opposed to it. The security people that work at the universities are not opposed to it. And I think it's a good Bill. I would also mention that Congress, the U.S. House has voted a similar Bill. And It's in the U.S. Senate now. And I think it's a good Bill. I think we should all put up a 'yes' vote up there. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1515 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, I hope everybody realizes that there's an Amendment on this Bill now which includes Chicago and the gathering of police statistics for college campuses. This is a Bill and I hope you vote 'no'. And the Amendment that was put on this Bill yesterday makes it worse because police districts in Chicago will have to gather statistics. And the irony is that downstate the campus will gather statistics, but won't have to report anything which happens in town. Now the Amendment says that in Chicago statistics will have to be gathered by the police districts to include what happens not only on the campus but the neighborhood. This is a silly Bill and I hope you continue to vote 'no' and defeat this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "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 42 voting 'yes', 60 voting 'no' and 12 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Representative DeLeo, on 1994, you wish to have that Bill heard? Representative? Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1994." Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act to amend the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo.
Welcome."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 1994, is a very simple Bill, it amends the Illinois Election Code to change the general primary election date, now currently the third Tuesday in March, in 1994 to Tuesday, the second Monday in September. It changes times for filing nomination petitions and applications for absentee ballots. This Bill passed out of the Senate 52 to 3. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Piel. Speaker in the Chair, Representative
Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman yields."

Piel: "Representative DeLeo, this changes the primary to what date? I'm sorry you know with the noise level I couldn't hear."

DeLeo: "The second Monday in September, for 1994."

Piel: "And from that point on it would be the second Monday in September."

DeLeo: "That's correct."

Piel: "I'm sorry, you're shaking, okay. To the Bill, Mr.
Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I think what's happening right now is a very good case of how this would be a very bad precedence to set. There are some election contests and if we we're in the second Monday of September, I don't think either of the candidates in any contested race would have a fair shot at bringing it up before a court of their peers,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

and trying to settle a election contest. Second of all, if you go into a primary in September, you would end up having a situation to where I think it's once every 20 to 22 years you would have your primary on a jewish holiday. think that we have wanted to sit here and you know infringe on a religious group's sacred holiday. Third, if you were talking to your county clerks this is a very unworkable date. I will be a little bit repetitive in what I said last year, in 1980, I was Chairman of the committee to change the primary date. We discussed everything from the later part of April to the second and third week in September. There were major problems with every single date after the first of May. Whether they were with rural areas, the City of Chicago, with the clerks, etc., so I would ask for a resounding 'no' vote, have them take that Bill back and either change it to an early date because this is not a time or this is not a date that can be palatable to many different groups. I would repeat, election contest you'd have problems with, the County clerks, I mean to a person have major problems with this date and also as I say it would affect a major holiday every 20 years or so and think this something that we want to do, and so I would ask for a 'no' vote on 1994."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand in opposition to this Bill. If you remember last year we took a very careful survey of the Members of the House on how they felt about changing the primary date. Every year that I've been down here I've tried to shorten the election season by putting in a May primary date. I think Mr. Piel has had a June primary date in and so far we have not been able to get anything like a majority to settle on this.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

The problem with a September primary date is first of all Representative Piel pointed out, on anything that emerges as a contest from the primary, makes it impossible get the ballots ready in time for a two month later general election. Every county clerk and board of election commissioners has to prepare absentee ballots to be in hands of voters who request them 45 days before the general election. I want you to figure back from a November, first Tuesday in November general election take 45 days away from that you've got to have absentee ballots in the hands of voters who want them the first week in October, possible with a September primary and if you are going to consider what other states do it is my understanding that a couple of those states that have September primaries at point are very seriously working at changing that, because there is not enough time to get it on board. of us want to shorten the election season, I think, we all are tired of politics and rhetoric and elections by time we get to November, but September is just too short a time in which to function. I urge you to vote 'no' and continue to keep your minds open to a different primary date. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, very much, Speaker Madigan, Members of the House. I'd like to embellish what Representative Stern has said last spring when this issue was raised in the task force on elections, this side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle did a significant survey which confirmed what grace has said about what happened on the Democratic side of the aisle. I'd also like to point out that as a courtesy to the President of the Senate, the Elections Committee gave them an extraordinary opportunity to move the Bill to the floor after they couldn't put together a

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

quorum at a nominally set meeting. Consequently, we would urge Members on the Republican side of aisle to vote 'no' on this measure."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this With all due respect to those who have a serious issue. spoken in opposition, I would ask you to seriously consider the impact of low voter turnouts in Illinois and how this Bill affects it. I disagree with Representative Stern who says it is impossible, other states hold September primaries and I believe that the county clerks in Illinois can certainly do this if others can do it. They have change, are we so paralyzed by the past that it is impossible for us to change? I can tell you that from short experience with a statewide election that it is imperative just from the cost and from voter interest we shorten the season, and a shortened season, Ladies and Gentleman, brings an election season down to four to five months instead of a year and half. When I first ran for this office with a contested primary, I had seven contested elections in seven years, how many people would go through that experience to sit in this Body, and how many voters could possibly keep up their interest for such a long election period? I think a better election cycle is offered us by the Senate proposal and I should remind you Ladies and Gentlemen that this is just an experience, the Senate only suggests that we do this once to see if it be done and done efficiently. I think it is a worthwhile experience. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Preston."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Preston: "Representative DeLeo, do I understand that you said the election would take place on the second Monday rather than Tuesday in September or on the Tuesday following the second Monday in September."

DeLeo: "It would be the Tuesday next after the second Monday in September."

Preston: "And was this does this Bill provide that in those years where it does election day would fall on Rosh Hashanah or Yom Kippur that it would not take place on that day or was that not put in the Bill."

DeLeo: "Well, Representative Preston as you know, the Bill is a one time only, we'd have to after our test primary which would be in 1994 then we would adjust to the certain legal holidays that we apportion in the State of Illinois."

Preston: "I see, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I share the concern about the potential conflict with the Jewish holidays, the legislation that we passed in 1983 that changed the election dates, does not apply to the fall Jewish holidays it only applies to Passover and it seems to me moreover want to encourage voter participation and in the course of the summer, people tend to go away and you're not going to be able to encourage voter participation with the situation where you in effect start a campaign on September 1st. I don't think this is a good idea. I don't think it's well thought I think it conflicts with the Jewish holidays, I think it just basically is not a good idea and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All of us hate to oppose a Bill that's sponsored by the Senate President, there is no question about that, and I'm in that

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

category too. However, many have talked about a fall primary and one of the obstacles is, and I know this is only a one time shot, but if we're talking about a one time shot, then we've got to think that if someone thinks one time shot may be successful, then you have to have the second time shot. And the second time shot would be Presidential year and as many of you know we have such a thing as delegates to a Constitutional...delegates nominating convention, and the convention is usually held in July which means that you have to have a primary election before the nominating convention. And I don't think we ought to be holding special elections for delegate process. We have been trying to limit the number of elections that we have. You know, years ago we, ago we had an April primary and everybody said well April's no good let's try something else. So we had a June primary and that was a horrible experiment, and so everybody said let's try something else and now we've been in a March primary. I think there are other reasons why there are low voter turnouts, it's not just in Illinois, it's all over the country there are low voter turnouts. I don't think we ought to blame when the elections are held as to the voter turnout. I think that you've got to be realistic too. Let's say that you are faced with a very tough primary a very tough primary contest, we all know. unfortunately, the cost of elections. A primary could take up all of your election resources, you may not have a dime left in your campaign fund because you had a real tough primary contest, so then you go into a general election facing somebody who didn't even have a contest who has all kinds of resources in his or her campaign chest and you are faced in that very short period to try to raise funds for your election campaign. I think

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

you face a major obstacle in trying to win your election. I think we've got to consider these very realistic things before we go into this, and I really believe, seriously, that if we did make the change it would not alter at all voter turnout, if anything it may be worse. So I...I oppose it...my only reluctance is because it's the Senate President otherwise my opposition I can say is vigorous I do not think we ought to change."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DeLeo to close."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard the pros and cons of this Bill. If we looked at this Bill, there is some major arguments about the filing dates, the authority, the...the certification. These things have all been addressed, this is a one time only, let's show that Illinois is going to be a leader throughout the country and move the primary up to September for one time in 1994. I ask for an affirmative Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall...Mr. Ewing for what purpose are you seeking recognition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 37 'ayes', 71 'nos'. The Bill fails. For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I understand the board is closed on this
Bill 1994. I was in the Senate, my Bill was being called
in the Senate and I just wanted to indicate my desire to
vote 'aye' on the Bill had I been here."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of State Government
Administration, Third Reading, there appears House (sic
Senate) Bill 2150. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this
Bill? Let the record show that this is a Senate Bill not

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- a House Bill. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2150 appears on Third Reading on the Calendar."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Frederick."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Frederick, on Amendment #6."
- Frederick: "I'd like to table Amendment #6."
- Speaker Madigan: "Withdraw the Amendment. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Frederick."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Frederick. Withdraw Amendment
 #7. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Myron Olson."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson."
- Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 is a technical clarification and it specifically says that, 'no individual that has purchased a new car shall be required to have his vehicle tested under the vehicle emissions inspections program sooner than 24 months after the date he purchased the car. This Amendment is offered at the request of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency And we move for its adoption."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9 offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Withdraw, Mr. Speaker."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10 offered by Representative Wennlund."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wennlund on Amendment #10."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #10 is a technical clean-up, excludes some very rural areas of some...counties. It's agreed upon by everybody and we ask for...move for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Kulas."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Kulas: "Representative Wennlund, you mumbled your way through this Amendment saying it excludes some rural areas. What exactly does it exclude? How many zip codes are you excluding from the Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program?"

Wennlund: "They are the zip codes, Representative Kulas, that the
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency does not oppose.

And they agree that exempting certain zip codes will
maintain the state's compliance."

Kulas: "How many zip codes are there, Sir?"

Wennlund: "Pardon?"

Kulas: "How many zip codes are there? How many zip codes are in your district?"

Wennlund: "Two."

Kulas: "And tell me that the Department does support these
 exemptions?"

Kulas: "They do not oppose it."

Wennlund: "They do not support it. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. This is another attempt to water down the Vehicle Emission Inspection Program. We've watered it down far enough as it is. You buy a new car, you don't have to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

test it for two years, after two years you only test it every second year, then you...then only after seven years do you have to test it annually. Now all of us pollute! Nobody does not pollute! We all pollute! The whole state should be included in this thing! I would ask everybody to vote 'no' against this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Balanoff."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last Speaker I'm sure is well intentioned. However, you need to recall that when the sites that the EPA identified as areas that needed They would take one day a year where the restrictions. levels were out of the norm. And if that one date was date that happened to be a day where the wind was not blowing or there was extraordinary pollution in an area, area by zip code was designated as an area that would not be...should not be exempt. That is foolish for days of the year for that area to be perfectly alright but for one date a year it fell at the wrong levels. The Gentleman has offered a reasonable Amendment exempting just a couple of zip codes. I think that you should not be opposed to it. This is just common sense taking place in government rather the typical bureaucratic nonsense that we normally have to put up with. I move, I rise in support."

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

To many in this chamber what this Bill is all about is complying with a Federal standard; to others we are complying and satisfying a law suit with Wisconsin; and still to others we are rescuing our state from the potential loss of hundreds of millions in dollars of Federal highway funds; and then there are some of us, and I count myself among them, that want clean air. Simply. This is the category that I fall into. We must protect the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

air we breathe, for our parents, for ourselves, for our children and our children's children. It's not a matter of seeing how many exemptions we can put in legislation. Because no matter where you are from, each and every one of our cars contribute to the problem and we all must do our part to be part of the solution. It's a sad day when we cannot hear what are constituents are saying that they want a clean environment. And I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting 'no' to Amendment #10 and number Amendment which is to follow."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Doederlein."

Doederlein: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. They ask about the numbers of zip codes. Well, there really are so many numbers there because they're such small towns. Gilberts, zip code 60136, now the EPA looked at those numbers and looked at the number of cars that were in those towns. And said that they were rural areas and these are rural areas. So, I would suggest that we vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are many, many, glaring flaws to our emissions laws as they exist right now. And my question to the Body is, 'why would anyone want to join into that geographic area wherein you would be subjected to the rules and the punishment that's meted out by your failure to...for your car to pass the emissions Let's cite an example, I'm a truck driver, I make test?' my living by driving a motor vehicle. When my car does not pass they not only take away the license plates from that car but they take away my drivers license to. Now I also have a truck and I also have another car and the truck does not have to be inspected whatsoever but the other car pass the emissions test. Now, I can no longer drive my

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

truck, and so I'm out of a job. Now, I no longer can drive my car which did pass the emissions test. And I simply ask you, why in the world would any rural community such as: Will County, Kane County or any other area in this state, want to join into this so called control of emission. It's absolutely ridiculous. Other things I won't even address, such as not addressing stationary engines, diesel locomotives, and etc. etc. Just the one glaring deficiency in the punishment is enough to make anybody want to vote 'no' against the Bill itself just to take it out of our books, as well as voting 'aye' for this Amendment. And I urge everybody to use some common sense for once."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11 offered by Representative Hanniq — Deuchler."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Two years ago we passed a piece of legislation to take two zip codes in rural Madison County out of the compliance At that time the Governor vetoed the Bill, and even though we overrode them here in the House, it failed in the Senate. He said in his Veto that he didn't think appropriate to take those zip codes out, those rural zip codes out unilaterally. That we had to have some kind of understanding with the Feds. Well now, when we're rewriting the whole book on this and we're actually increasing the number of areas that we are going to test think it's certainly appropriate that we now consider not testing in those rural areas of Madison County, those farm areas, agricultural areas that certainly

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

will not cause the problem in our state. So, I would ask that we adopt Amendment #11."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to offer the appropriate rules so that we may move to hear this in immediate consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian tells me there's no need for that, Mr. Olson, just present the Bill on Third Reading."

Olson, M.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson, just one second."

Olson, M.: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson. The Gentleman requests leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive the rules to hear the Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2150, a Bill for an Act pertaining to vehicle emissions controls. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. We've just had a discussion on this issue. To refresh your mind, we are sunsetting in January of 1991, this will be a five year extension, it will recapture 155 to 170 million dollars in Federal funds. We are meeting the challenge of the Wisconsin law suit and our emission standards for the State of Illinois is significantly expands the areas that are covered, it offers to the people who live in those areas an opportunity not to have to test as frequently with some of the vehicles they

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

have. And I would move for a 'aye' vote on 2150."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 people voting 'aye', 4 people voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. Capparelli in the chamber? Mr. Lang. Is Mr. Lang in the Chamber? On the Order of Human Services Third Reading there appears House Bill 2050 (sic - Senate) Mr. Lang. Mr. Clerk Read the Bill. Senate Bill 2050."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to hospital payments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Lang: Senate Bill 2050 is a Bill that deals with adjustments in payments by the Department of Public Aid to hospitals that handle Medicaid patients. This does not deal the issue of payment cycles. I think we've taken care of that situation pretty well in our budget. This an initiative of Illinois Hospital Association and it deals with four areas and it has...first area it deals with is an out patient indigent volume adjustment. It's clear that one of the factors contributing to restricted access in health care is inadequacy, inadequacy of Medicare reimbursement for out patient care. This will address that problem through a formula that will help hospitals recover the cost of for indigent patients. The effective date of this Section of the Bill has been delayed to July of '91. So won't take place the fiscal impact of this Bill won't take

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

place until the following fiscal year. The second aspect of this proposed legislation deals with obstetrics. know, there are 16 counties in the State of Illinois that don't even a hospital that can deliver a baby. is an outrage in a time when we're concerned with health care, it's an outrage in a time where we continue Bills brought before us dealing with rural health care and these are all rural areas that aren't served at all. The proposal would increase obstetric payments by 25 percent for hospitals that obstetric case loads includes at least percent Medicaid recipients and by 50 percent nonurban areas. At this time in our state we have problem with, a severe problem with infant mortality, and this will address that problem. This Section of the would go into effect January of 1991, this is the only Section of the Bill that would have any impact in coming fiscal year, and this impact would only be to the extent of \$600,000. The remaining \$600,000 would be the federal government. The third reimbursed fully by Section of this Bill, also delayed until the 1992 fiscal year, deals with hospital emergency services and sets rates for emergency services, and separates out different rates for teaching at non-teaching hospitals. States a for these services to be provided to Medicaid recipients and it also provides a technology factor for payments so that high tech type of services given to patients would be paid for and not merely put into the formula. These high tech services as you know, expensive but these high tech type services are the types of services that have brought medicine to the high pinnacle it's reached and has helped greatly in disease and has helped ill people become well faster as we discover what their problems are. This high tech type of

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

approach is necessary and therefore, the state should be paying for it. Finally this Bill deals with trauma center We have already recognized the critical importance of a well organized trauma network, we've already directed the Department of Public Health to organize and supervise a comprehensive system of However, at the same time we have an arm of centers. state government that penalizes hospitals in their payments to trauma centers. In-patient services provided through the emergency room of a trauma center are badly under compensated. The fiscal impact of this legislation in FY91 to the State of Illinois will be 600 to \$800,000.00 the rest to be matched by the federal government and in fiscal year 92 the impact will be \$25 million the other million to be reimbursed by a match by the government. This indeed is a lot of money but compared the upside which is better healthcare in our state and our trauma centers and our emergency rooms and our hospitals that treat indigents and in our obstetrics where hospitals across the state are closing their obstetric department because they aren't paid. We need to set these priorities and for those who would say to me that the state can't afford this I say the state must afford this. hospitals in our states are not in our state are not banks. The hospitals in our state do not exist so that the General Assembly can heap upon them unpaid care for indigents the hospitals in our state do not exist so that we can continue to cause them to bare the burdens of health care without any help from the General Assembly. In fact, only 75 percent..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang, Ladies and Gentlemen. I trust all of you were here yesterday when the Chair announced that today will be the last day to consider Senate Bills. So we plan

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

to leave today, and I think in fairness to all, everybody should get an opportunity to call their Bills. So if we could curtail the debate and explain the Bill as succinctly as possible to then move to a vote so, Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm almost complete.

Seventy-five percent of Medicaid costs are paid, 25 percent
are not. The state needs to do a better job in this area
and I will curtail my discussion to answer questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens, for some brief comments. And of course, Mr. Stephens everyone is very anxious to hear what have say."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that you'll pay special attention."

Speaker Madigan: "I will, absolutely."

Stephens: "First all, I wish Representative Lang does of complete. Representative, you have adequately outlined the, the benefits of the Bill and many of us especially downstate recognize the need for some change. However. given our action yesterday with the...the diversion of funds from the, from the transportation the Department of Transportation and creating a hole in next year's budget. I think the Members of the General Assembly ought to least be aware of the fact that what we're creating here is massive hole in next year's budget. As good as this program is...we have to recognize that there are other estimates about the fiscal impact. We think that the first year 1991 will be 1.1 million and the full year costs are estimated to be between 50 and 54 million dollars. You remarked that some of the...that this will just be 25 million because there's going tο be federal reimbursement...funds provided for the indigent care would not be eligible for the federal match. We regrettably rise in opposition, I think the proper vote on this side of the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

aisle is a 'present' vote recognizing the need to deal with the issue but you just can't say we'll pass another program that cost, and we have to pay for it. The proper and responsible way to go about this is exchanging it for some other program. Let's see the dollars you want to cut out of some other budget. If you want to cut education put it on the table if you want to cut public aid put in on the table. If want to make some cuts put them on the table balance them against these programs. We can't have everything there's much merit to your program, Sir, but it is way to expensive. I recommend a polite no which would be a 'present' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The last speaker will be Mr. Woolard, Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to first state that even though there's five Chicago area Sponsors of this Bill it's only because they were quicker than I was. I think competitive in nature and as we proceed down the highways and byways of that competition sometimes we fail to address those issues that we should be concerned about. There's one that's very near and dear to this issue and that's the fact the State of Illinois is fast becoming the leader the loss of lives of young children. In fact, our newborn babies soon will be the State of Illinois as the number one state in this great nation as far as lost of life, this will address that in some way in rural America as well as inner city America in the State of Illinois we have a responsibility to those children. This will address it a very positive way. Yes, there are 16 counties in southern Illinois that don't have hospitals and these counties are not adjacent to and right beside a county that has a very sufficient hospital. In fact.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Carbondale Illinois alone in Bruce Richmond's district they serve some 22 counties in birthing throughout the southern region of this state. This is inadequate, irresponsible and we have a responsibility to see that we have proper care for the children of this state. We cannot become number one in loss of life of newborn infants in the State of Illinois, a 'yes' vote is a proper vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'aye' because particularly in the area of prenatal care this Bill could actually save us money. The general accounting office has estimated that every dollars worth prenatal care is worth more than three dollars in the cost of treating infants suffering from illnesses that result when prenatal care is lacking and I'm please to see that it has 88 votes. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn, to explain his vote."

- Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the board is now at 92, and all the talk we've heard about this Bill for and against it meant not one single thing. Most of us are like myself had already made up our mind to support it. I think we ought to stop all the talk, let's get on with the business of the House."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCracken, Mr. McCracken to explain his vote."
- McCracken: "Yes, just to say that...we have a position on this Bill and it's against the Bill, and it's against the Bill because no one is willing to Sponsor an income tax increase. So, I ask my friends to act accordingly."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCracken, has asked for a survey of his friends. He's not doing well. The Clerk, shall take the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

record. On this question, there are 95 'ayes', 7 'nos'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Human Services, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2076. Mr. Clerk, who is the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2076 is a Committee Bill.

Representative McGann is the handler."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to return Senate Bill 2076 to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment?"

Speaker Madigan: "Place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

Are there any Amendments?"

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

McGann: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGann."

McGann: "I would ask that we could table Amendment #2 and deal with Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Relative to Amendment #2 Mr. McGann moves to table the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment then is tabled. Mr. McGann, on Amendment #3."

McGann: "Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker, makes a technical change. It
agrees with the Psychiatric Society."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Is there leave to hear this

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Bill on the Order of Third Reading? Leave is granted using the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2076 is once again complying with the Governor's Commission to revise the Mental Health Code which deals with Part #6, the confidential area. It has been agreed upon by all parties, the Departmental Health, Psychiatric Society, all interested persons. I'd ask for passage of Senate Bill 2076. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'aye', no one voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Housing, there appears Senate Bill 722, Mr. Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, is the Bill on the Order of Second Reading?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill has been returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino on Amendment #1."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 which address the Rural Bond Bank. Eliminates the mandate that the Illinois Housing Authority approve and provide alternate financing for a specific project if it has been turned down by the authority. What the Amendment says that is that they would help to seek alternate financing. That's exactly what it does and I move for it's adoption."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 722, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill is now on the Order of Third Reading.

Those in favor of the Bill signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'aye', no one voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Insurance there appears Senate Bill 2099, Mr. Countryman.

Mr. Countryman, do you not wish to call this Bill? Okay, the Gentleman indicates that he does not wish to call the Bill. On the Order of Insurance there appears Senate Bill 1962, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1962 was amended yesterday and the major thrust of the legislation now addresses the comprehensive health insurance program and the provisions that would eliminate dumping individuals into that program with the exception of those ten."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. If the Clerk could read the Bill for a third time. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1962, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the comprehensive health insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'.

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

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'aye', no one voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Transportation, there appears Senate Bill 1491. Mr. Hicks. Mr. Hicks on Senate Bill 1491. On the Order of Transportation, Third Reading. Mr. Hicks, do you not wish to call this Bill? Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Mr. Speaker, will you take it out of the record for just for a minute. As soon as one of our Members is back on the floor, I've got to clear the Bill with him. He's got a problem with it. Go ahead, Mr. Speaker. Let's call the Bill."

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

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1491, a Bill for an Act to amend the All-Terrain Vehicle Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hicks, do you wish to take this to Second Reading or to call it on Third?"

Hicks: "I wish to call it on Third."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine, proceed."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1491 is the repeal of the ATV Act. We placed this Bill, the ATV Act, into law a couple of years ago and in doing so, we took the funding source away from it. Now, it's the Department of Conservation's desire to have this Act repealed and I think the desire of many people across the State of Illinois to see the ATV Act repealed. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, does the Bill repeal the All-terrain Vehicle

Act? Is that what this Bill does?"

Hicks: "Yes, it's a repeal of the Act. It still leaves some

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

safety things in. It also has an Amendment on it that takes care of some of the public areas such as Shawnee National Forest, we put on it that deals with some of the trails and stuff there. But since there's no funding mechanism for it, the actual Act itself and the safety part of it that courses and things that are supposed to be taught could not be done, so I promoted and the trails could not be promoted by the Department of Conservation. So, we're repealing the Act as it is."

Cullerton: "But the original Bill was designed in part to provide some protection for people who ride these all-terrain vehicles by restricting them, requiring them to wear a helmet in some cases and what you're doing here is repealing the whole Act. Is that right?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes, that's correct."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp. Mr. Ropp."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Ropp: "Representative, did you move this back to Second Reading for an Amendment that I talked to you about putting on? The Amendment is two or three...about a method of funding a proposed trail for ATV vehicles other than through licensing."

Hicks: "Yes, Gordon, I would consider doing that. Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House, take the Bill back to Second for the purpose of Amendment? The Amendment is filed, right, Gordon? Representative Ropp?"

Speaker Madigan: "Place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading,
Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment 2 is being offered by Representative Ropp."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp on Floor Amendment #2."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason that this concern for even having an ATV Bill in the first place was that many owners of AT vehicles had no place to ride them. The state provided no territory, no trails or anything. So, the Bill established initially in order to generate funds. not worked out very well because we have just about exempted everybody who has an ATV. This particular Amendment now, would allow for a \$2 title transfer that currently they are spending to be put into a fund that would be used to develop ATV trails in Illinois. It's a good economic tool and it allows those people now, who have them not necessarily to pay any registration fee, only a title transfer fee of \$2 that would go into this fund. I move for it's adoption."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those is favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. For what purpose does Mr. Cullerton seeking recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 36(d), the Amendment changes the title of the Bill. I'd like to the Bill to go back to Second Reading, First Legislative Day."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentleman, we took a voice vote on the Amendment and the apparently the machine malfunctioned. And now, Mr. Cullerton has raised a point of parliamentary procedure. Mr. Parliamentarian. Mr. Hicks, the Parliamentarian informs me that since the Amendment amended the title of the Bill, Mr. Cullerton has a right that the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day which can be suspended by a record vote of 60 votes. Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved that the rule be suspended to permit the hearing of the Bill today. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Motion to suspend the rule to permit the hearing of the Bill today. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 93 'ayes', 15 'nos'. The Motion is adopted. The Bill is now on the Order of Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "I...I rise on briefly on a point of personal privilege,
Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we can ask the Gentlemen in the
Republican gallery to deflect their spotlight. It's
shining right in our eyes down here, you can't even look at
the score board. If you won't, I will. Please move that
spotlight up there. Please move that light up there in the
Republican gallery, will you please. Hello, can you hear
me up there? Turn you light off or move it."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay, let us move ahead. The Gentleman has left the chamber. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill (sic - Senate) 1491, a Bill for an Act
 to amend the All-terrain Vehicle Safety Act. Third Reading
 of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply ask for passage of Senate Bill 1491."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Because of the Motions and changes in the rules would this Bill not now require 71 votes to pass today?"

Speaker Madigan: "Your point is well taken. Mr. Hicks, to consider the matter would require a vote of 71 votes and

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Mr. Hicks, moves to suspend the rule to permit the hearing of the Bill today. Those is favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Motion to permit the hearing of this Bill today. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. question, there are 83 'ayes', 24 'nos'. The Motion is adopted. Now, on the Order of Third Reading, Mr. Hicks has moved that this Bill pass. Those in favor of the passage signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Third Reading Roll Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall...have all voted who wish? Have all voted The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 75 'ayes', 28 'nos'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Transportation, there appears Senate Bill 2167, Mr. Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2167, a Bill for an Act providing for the creation of the Kankakee River Valley Area Airport.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2167 creates the Kankakee River Valley Airport Authority Act. The authority will consist of members four each from respectively from Kankakee and Will County. The members will serve from a period of five terms...five year terms and will be reimbursed for expenses as they antic...anticipate income. They're, as you well know, a third major airport has been...has been studied and is currently being studied in Illinois. A number of sites including our site in the northern part of Kankakee County and a number of sites in Will County, one in the City of

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Chicago and another one in Indiana and a bi-state site. We've been studying this process...we've been studying this the last few years. process for The site selection committee is studying this diligently to come with a recommendation. I'd like to point out that this legislation does not mandate that that a site, our site northern Kankakee County or the site...any of the sites in southern Will County are mandated by this legislation. This legislation is merely enabling legislation to allow the respective county boards in Will County and Kankakee County to establish an Airport Authority should a site in those...either one of those areas be selected. Noe we know about the grid lock that's occurring over the skies in the City of Chicago, whether you live on the southwest side by Midway Airport or whether you live in or near the suburbs by O'Hare Airport. For those Legislators that represent that area over there, the grid lock is immense. Ladies and Gentlemen, as you well know. The congestion, the safety hazards are well documented by the Federal officials...by the city officials. There is a great need for a third major airport in the State of Illinois and we need to facilitate this process. Get this process sped up, enhance this process, to get going and to encourage site selection committee to make a final decision and select a site, so we can all move on into the 21st century as transportation is concerned and the air traffic needs of our neighbors. And as well as the safety and welfare and the environmental concerns of our citizens. Whether you live in Des Plaines, Illinois or Kankakee, Illinois, or in Oak Lawn, it's very important that we pass this legislation. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewing. Mr. Ewing."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Ewing: "Yes. Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly. I have worked with the Sponsor of this Bill on this authority for I think now the second term. I believe that this has a great deal to offer in economic benefit to the area of the state that I represent and all northeastern Illinois. And I would certainly encourage the people on this side of the aisle to vote in support of this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McNamara,"

McNamara: "Yes, the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

McNamara: "Representative, what...by...my question is...is that, does this action on your part skew the selection committee to the one predisposed site of the Kankakee River Valley Airport?"

Novak: "No, it does not."

McNamara: "In other words, that all of the sites are included in this authority, then?"

Novak: "No, Representative McNamara, this authority is for Will County and Kankakee County. The legislation does not impede or skew any type of site selection that's going on in the site selection process right now. It has no authority to do that."

McNamara: "So you just setting up by this...by this measure, a

Bill that will put you...put your area into the front
runner position for the airport as far as the authority is
concerned. Is that correct?"

Novak: "No, that is not correct, Representative. Even though this legislation is enabling legislation pursuant to the wishes of the members of the respective boards in Will and Kankakee County. Now, you may consider it as us being the front runner. I personally think our site in Kankakee County, northern Kankakee County is the best site,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

logistically, environmentally, politically and economically, the best site. So, that's the answer to your question."

McNamara: "That's not my question. No, that wasn't my question.

And to this...and to this particular Bill. I understand that the Representative is doing everything in his power to help his area, as well he should. I think that the impact of a third airport is extremely important in any area. My concern on this measure is that it puts the Will and, his area, Kankakee County areas one up step on the site on the selection processes. I do no believe that we should impede or give that one foot up to any of the selection sites that the administration, the FCC is now looking at. So, therefore, I would ask you to vote a 'no' or 'present' vote on this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Chamber. I too, rise in opposition to Senate Bill 2167. I would simply say that while the study is going on there is no need to create another airport authority. Specifically in Will County Airports are controlled by the Joliet Park District and the Joliet Port Authority. With regards to Kankakee County there's the Greater Kankakee Airport which operates that authority. I would say that if these sites are not selected in either Will County or in Kankakee County, we have created an airport authority without apurpose. Absolutely, this is legislation that is not needed at this time and I would say that a 'no' vote is what we need."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak to close."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me emphasi that this airport authority does not prefer Kankakee or the Beecher Site or the Peotone Site or the Bi-state Site, for that matter, in Will or Kankakee

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

County. Let's get this state moving as far as a selection of a third airport. If you live in the City of Calumet. alright, and if you want a third airport up there, you want houses dislocated, fine, alright. Our area is the most politically, economic, environmental area. It's going to dislocate...dislocate the least number of people. authority does not mandate that the third airport site will be there. There are a number of sites being studied. want to facilitate the process. We want to expedite the We want to process. enhance this process. legislation will assist in that. And I please, I ask for your 'ave' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 77 'ayes', 27 'nos'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill (sic - Senate) 2239, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2239, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "For the purpose of an Amendment, I'd like to take it back to Second, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7 being offered by Representative
Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor
Amendment 7 provides for the establishment of the Vehicle
Recycling Fund. Funded by \$1 of the money collected for
each certificate of title, duplicate title, duplicate

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

certificate of title and corrective certificate of title beginning in December of this year. It addresses as well, the other sections concerning utility towing of vehicles and receiving of junk title certificate and a payment of \$20 from the Vehicle Recycling Fund to offset the cost of towing and storing vehicles that are left on the highway or in areas that are abandoned. That's what the Amendment does."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that everybody heard the explanation there. But what we're talking about is a \$1 on each vehicle title and the fee shall be deposited in the...to be deposited in the Vehicle Recycling Fund. That money would have gone to the General Revenue Fund and we're sitting here today, this second time we've done this. With the passage of this Amendment, that would be \$7 million diverted from GRF special funds. Seven million dollars in a budget that is already very tentatively balanced. Representatives, we have to be careful, also those of you downstate need to that this money will be winding up in private providers hands, towers in Chicago, that's where it's going This is money that would have been spent in your schools, your mental health facilities, your corrections centers throughout the state, downstate, rural, and suburbs and Chicago, but now it's going to be winding up only in Call on this Amendment. A responsible vote is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those is favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Motion is to adopt an Amendment. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 44 'ayes', 60 'nos'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Mautino, do you wish to call the Bill? The Bill can be called on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a third time?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? shall take the record. On this question, there are 94 'aves', 14 'nos'. This Bil1 having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Human Services, there appears Senate Bill Mr. Phelps. Place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 being offered by Representatives

 Edley Leitch."
- Edley: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This Amendment is a mirror of the House Bill 3753 which passed out here a week or so ago, 104 to zip. It's simply a kind of a Sunshine Law for the four regional tourism councils. I...I request your favorable vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Leitch."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too, would like to urge Members on our side to support this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2277, a Bill for an Act to improve the delivery of health care services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted to hear the Bill on Third Reading use the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Phelps: House. I'll try to give a brief explanation comprehensive action on behalf of several organizations and people involved the last several weeks. We have along with Representative Hasara and other groups, a bipartisan effort. We have headed an ad hoc Rural Health Summit similar to the team that meet for the Chicago Cook County Health Care Action Plan. And we have put together a frame work that we believe is the best agreement at this particular time. We have a commitment to...to work on continuous basis, whether this particular piece of legislation goes to Conference Committee or goes to the Governor's desk. We realize the final stage is looking at realistic funding. This is the frame work, carefully designed. I must emphasis to, that the permissive language this plan will consider what the budget that's in priorities will dictate as we progress through negotiation. But this is agreed upon by several organizations. Let me just mentioned who's been involved in this series of meetings. The Representatives from the Lieutenant Governor's office, the Department of Public

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Health, the various health related schools of Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Nursing School, Dental Rehabilitation Institute, the State Medical Society, Hospital Association and, I like I said, we hope thatthis will work to ward a final agreement with the statutory frame work for rural Downstate Health Care Action Plan. We really appreciate your support and I want to say thank you for the cooperation we've had for all that's been involved. I move for it's adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker would the Gentleman yield for a question? Representative Phelps, this isn't the first time that you've had a Bill of this type. And help me out with my recall of memory, last spring, you were asked would this take away any money from the health care system in Cook County?"

Phelps: "No, it will not."

Morrow: "It won't. Alright, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Ryder. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill, but more importantly I rise to congratulate Representative Phelps and Representative Hasara who've worked so hard on this Bill. For those of you in the General Assembly that are not aware, these two folks have voluntarily agreed to serve as Cochairs of a focus group on rural health care. They have worked very hard on this issue and I think that although it is permissive language and it is more of a wish list than something in concrete. It is a very valid first step. They are to commended for this. I'm proud to associate with them and their efforts and I urge your favorable support for this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Hasara: "Thank you, Ma...thank you, Madam Speaker and I'd like to thank Representative Ryder for his nice comments. I do urge a positive vote on this. It is the first time that I can remember in many years of many efforts by many groups that we finally do have an agreement by everyone that's been involved in it. It has taken a lot of effort on the parts of many people. So I do appreciate the support of this Assembly to get this moving and to benefit the rural areas in regard to health care. Thank you."

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

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just urge those that care anything about an action plan for a state response to meet the needs of medically underserved, designated shortage areas downstate and rural areas. This is the Bill that the only that we have before us to address those problems. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2277 pass?'

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

Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage.

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are

113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'.

This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is

hereby declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go

back to Bills that were passed over on the first page. The

first Bill is Senate Bill 1838, Representative Brunsvold.

Clerk, read the Bill. It's on the Order of Environment,

Ladies and Gentlemen."

Clerk Leone: "On page seven of the calendar, Senate Bill 1838, a
Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading
of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was debated at length yesterday. We have been working with the Department of Conservation and on the Rock Cut Amendment and we feel that an agreement is eminent. And I would ask for your support and passage of 1838."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
 Bill 1838. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, if the Sponsor would yield for a question, I'd like clarification Representative Brunsvold, on what you mean some kind of a compromise to be worked out with the bow hunters."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "The Department of Conservation, Representative, is working now with the bow hunters and meeting with the people from Rockford, from the Winnebago area that are concerned about this. And we feel very confident that an agreement is going to be reached."
- Parke: "Well, Representative Brunsvold, are they still going to be banned from deer hunting in Rock Cut State Park if this Bill passes?"
- Brunsvold: "Well, I think...I think it's a little to early to say that right now. I think we're in a position now where conservation is really starting to meet. The problem has been they have not met with these people and we feel that we are going to reach an agreement here. And I think conservation is really now in a position where they can talk to these people and come to some amiable situation with the Winnebago people."
- Parke: "Thank you, to the Bill. It is obvious that there is trying to work out some compromise on this legislation; however I'm going to oppose it. And I think that until something is worked out that we should not approve this

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

legislation. We are starting a bad precedent by saying that one group should be excluded because of another group. I think compromises should be worked out before legislation. I mean after all, this legislation does ban bow hunting in Rock Cut State Park and I think that that's a bad idea and I'd ask with you to join with me in opposing this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of this legislation. You know we...we're here to respond to the people and the people in that area have requested that bow hunting be disallowed in that park and I think we're here to do our job. There are 30 other state parks in the State of Illinois that do not allow bow hunting and so I think it's only right and proper. And I don't think it's a move any further than that. A 'yes' vote is a right vote here."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Also on this Bill is the authorization for use of hand guns for taking of the bear...of deer. What this does I believe is expand a legitimate use for hand guns at a point when many forces are trying to ban those hand guns. I think that is an overriding fact or on this and we should definitely vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold will yield."

Goforth: "I talked to you...I talked to you this morning and voiced still my concern. You asked me to talk to the Department of Conservation and apparently I'm reading a

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

different story than they was giving you. I'm sorry, but I'm still going to have to stand opposed."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold is recognized to close."
- Brunsvold: "We have been working with conservation they...they have been discussing the issue with the other side of the aisle and I feel they have come to an agreement on this situation and I'd ask for your Conservation is not in a situation now where they're going to probably oppose this Bill and I think they're not here to do that. But they are working diligently now to come to an agreement and I think they're very close and I think they will reach an agreement on Rock Cut. So, I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1838 pass?'

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

 Voting is open. This is final passage. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1643, Representative Black's Bill. It's on the Order of State and Local Government. Senate Bill 1643, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1643, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
 - Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black."
 - Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Due to a drafting error, Amendment #4 really renders the Bill useless. I've checked with the Sponsor of Amendment 4, Representative Granberg and he has given me permission to ask that we table Amendment #4 that has previously been

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

adopted to the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill is on the Order of Third Reading.

Does the Gentleman have leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of tabling an Amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is on Second. I...Representative Black has made a Motion to table Amendment #4. Amendment #4. Is there any discussion on his Motion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 is tabled. Any further Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill moves to Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third again, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1643, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 now becomes the Bill and as we explained an hour or so ago, it grants partial toward immunity to directors, officers and employees of duly organized Soil and Water Conservation Districts which are excempt or qualified to be excempt from taxation pursuant to Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. I think we've discussed the Bill. I'd ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1643. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1643 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- wish? Representative Hartke, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hartke: "Well, I don't know if I'm explaining my vote I want to ask Representative Black and I was...did that...are we taken care of, are we okay with the Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, we tabled Amendment #4, just previously." Hartke: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further...Mr. Clerk, take the record on this question. There are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1523, Representative Turner's Bill. It's on the Order of Education, Senate Bill 1523. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to scholarship programs. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to have leave of the Body to bring this Bill back to Second Reading one more time for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

 Are there any Amendments or Motions filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #7 amends the Illinois Library System to increase the annual per capita grant from the sum of 1.435 per capita to the sum of 51.3 per square mile, a fraction there of. This is an Amendment that was given to me by the Illinois Library Association

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

and is necessary to make the final appropriation change that were passed this year. And I move for the favorable adoption of Amendment #7"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1523. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted? Excuse me, Amendment 7 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 7 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read...Representative Turner now asks leave, unanimous consent to have this Bill heard the same day; although it has been amended. Is there any objection? There being no objection, leave is granted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act relating to scholarship programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Amendment...Senate Bill 1523 is the Nursing Education Scholarship Act that also has in it the library formula change. It has in it some information regarding the peace corps volunteer program. It also has something in it dealing with teachers' education. And I move for the favorable adoption of Senate Bill 1523."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1523. On the question, the Lady from Du Page, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Cowlishaw: "Representative, I...there were so many Amendments proposed to this Bill, I think we just adopted #7. Would you please go back and review for me as briefly but completely as possible the content of those Amendments that were in fact adopted beginning with #2."

Turner: "Number two was Turner - Weller Amendment and that Amendment created the Illinois Peace Corps Fellowship Program. And it allows people who return from the Peace Corps to be placed in public teaching positions while on fellowships or Masters Degree Program public institutions of higher education. Amendment #3 was the Amendment that added the provision requiring drivers education courses in the classroom instructions on the offense of driving under the influence of alcohol and the effects of drug and public safety. Amendment #5 was a addition to Amendment #3 and what it did was it added in the Anatomical Gift Tax, so that people are also informed as to organ donor donations and it's effect on state government. Amendment #4 was an Amendment given to me by the Illinois community colleges which added in spell...which defined those schools that qualify for...the community colleges that have a nursing program that qualify for the nursing program. Amendment #5 was Representative Actually Amendment #6 was the one with the anatomical gift. Amendment #5 was Representative Ropp's Amendment and it allowed teachers to work in a...it's a VIP program, I believe. So that teachers in the public schools who are regularly teach science courses and math courses will be able to receive grants up to \$2,000 per individual. That Amendment is supported by the State of Education. Amendment #7 as I just stated was an Amendment from the Library Association which changed the formula address the appropriation that we passed out of here

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- regarding the appropriations to state libraries and..."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, I really appreciate your help.

 Thank you, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1523 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The House does adopt...and this Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 22...excuse me, we did 2277. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1639 on State and Local Government, Third Reading. Representative Saltsman, chief Sponsor will handle that Bill for Representative McPike. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts regarding injuries. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, this Bill was a Vehicle Bill and the Amendment is the Bill. And it allows the Department of Conservation Police to have their own local union. It separates them from the from the American Federation of Teachers. And it was agreed upon with the American Federation of Teachers and the Conservation Police's organization. I ask for it's passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1639. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1639 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,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21. 1990

there are 113 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 2309 on the Order of Criminal Law, Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2309, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Twenty...Senate Bill 2309 does several things. Amendment #5 is the State's Attorney's Amendment that clarifies the difference between probation and condition of probation. Amendment #6 creates the Substance Program in the Department of Corrections. Treatment #7 is Representative Kirkland's Amendment Bill clarifies...the provisions of parole and mandatory systematic release. And Amendment #8 is Representative Pullen's Amendment that provides for AIDS testing for the release of prison inmates. I move for it's adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Bill 2309. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2309 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 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', and 1 This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Going to the Order of Children, Reading, appears Senate Bill 1593, Third Representative Trotter. Mr. Trotter are you ready on this Bill? Out of the record. The next Order is the Order of Labor. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1501, Representative Kulas. Clerk, read the Bill."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1501, a Bill for an Act in relationship to medical and family responsibility leave. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr...Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 15...1501 creates the Illinois Family Responsibility and Medical Leave Act of 1990. It's the identical Act that we passed out of this General Assembly last year and I'll gladly answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate

Bill 1501. On the question, the Lady from Cook,

Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of fully debated this issue and I think we all House. We pretty much know where each of us comes from. I would like to say that many of us who are going to be voting 'no' this measure, do not believe that this is an issue that ought to be mandated. We firmly believe in the Medical Leave Act but we just don't think that it's the appropriate role for government to play. Just like isn't the appropriate role for government to mandate back on our school systems. We don't believe that we ought be mandating Family and Medical Leave Act back on to, not only onto our school systems, and this does effect our But back onto local units of government, school systems. back onto our fire departments, police departments and of course big business and small business. But let's not even talk about big business because big business already allows for Family Medical Leave Act. It's the little guy. It's the little guy that you're going to be mandating and removing the flexibility with regards to scheduling hours. What you left on the table earlier this week in terms of putting this into position that we could have all voted for

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

was the fact that it's not only for full time employees, no not indeed. We're going to do this on businesses, small businesses, that have part-time employees. In fact, this is a policy, a leave policy, that we are manding now that more liberal, liberal. more liberal than the State of Massachusetts. We also put on this, we also opportunity and we left in on the table with regards to first having to use up other medical leave, other personal days and vacation days. The Chicago Tribune about two or three weeks ago, editorialized against business as usual in the City of Chicago and the fact that they're going to have to be coming back down here to the state for assistance because of the personal days. Forty three personal days accumulated that they offer. We're going to expand that with this Family and Medical Leave Act. I would say to you, that you can very...in good conscience vote 'no' on this Family Medical Leave Act because we did try to this into the kind of shape that we could have allowed some flexibility for the little, small employers in the State of Illinois for your school districts and for your little, village...village halls and communities. Unfortunately, we didn't leave it in good tact and so I rise in opposition to this."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Du Page, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We ought to call this the Discrimination in Employee Benefits Act. You know, this mandate from the state is going to tie the hands of employers throughout Illinois. They are going to be forced to offer this benefit and in some cases offer this benefit in lieu other benefits. Ask yourself, who is going to take the unpaid leave? The unpaid leave is going to be taken by couples who can afford to do without the salary. Who are

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

those couples? Those couples are the yuppie couples. Those couples are the couples that don't need the money, who can afford to take the time off from work. It isn't businesses that are discriminating in offering benefits, it's the State of Illinois. We are telling the employer, regardless of sick days, regardless of leave, regardless of any other benefit, you shall offer benefit. And who do you think is going to take advantage of it? The yuppies, that's who's going to take advantage of it. The people who can afford to stay home, who don't need the two incomes for a period of time, that's the people who are going to take advantage of this. It should be called Discrimination in Employee Leave Act. should be called because that's the effect it's what it going to have. You will be voting in favor of the people least need your help. The yuppies. The ones who can take this time off and indulge themselves. You're not helping the people on South Cicero Avenue. You're not helping the people in the west side. You're not helping the people that need it the most."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there is several people seeking recognition and I do not wish to limit debate, but it is something we have debated many times before. Two people have spoken against. One person in favor. With leave of the Body, I will go to the Sponsor to close and then recognize everyone for explanation of votes. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't belabor the point. We've all heard these smoke screens before about this being an anti-business Bill, anti-little guys Bill, it's a yuppie Bill, etc., etc. These are all smokes screens. You know it. They say it's going to cost...the employees are going to have to pay more

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

in unemployment insurance. Well let me tell you something. Under the present law, if a person takes a leave because of sickness, or sickness of a spouse or a parent, he can still collect unemployment insurance. So, we're not adding any new cost. This is all a smoke screen. It affects only 92 percent of the businesses in the State of Illinois. It's a good pro-family Bill. If you believe in the family, you should be voting 'aye' on this Bill. The Federal Government has finally opened up their eyes, they see it coming. Unfortunately, our President will veto the Bill, so therefore, I would ask you all for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1501 pass?'

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

Voting is open. Representative Klemm, one minute to explain your vote."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know there's one serious flaw in this Bill and that is because you can take the eight weeks intermittently. Which means I could have my bookkeeper come to me and say I have a child that's ill and I'd like to take the next Friday off for the next 52 weeks. And it would be allowed and there'd be nothing you could do about it. And if I've got a payday coming up for my employees or whatever it may be, I couldn't stop that. I mean, I may say, well, if you got to, could you take Thursday off, that would be fine, but Friday is payday and I need you to do my books or my payroll. It doesn't allow that type of flexibility and I think that's really a serious flaw for a small business."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston. One minute."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative McCracken just didn't

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

understand just who this Bill is designed to assist. And it's not for the couples of children, it's not for their pleasure. It's to assist a child or family member who is sick. Those are the people that benefit from this legislation. And in reference to Representative Klemm's remarks, employees are not out there saying how they can make their employer unhappy. How can I figure out a way to take advantage of my employer so that he's least happy or she is least happy with my performance and my working here. That's not what employees do. They'll only use this when they have to use this provision for the health and well being of their families. I think it's an excellent idea. I'm glad to 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen. One minute to explain your vote."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not really pro-family because what it is is just another government solution that intervenes in the private sector and forces this and forces that, hires bureaucrats, messes around. If you really want to help the family, if you want to help the family with little kids, we need significant, meaningful tax reductions on families with little kids. Let's reduce the taxation on them so that they have a basic choice as to whether or not they even want the second earner in the marketplace. Let's get our priorities straight and not go off on these tangents that really make the problem worse. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1568, Representative Wolf. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act to amend the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative...Wolf."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, that under current law the State of Illinois pays for the group health insurance of all state employees. On that group health insurance also includes life insurance equal to one half of the individual salary. The one exception to that however, is that those individuals age 56 years of age and older have their life insurance reduced at a rate of five percent per year. For an example, an individual who is still working at the age 65 would have already had his insurance reduced by 50 percent. Bill 1568 on the other hand would remove that five percent reduction. And it would remove the discriminatory practice of discriminating on those individuals age 56 years of and older. This Bill passed the Senate by a vote of 41 to 5. And I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1568. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Pedersen."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will. He will."

Pedersen: "Yes, Representative, these benefits that you're talking about are really subject to the collective bargaining procedure, are they not?"

Wolf: "Yes, Sir, I believe they are, but I don't think that we have to wait in every case for a benefit to be arbitrated.

I think when there's an injustice, I think that we have an obligation to...to address that injustification and take care of it on this legislative floor."

Pedersen: "Isn't that...isn't that really the purpose of collective bargaining to address those injustices?"

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Wolf: "That's one of the purposes; however, I would remind you Representative, if years ago, if we had addressed a lot of the injustices of labor, maybe the unions wouldn't be even here today."

Pedersen: "Alright, to the Bill, Madam Speaker. By collective bargaining, we have...it's been approved that we go to the full annual salary, so the five percent reduction is much less a problem. That's going into effect eminently. What we're really talking about here is another big expense outside...and we're going outside the collective bargaining process. If ... if ... in other words, if you can't get what you want by collective bargaining, then you come to the The budget...there's no money in the budget for this and we've just...we've just increased the benefits substantially by collective bargaining and so I think we could pass up this additional cost to the state in a time when we're having trouble balancing the budget. I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. May I reiterate that the collective bargaining agreement just puts in place next month double the benefits that they had before. Workers had a half year salary expense for years and now the collective bargaining agreement just doubled that benefit to full salary benefits. That means full salary benefits will continue on all through into their retirement if this Bill passes. The cost factor is over \$2 million, there isn't budget money for it. The last Bill we passed increasing benefits was 3.2 billion. How far can we go? This is a collective bargaining situation, let's leave it there. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question...Representative Wolf is recognized to close."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The last Speaker indicated that there was arbitration which addressed the life insurance portion of the group health contract. That arbitration did not however address the issue of those employees age 56 years of age and older. This Bill, Senate Bill 1568 does address that issue. And I would solicit your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1568 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 On this question, there are 93 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill having Constitutional Majority...Representative received the Bowman votes 'aye'. So there are 94 voting 'aye', voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared On the Order of State Government Administration, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1496. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1496, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "This is Representative Capparelli's Bill. Is Representative Capparelli in the chamber? Representative Cullerton, can the Gentleman have leave to carry this Bill for Representative Capparelli? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is on Third, Representative...excuse me, Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "I don't think Representative Capparelli wants to move it in this form. I think...I think we should wait and see what he wants. I'm not trying to stand on a parliamentary maneuver. But I don't think he wants this to move on in this form."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "No, I think the Gentleman's intention is to return it to Second to put on the Amendments that are agreed upon. So Representative Cullerton asks leave of the Body to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there an Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representatives Madigan - Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This would...Amendment would permit a Cook County Fair Association. Earlier this month the Cook County Board passed a resolution declaring its intention to conduct a Cook County Fair in June of 1991. The first year's fair is scheduled to be held at Rosemont Horizon. The funding would come from the Fair and Exposition Fund. Currently nine county fairs including Du Page for example, receive a share of the money from this fund and it's based on population. The current allocation is 46¢ per capita. That fund contains about \$1.2 million. Again to show you how this works, in Du Page County, they get about \$300,000 for their fair. This Amendment provides for the Cook County Fair to receive only 10¢ per capita. should be a total of about \$500,000. The Fair and Exposition Fund is enough money to fund the nine county fairs at the current levels along with this new Cook County Fair. There are no General Revenue transfer funds required and this is supported by the Agricultural Department of the State. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1496. On the question, the Gentleman from Du Page, Representative McCracken. Representative Ropp."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "This isn't the same Amendment that we put on when we adopted 30 yesterday, was it?"

Cullerton: "No, this is the Cook County Fair. I don't know of any other Amendments like this."

Ropp: "I thought we put one in for Cook County yesterday..."

Cullerton: "Might have...the appropriation? Appropriation?"

Ropp: "Yes, was that the..."

Cullerton: "Appropriation for \$500,000."

Ropp: "And this is the...for that appropriation."

Cullerton: "Substantive language. Right."

Ropp: "Is it your opinion that there is currently an abundance of Ag Pre...of Fair and Exposition money that this is in fact would not decrease the amount of revenue that is made available for those current counties that are using funds to sponsor their fairs?"

Cullerton: "That's correct. There is enough money. Those other fairs will get their money."

Ropp: "So the money that heretofore was not spent in this fund was, I think, either put back in the Ag Premium Fund or General Revenue Fund. One of those two."

Cullerton: "I think General Revenue."

Ropp: "General Revenue, okay. So really the...I guess years ago, didn't we put substantial amounts of money into McCormick Place to somewhat offset the Ag Premium Fund for downstate and is this now an attempt to, in addition, to the McCormick Place Funds that we do normally, to now establish a county fair in Cook County in addition to that?"

Cullerton: "Well, the Horse Racing Funds are split up in various ways. And some of them go to...small percentage goes to McCormick Place and I think another percentage goes to..."

Ropp: "Several million...several million."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Cullerton: "Well, okay. But a small percentage. And then...and then a...this is a fund called the Fair and Exposition Fund and this is what funds nine county fairs including Du Page and this would add Cook County to that fund. And as I indicated those nine county fairs would not show any decrease in their funding."
- Ropp: "So Cook County in essence has never received money..."
 Cullerton: "For a fair."
- Ropp: "Okay, but don't they get money out of the Ag Premium Fund for let's say their 4-H program like every other county does?"
- Cullerton: "Well now, I...I don't..."
- Ropp: "I guess my question is, I don't think you can get both. I think you have to either accept monies from the Ag Premium Fund or a Fair and Exposition Fund. Or do you get both?"
- Cullerton: "Well this is different than the Ag Premium Fund.

 Okay? This is a different fund altogether. This is a Fair and Exposition Fund. Which currently funds nine county fairs and...and we're adding this Cook County to those nine county fairs. It's not the Ag Premium Fund."
- Ropp: "No, I know it. I...you can't take it from both funds. I think you either have to take one or the other to support a fair."
- Cullerton: "Right. We're...we're taking it from...we're not taking it from the Ag Premium Fund, we're taking from the Fair and Exposition Fund."
- Ropp: "I know. Okay, another question then dealing with this particular situation. A few years ago, there were monies that were spent for a backyard fair which was also in Cook County. Is that still going on?"
- Cullerton: "It was called 'A Back of the Yards'."
- Ropp: "What ever it was for one...was that for one year. Is that terminated? I mean there's no moneies now going to Cook

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- County for some kind of a fair. This is not an additional fair."
- Cullerton: "No, I think we had a...we might have had a one time

 Chicago Fest appropriation."
- Ropp: "Well, it's Chicago Fest or Backyard Fair or something."
- Cullerton: "Well, there's two separate things. One was a Chicago...Taste of Chicago...no, it wasn't Taste of Chicago. I think it was the Chicago Fest on Navy Pier. That...there was an appropriation for that one. Mayor Byrn was the mayor. And then there was a 'Back of the Yards' council appropriation. But that...I don't even think that's going to on anymore."
- Ropp: "Those are not...no longer being funded."
- Cullerton: "I don't believe so. This would be Cook County Fair we could...where we could exhibit the animals that are indigenous to Cook County."
- Ropp: "How many...how many animals are in Cook County?"
- Cullerton: "Well, we have...I would anticipate...this is going to be out at Rosemont. I would imagine we'll have a lot of pigeons. We would have a display of pigeons. We would have some alley rats. I imagine some cockroaches, could be on display. We're going to be out in the Republican Bailiwick there, we can have some Republicans in cages perhaps."
- Ropp: "Let...for your...for your information though, no exhibitor of any livestock gets any money out of this Fair and Exposition Fund. Are you aware of that? No monies will be received by any exhibitor, if you get money from the Fair and Exposition..."
- Cullerton: "It's only...it's only \$500,000. So, I mean..."
- Ropp: "I'm trying to explain to you a little bit. This money will be used for exhibits, scientific exhibits, research exhibits, and all...every other thing."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Cullerton: "Think..."

Ropp: "Not premiums going to exhibitors. I really don't think it's a bad idea. It's not that much money really. But I did want the Sponsor, since he's not really a farmer, to be knowledgeable of these things."

Cullerton: "Well, I have the farm and the zoo in my district in Lincoln Park. That's the closest thing we have to a farm in Chicago."

Ropp: "Well, that probably that makes you as close as a lot of people. Thank you."

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

Kubik: "As another zoo farmer. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Kubik: "Representative, quick question regarding the...the county funding. Is it my understanding that the money from the off track betting parlors...that...that money which currently the tax for the county, is that going to used to pay for this fair?"

Cullerton: "No. No. The off track betting..."

Kubik: "I thought that was the idea."

Cullerton: "No, the off track betting money that you're referring to is split up in seven...it's in the sevenths and four sevenths used to go to the museums. Okay, and one seventh goes to the Home Extension Council, which is a statewide program mainly outside of Chicago. And then two sevenths goes to DCCA to promote horse racing. This has nothing to This is...this is money that comes from the do that. Paramutual Tax. Which is then split uρ and into...one...a good portion of it goes to Ag Premium Fund, the other goes to what's called the Fair and Exposition And that's the one we're tapping into. It's only got \$1.2 million in it now."

Kubik: "I understand that portion. But we also passed the

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- tax...that the local municipality can levy and the county can levy."
- Cullerton: "Right. That's one percent of the handling. That
 goes to the county and the city. And that's not...that's
 local money, that's not..."
- Kubik: "Right. And then I...I was under the impression that the county was going to use that money to pay for the fair."
- Cullerton: "Well, they might use that to supplement it. But this \$500,000 comes from the state. Those...that one percent that you're referring to goes to the county and the city."
- Kubik: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman
 yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Hartke: "Representative Cullerton, didn't we just in a Bill ear; ier this Session with Representative McPike have to poll the Illinois State Fair and the Du Quoin State Fair out of the Ag Premium Fund and subsidize that directly from the General Revenue Fund?"
- Cullerton: "I'm sorry, you're going to have to repeat that question for me."
- Hartke: "I said didn't we earlier in the session take monies from the...or take the Illinois State Fair as well as the Du Quoin State Fair out of the Ag Premium Fund and fund that directly from the General Revenue Fund?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, which I think Representative McPike had that Bill. That's correct."
- Hartke: "Yes, that's correct. We did. So now, that was because the Ag Premium Fund was running behind every year and we wanted to be straight with what we were doing. Correct?" Cullerton: "That's correct."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Hartke: "And now you're wanting to add another fair to the Ag Premium Fund which again will deplete that fund."

Cullerton: "No. No. Very important...very important distinction here. This...this funds...you can fund this fair out of two separate funds. One would be the Ag Premium Fund which funds. I think 90 counties...91 counties. And there's another fund which is called the Fair and Exposition Fund which currently funds nine county fairs. That's the fund we're taking it out of. We're not taking his out of the Aq Doesn't effect Premium Fund. those county fairs whatsoever. It only...you have to one or the other. We've chosen to the one. It funds nine county fairs including Du Page County. It's got about \$1.250 million in it and we're taking \$500,000 out of it. The \$1.2 million is used to fund the nine county fairs that it currently funds and there's no dimunition in that fund. So this is entirely separate from the fund that funds the county fairs in area."

Cullerton: "No, because this particular fund has shown the excess of 500,000 and that's where we chose to take it from."

Hartke: "Maybe we should transfer that to the Ag Premium Fund."

Cullerton: "Well, I think in the past it may have been transferred either to the Ag Premium Fund or the General Revenue Fund. I'm not sure which. But now we're going to abolish the Ag Premium Fund and you're going to take money for your county fairs directly from the General Revenue Fund."

Hartke: "No, we're not abolishing the Ag Premium Fund."

Cullerton: "Well, in either case this doesn't come out of the fund that funds your county fairs."

Hartke: "Okay, thank you very much."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bugielski. Representative
Bugielski is recognized for a Motion. Oh, Representative
Bugielski wants us to speed up the debate. Representative
Mautino is recognized."

Mautino: "Thank you. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Mautino: "As I understand it, your Amendment caps your participation at 10¢ per head. Right?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Mautino: "There's five million people, that's your \$500,000.

Right?"

Cullerton: "Right."

Mautino: "And this can be changed with future changes in that...that per capita head count, can it? Up to 20¢ if it were to be. Or 30 or 40?"

Cullerton: "You have to pass...you'd have to pass a Bill, yes."

Mautino: "To change...to change the ten to something else. Now,

if in fact that fund is not tapped for this additional

\$500,000 that money would be used under current statute as

part of the formula for the rest of the state currently

being covered by the fund. Is that not true?"

Cullerton: "I...I...was your question, if the money wasn't tapped, what would happen with excess money?"

Mautino: "Well, basically it's 45¢ for downstate and now you want to tap on 10¢ for the fair. The original concept...the original concept that was established was that the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority or Board or Fund was established because the City of Chicago and the County of Cook don't have a county fair. That's how that money originally got there. It funded those other things in Du Page and the five county fairs that are in it now. Is that not correct?"

Cullerton: "You're talking about the original Fair and Exposition

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Fund, set up?"

- Mautino: "Yes, we increased the funding of it about two or three years ago. And the rationale at the time to provide this direct flow to those areas was the fact that the City of Chicago doesn't have a fair. They have neighborhood fairs.
 - Is that not correct? And you get...and you get funding."
- Cullerton: "Well, that could have been part of the rational.

 Another part of the rational could have been that all of
 the money came from Cook County, since it comes from the
 race tracks in Cook County."
- Mautino: "There's race tracks other places as well. Rock Island has a race track and Cahokia has..."
- Cullerton: "Well most of the...most of the handle...95 percent of the handle comes from Cook County. And that's what's funding the Ag Premium Fund and the Fair and Exposition Fund. So that could have been part of the rationale at the time as well. But what I'm trying to say is there's...there's a separate fund, Fair and Exposition Fund that currently has about a \$1,250,000 and that funds nine county fairs."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I can't when they turn my microphone off."

Speaker Breslin: "I understand."

- Cullerton: "So, there's a sep...there's two separate funds. The Fair and Exposition Fund right now funds Du...Du Page, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Peoria, St. Clair, Sangamon, Tazewell and Winnebago. And we're adding Cook to that list. And what we're saying is that when you use the allocation of 10¢ per capita, it's only \$500,000. It doesn't take away from the Ag Premium Fund which funds the other fairs."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Mautino, bring your remarks to a close."

Mautino: "There isn't any Cook County Fair."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Cullerton: "Well, I'm just trying to answer his question."

Speaker Breslin: "Very...very good. The question is now, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Simple majority is required. Representative Ewing, one minute to explain your vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I am glad to see the red votes up there out numbering the green. I think when the different fair associations and mechanisms for funding were set up around the state there was equity built into it for the City of Chicago and Cook County as well as downstate the small fairs and downstate the large fairs. This is nothing but an opportunity for Cook County to come in and take another chunk of money with nothing for the small fair, nothing for the largers fair. A red vote is the right vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? A simple majority is required for the adoption of this Amendment. Representative Cullerton, one minute to explain your vote."

Cullerton: "Well, perhaps there's some confusion here. I think some people think that we're taking money out of the Ag Premium Fund. It's not the case. There's a separate fund that funds right now eight county fairs. I just gave a list of them. There's excessive money in that and as a result, we're asking for \$500,000 go to establish a Cook County Fair to be held out in Rosemont. There's five million people in Cook County, we're only asking for 10¢ per head; whereas the other fairs get 45¢ per head. So it doesn't take any money away from any of the other fairs that are downstate other than the...and it doesn't even

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

take it away the nine that I indicated. Because there's an excess of funds. We've already passed the appropriation. And I would ask people to reconsider those who voted 'no'. And understand that their fairs are not being harmed and we're simply following the wishes of the Cook County Board, which in a bipartisan move requested the..."

- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Representative Cullerton. I cut you
 off."
- Cullerton: "Yes, requested that there be a county fair in Cook

 County. It was requested by the Democrats as well as

 Republicans. And the amount of money that is being

 requested is a very small percentage."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Giorgi, one minute to explain your vote."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, as is...as pleas...pleasant as 1 can be about the Agricultural Premium Fund money, about 70 years ago or 60 years ago, the mid-Illinois Legislators told the Chicago city slickers, we let you bet at the track as long as we can skim some money for our county fairs. S٥ 101 county fairs have been enjoying the money solely from the Chicago tracks. Solely from the Chicago tracks last 50 years and they never told the farm wives that some of their ribbons were being paid for with gambling dollars and some of the best sheeps that were curried were paid...their ribbons were paid with gambling dollars. Livingston County is so aware of this, they have three county fairs in their county. They're the only county in the state that pulls that stunt. That's Ewing and his friends. This has been so unfair, I think it's about time that we turn the pendulum and gave Cook County their just due. All the money up till now has been coming from the race tracks and..."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

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

Representative Hicks, one minute to explain your vote."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, this almost funny when you say that it's not taking money away from the county fairs in the rest of the state because currently F and E has a surplus but where's that money go from the surplus of F and E, it goes to the Aq Premium Fund which funds all the other county fairs in the state when there's any money left over. Now that Aq Premium Fund is several million dollars short now and why is it so short because the money has been going to Chicago for McCormick Place for one thing. Money comes out for McCormick Place that goes to the Ag Premium Fund. What are you think you're doing? You're taking more money out of Ag Premium, it's not just F and E's. Sure the F and E's a couple years ago got 500,000 more dollars than anybody else did and all the other county fairs took a \$500,000 cut. Now you give a half million more dollars to F and E's and then you turn around and you take it from the other little county fairs of the state. Give me a break."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing, for what reason do you
seek recognition?"

Ewing: "Well, on a point of personal privilege. Not the last Speaker who was absolutely right. But the Speaker before him mentioned my county and my name in vain. I want to tell you that we don't rip off this state like Cook County. We would if we were as big maybe but we aren't. And this is a rip off and everybody ought to know it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes, one minute to explain your vote."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this

Amendment when it was passed by the county board, the

purpose is to educate the children of Cook County about

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- agriculture and about farming. And that's why I think it's important. I would suggest more 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Two points of order. One the Amendment changes the title within the meaning of the rule requiring that it be sent back to Second Reading, First Legislative Day. And I so demand. Secondly, it was returned from Third Reading for an Amendment which was adopted on Second and cannot be heard today. So put it back to Second Reading, First Legislative Day."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I'd move to suspend the provisions of Rule 36(d) with regard to the first point the Gentleman made with the fact that it goes back to Second Reading, First Legislative Day.

 That requires 60 votes to suspend that rule."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "Well, my point being, the reason there is no reference to a suspension of this rule is because in...in fact, this is a Constitutional requirement. The Bill will not be read three times by it's title as required by the Constitution. That's why you have to send it back to Second Reading, First Day."
- Speaker Breslin: "That is the...that is not the ruling of the Chair, Representative McCracken. As to Representative Culler...Cullerton's point, it will take 60 votes to suspend the rule as to whether or not the Bill can...can...needs to go back to Second Reading, First

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Legislative Day. So that Motion has been made. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Representative Hicks, one minute to explain your vote."

- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, I'd just like to be able to see this held over just for one more day because all the downstate guys, I'm just going to call all the county board all the county fair presidents and I want all of them to call all the downstate guys who are voting for this because they're going to tell you exactly what this Bill means to your county fair. To your county fair. That's what it means. And it's taking money away from it. And if you've got a small county fair that's not an F and E, it's taking money away from it."
- Speaker Breslin: "It requires 60 votes for the adoption of this waiver. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take...Representative Hicks, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Madam Speaker. If this Bill get the required number of votes, the Motion. I would request a verification."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Only vote your own switches.

 This...this Motion will be verified. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 61...60 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Hicks has asked for a verification. Representative Matijevich requests leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "I'll offer to do his verification for him. We're used to it."
- Speaker Breslin: "He needs the practice Representative McCracken.

 Representative Shaw asks leave to be verified. Proceed
 with the Poll of the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Kubik."

- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff. Barnes. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Kubik asks leave to be verified. Representative Terzich asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Hartke. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Krska.
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Kulas asks leave to be verified. Representative Kulas. Leave is granted. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Parke. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Santiago. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. White. Williams. Williamson. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. Zickus, And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any questions? Representative McAuliffe votes 'aye'. Mr. McAuliffe votes 'aye'. Representative Richmond votes 'aye'. Do you have any questions of the affirmative, Mr. Hicks?"
- Hicks: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Williams?" Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams. Paul Williams. the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."
- Hicks: "Representative Stern?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern. Grace Mary Stern. the Lady in the chamber? She is not. Remove her from the Roll Call."
- Hicks: "Representative McGann?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Stern has returned to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the chamber. Add her to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Hicks: "Representative McGann?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann. Andy McGann. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Lauriro...Laurino?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino. Bill Laurino. The Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Bruce Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman was granted verification."

Hicks: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Representative Balanoff asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted."

Hicks: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan. Al Ronan. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Matijevich?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'.

Representative Matijevich was verified. Representative Keane asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted."

Hicks: "Representative Terzich?"

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich was verified."

Hicks: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Jim DeLeo. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hicks: "Representative Kubik."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik was verified."

Hicks: "Representative Parke?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke. Terry Parke. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?" Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him. Representative Ronan has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Hicks: "Representative Preston?"

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

Hicks: "Representative Wennlund?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund. Larry Wennlund. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded. The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Hicks: "Oh, excuse me. He's voting 'no', Representative. No
further."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. On this question, there are 57 voting 'aye', 50...Representative Williams has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Representative Flowers, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Flowers: "Madam Speaker, I would like to know, how am I recorded, please?"

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

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis. Representative Davis the verification is completed. Representative Jones, for what

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

reason do you seek recognition?"

Jones, S.: "Madam Speaker, how am I recorded?"

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

Jones, S.: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Woolard. Representative Salt...Representative Woolard votes 'aye'. Representative Saltsman votes 'aye'. Representative...on this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no'. And the Motion carries. Representative...Representative Cullerton is recognized. Yes, you have another point of order and..."
- Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, I would move to extend the deadline with regard to the Third Reading deadline with regard Senate Bill 1496 to June 30, 1990."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. So the Motion before the Body is to extend the deadline until June 30th, 1990. And on that question, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Very good."

- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you. This Motion requires 60 votes. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there is 60 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no'. Representative McCracken wishes to verify. Poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative: Balanoff. tapes inaudible)...Bugielski. Barnes. Bowman...(both Cullerton. Currie. Capparelli. Davis. DeJaeqher. Didrickson. Farley. Flowers. DeLeo. Giglio. Giorgi. Krska. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. Keane. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago.

133rd Legislative Day

McCracken?"

June 21, 1990

Zickus and Mr. Speaker."

Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. White. Williams. Williamson. Wolf. Woolard.

Turner. White. Williams. Williamson. Wolf. Woolard.

Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the affirmative, Mr.

McCracken: "Yes. Thank you. Representative Krska?"

Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge.

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich? Representative Bob Terzich? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez? Mr. Martinez? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Bugielski?"

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

Representative Matijevich asks leave to be verified Mr.

McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Leave is verified."

McCracken: "Representative Santiago?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Santiago is in the chamber.

Representative McAuliffe changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Preston?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston? Lee Preston? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

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

McCracken: "Representative Leverenz?"

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

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

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

McCracken: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey is voting 'no'."

McCracken: "Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas? Myron Kulas? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley? Bruce Farley? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw? Bill Shaw? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Richmond?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino? Bill Laurino? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane? Jim Keane...is in the chamber. Representative Kulas has returned to the chamber.

Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Wolf?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf? Sam Wolf...is in the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Lang?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang is in his seat."

McCracken: "Representative McNamara?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Repr..."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further questions?"

McCracken: "Representative DeLeo?"

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

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this Motion, on this Motion there are 53 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no' and none voting 'present' and Representative Cullerton's Motion fails. This Bill moves to Third Reading and will be held on Third Reading. The next Bill on the Order of State Government Administration, Third Reading is Senate Bill 1497, Representative Capparelli. 1497. Excuse me. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Yes. We had asked for a fiscal note on that. We filed it as amended by Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, please be advised that they have requested a fiscal note. Do you have a Motion at this time? I see the Bill couldn't move to Third Reading because a fiscal note had been filed. So the Bill has to remain on the Order of Second Reading unless you have a Motion to make. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I understand that I can make that Motion tomorrow when we're gonna be in Session so we can pass this Bill tomorrow, for those that voted 'no'. Tomorrow when we're in Session I can make that Motion. Is that right?"

Speaker Breslin: "That is true."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, for what reason do

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "If he doesn't do it now, it will only be Third Reading, first day tomorrow. We'll have to stay until Saturday."
- Speaker Breslin: "What's with this first day business?"
- McCracken: "Isn't there a first day on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Only on the Consent Calendar. I don't think this is one of those Bills. Senate Bill 1487, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2222, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I ask leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of Amendments please."
- Speaker Breslin: "You heard the Gentlemen's Motion. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, withdraw Amendment #3 please."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative DeJaegher."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher. Amendment 4."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you Madam Speaker. Basically what this is a language clarification that's been asked for a bonding company. Very shortly, they are going to be in the process of selling bonds for the construction of a NASCAR facility in our area and they have requested that this language be inserted so that there would be no problems for pertaining, to the selling or issuing of bonds for the construction of

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- that particular facility and for that reason I ask support of this Amendment 4 to 2222."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 2222. Does anyone rise in opposition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Not necessarily opposition. I'm just curious. Now the bonds are exempt. Or the authority's exempt. But you want them to be exempt only if in their discretion they find that the tax exempt status enhances the market ability of the bond? Okay."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The question is, 'Shall Amendment 4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amentment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

 Amendment #5 was brought to our attention by Senator Dunn in whose district in Will County, there's an airport that is owned by a private party. And there are suggestions that the airport owned by the private party will be condemned and by one of the neighboring municipalities.

 And Senator Dunn asked our consideration of prohibiting that kind of occurrence from taking place. So it's limited to Will County only and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 2222. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the excuse me, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Barger."
- Barger: "I just wanted to say that I have read the Amendment and

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

I agree with it thoroughly. It's a good Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo now asks leave for immediate consideration of this Bill as amended.

Is there any objection? Hearing none, read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Members of the House. addition to the two Amendments that were just added to Senate Bill 2222. The original Bill provides that notice of a proposed annual appropriation ordinance for municipality. Those are municipalities under 500,000 will take effect upon passage of the ordinance. That is, I believe, language that we've done for others before. And provision passed the Senate unanimously and is noncontroversial. We were also requested by the City County of Peoria to look into a situations where service agreements between the county and the city could take place with sharing of sales tax revenues between the two. is added as Amendment #1. And Amendment #2 puts in language that this House passed as part of House Bill which deals with landscape waste and which allows the corporate authorities of municipalities to register with no Landscape maintenance businesses that, fee. that business within their municipalities. Madam Speaker, I'd answer any questions and if none, would ask for passage of House...Senate Bill 2222."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2222. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, there being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2222 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote Voting is open. This is final passage. voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. who wish? On this question there are 109...110 voting 'ave'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Government Administration, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1504, Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien "Senate Bill 1504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment was brought to my attention and was asked to sponsor by the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, Neil Hartigan. And it's in response to a letter that he received from an organization called 'We The People'. Which is a grass roots Committee located in Lombard, Illinois and it addresses the problem they uncovered at the DuPage County Airport. Apparently the DuPage County Airport, according to this organization, is using tax payer money to create an elitist shangri-la commonly known as the DuPage County Airport. Property tax dollars which are collected from throughout the entire County of DuPage are being used to acquire land removing that land from the tax roles for utilization by private

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

enterprise. There's a Pet-Martwik land development plans of the airport which is a private facility reserved for individual and corporate aircraft use. The proposed nonaviation development includes a recreational complex and business park, incorporating a clubhouse, an championship golf course, a health club, private cottages, hotel, and fashion center, containing Bonwit. Teller and other retail shops. Now the purpose of this Amendment is to simply say that if you're going to raise property taxes in DuPage County to pay for an airport that the proceeds from that tax shall be used to construct and maintain airports and airport related facilities and not any other facilities. I think it's something which in light of the current property tax mood in DuPage County, which is one of a shock since everyone got such a large increase and since everyone in DuPage County is being taxed for this...this airport, which is way out in the very edge on the Cain County border, this makes sense. The Attorney General has responded by having this Amendment drafted he believes, as you know, that we are overtaxed especially in the property tax area and this would go a long way towards saving DuPage County some Property Tax money. So, I would urge that you assist me in adopting this Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1504. On the 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 O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Pullen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen. Mr. Clerk, is this Amendment printed and distributed? Representative Pullen."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Pullen: "Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House this Amendment would create a regional airport auth..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen, Representative Pullen.

 This Amendment nor any of the following are printed, they are not printed or distributed so we cannot hear them at this time."
- Pullen: "Well, I'm wondering whether the Gentleman would agree to hold the Bill so that we could have consideration."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli? Representative Capparelli. This is the development, there are several Bills filed, several Amendments filed to your Bill, they are not printed and distributed, this is probably the last day for consideration at this time. Representative Cullerton's Amendment was adopted. The next Amendment is sponsored by Representative Pullen, she is asking you to take the Bill out of the record and hold it."
- Capparelli: "I would like to move to table the Amendments and go on with the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Capparelli has moved to table Amendment 2, 3, 4, and 5, by Representative Pullen, since these Amendments are not printed and distributed.

 Representative McCracken is recognized on that Motion."
- McCracken: "Ralph, a Gentleman would have acceded to the Lady's request. We're gonna be in here for a few more hours and we are...we are happy to accept Amendment #1, which we have done, we would like to have our Amendments considered. Apparently, we'll be here tomorrow anyway, so there is lots of time."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendments 2 through 5 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. A simply majority is required. Representative Parke, one minute to explain your

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

vote."

Parke: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we're trying to do is just ask that our ideas are as valuable as other's ideas are valuable and I think that this process is big enough to let debate on good ideas. I see no reason for us to be singled out because they're not printed and distributed, who knows what the reason is that the printing bureau hasn't got them out, but I think any Member, every Member your side, my side, has a right to have their ideas heard. I would ask that this Bill be taken out of the record and held so that we can proceed in a manner that allows all people to have their ideas heard. That dialogue for the people, by the people, will not be denied by this Body. So please join with us in 'no' votes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke, the Chair would advise you and the Members that these Amendments were just filed at 1:45. Representative Black, one minute to explain your vote."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would just remind people on both sides of the aisle that I would think that what you're going to do with this vote is you're going to establish a precedent today if your Amendments on either side of the aisle aren't printed and distributed, and you know how they back up at this time of the year, then I don't see how you in good conscience can expect...excuse me...expect anybody's Amendment to be heard today if your goning to deny the Lady the chance to have her Amendment heard because of the backlog and the printing process. It happens every year at this time, if you want to establish that precedent then let's be consistent and nobody's Amendment will be heard today unless it was distributed early this morning."

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pullen, one minute to explain your vote."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know when this Bill, until about five minutes ago this Bill provided that the Cook County Board adopt it's annual Appropriation Bill not later than the beginning of each fiscal year. This Amendment wouldn't have been germane until the adoption of Amendment #1, that's why it was just filed, because this was not a Bill dealing with Airport Authorities until Amendment #1 was adopted. So, Amendment #2 and the others are in order, and were filed timely, because Amendment #1, was just adopted. Don't let them do this to me cause they'll do it to you too."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 65 voting 'aye' 52 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the Motion to table Amendments 2, 3, 4, and 5, have been adopt...succeeds. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Capparelli.

 Representative Cullerton, to present the Bill. Whichever I

 don't...Representative Cullerton to present the Bill."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I would ask for passage of the Bill which was
 Amended by Amendment #1, dealing with the DuPage County
 Airport Authority which Representative McCracken indicated
 he supports."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1504, and on that question, Is there any discussion? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1504 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2229, Representative Munizzi. Out of the record. The next Order of Business is Public Utilities, Third Reading. The only Bill on that Order is Representative Hoffman's Bill. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. The next Order is the Order of Labor. Third Reading. Senate Bill 1638, Representative McPike. Mr. McPike. Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1638 as amended by Amendment #2 deletes provisions authorized in deduction of Unemployment Insurance Benefits for spousal support. Unemployment benefits can still be deducted for purposes of child support. According to the Department of Employment Security, this Amendment was mandated by Federal Law and it's been agreed to by all parties to the Agreed Bill negotiations."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1638. Does anyone rise in opposition? There being none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1638 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. 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 1704, Representative Saltsman. Mr. Saltsman. Clerk, read the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1704, a Bill for an Act concerning leave for fire fighters. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman. This Bill provides that union officers arrange, firefighters...the union office will arrange for firefighters of the municipality to be able to trade time off when they represent their organizations in Springfield. This is cost to the city. It's something that currently is in progress in the State of Illinois now, but all this does is it does not let the mayor and one certain union official have a problem where the mayor can forbid him to come down like happened one city in the State of Illinois. I ask for its passage. There's no additional cost to the municipality."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 1704. On the question, the Lady from Cook,
Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I would just like everyone to understand what really is this Bill and I'm going to take the liberty of reading one paragraph. It says that 'a firefighter who is an elected state officer of a statewide labor organization that is a representative fire protection district firefighters in Illinois shall be granted leave by the district, without loss of pay or benefits and without being required to make up for lost time for work hours devoted, to performing the firefighter's responsibility as an elected state officer of the statewide labor organization.' There is nothing in our state statutes that says we do the same thing for teachers. Their leave for such union activities is unpaid. like you all to listen to that. The second point I'd like

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

to make is that Chicago's not included in this proposition and I think if you've talked to any of your local state fire chiefs they've been very concerned about particular measure. Because what they're being asked to do at the local level, your local municipalities are being asked to give time off so that a firefighter, unlimited time off by the way, for a firefighter to go and engage in union activities which is then going to come around and at bargaining time be on the opposite side of the table from the local management of that firefighter unit. I think what we have done here is set an unprecedented measure with regards to sense of fairness. Why would we do this for firefighters outside of Chicago, and not if this is a great idea, not do this for our local teachers also? fighters do not work day in and day out. This is unlimited They work for 48 hours and they get 24 hours off. And I would suggest to you that that kind of an arrangement certainly allows them enough time to engage in union organizing activities. So I would really suggest to you, for those of you outside of Chicago, be very careful with this particular measure and I think that the 'no' vote is the appropriate vote."

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

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason Chicago isn't in the Bill is because Chicago has an arrangement with the firefighters union in Chicago so there's no problem. Actually this Bill was drafted because of one problem that occurred in my district when we had a member of the downstate firefighters, associated firefighters of Illinois who belonged to а local Waukegan, was in the statewide group. And I wrote a letter to the then mayor asking if he would allow the Gentleman to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

he here in Springfield to serve on that legislative committee and that another member οf the firefighters...firefighters in Waukegan would cover up for at no cost to the taxpayer. So Representative Didrickson didn't read the whole Bill because there would be no cost to the taxpayer. This is very fair. have happened if that Gentleman couldn't come here to represent his union. He was a very capable person and I think he ought to represent the interests of firefighters. The municipalities paid moneies actually, taxpayers' monies to belong to the municipal league. And nobody seems think there is anything wrong with that to spend taxpayers' monies to have members of the municipal league representing the best interest to that city. Why shouldn't firefighter be allowed to be down here, represent his employee, his fellow employees and at no, no cost to the taxpayers. This is a good Bill and I would urge all of you to support it."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson, for what reason do
 you seek recognition?"
- Didrickson: "I seek recognition because my name was used in debate and I'd like to correct an error that was stated." Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."
- Didrickson: "With regards to no cost to the taxpayer, when you are trading days, that may be true. But there are undefined additional costs that are not...that are not spoken to in this particular Bill with regards to time and a half. And that indeed, if that is the case, which is one of the concerns of this Bill. There is a cost to the taxpayer."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

One of the reasons that the Chicago is not in this particular Bill is because actually their firefighters that are down here actually get paid by the city. All this Bill really does is simply let them trade time. And like Representative Didrickson said they work 48 and off 24 I'm happy to say that most of them work 24 and off 48. What this Bill simply does is allow what we call as a trade-off of time. For example, if I'm supposed to be working today that I can trade the time off with another firefighter who would work in my place. There's no cost to the municipality all it does is simply allow firefighter to trade time. It's not going to cost the municipalities any money nor underman the fire department and it's a very, very good Bill and should receive report."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1704 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.
On this question there are 70 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no'.
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Civil Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2267. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act in relation to Criminal Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you, very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 simply deletes sexual

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

orientation as a protected status as the Bill came out of the Judiciary Committee. This Bill was amended basically to delete ethnic intimidation and replace it with a word, that is hate crime. When we think of this hate crime, it conjures up visions of storm troopers and klansmen, muslims, simply going out and perpetrating acts of violence for bigoted reasons. The Legislature has already dealt with ethnic intimidation. What we have done here, Members of this Body is simply this, we have inserted a status. an artificially created status, orientation into the Bill. The real purpose of this, in my opinion and the opinion of others who have looked at this is once again to continue a steady but legislation, accelerating trend by a small and vocal minority who are looking for nothing more and nothing less than full acceptance. Let me remind you that this is not the Hate Crimes Bill that passed Congress and it was signed by President. In fact Amendment #2, is simply that , but what this does, what this Amendment does, in my opinion, is simply deletes something which really shouldn't be in the It. simply states that sexual orientation is not a protected status, that those who engage in deviate sexual behavior should not enjoy a special protection and need not legally protected in a manner in which is specified in We don't grant special license to polygamist. this Bill. we don't grant special license to bigamists, and the reason is very, very plain. The United States Supreme Court in a series of decisions over the years has looked towards the central core of the family of being the bulwark of American society. And yet there are some words that have been used which attempt to put this type of status and codify it and use a nice word called civil Now, we're looking at civil rights protections,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly the status of race is unrelated totally to behavior, it's totally unrelated. But the traditional perception of person making a choice based upon a person's behavior is something which has always enjoyed protection. have a group that is bonded together merely by its preference for sexual deviant behavior and asking to he legally protected. The Supreme Court of the United States in a decision four years ago has stated in Hardwick vs. Bowers, that there is no fundamental right found in the United States Constitution that would protect the right anal intercourse or anal sodomy. The law has in fact every right if it chooses and the Body of the Legislature has every right if it chooses to discourage people from entering a course of conduct which is detrimental not only to themselves but eventually to society. So the inquiry is this, does a freely made individual preference towards oral or anal sodomy with members of the same merit special legal protection? I see no outcry across this state anywhere but from a small and militant minority who are simply seeking full social acceptance for their deviant behavior. Any time a homosexual ordinance or a homosexual rights ordinance has been put to the test, even in San Francisco, even in St. Paul, Minnesota, been invariably defeated. What we're asking here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is simply this, we do not want government to begin the slow but steady process towards granting full social acceptance to deviant behavior. Once again I can't stress strong enough, this is not a Bill that was passed by Congress and signed by the President, it has placed in some buzz words like civil rights, and Hate Crimes to create the impression that somehow, and some way that by passing or voting against this Bill that you're going to be

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

a bigot, a Member of the Ku Klux Klan, the Nazis, the Black Muslims, or whatever hate group you care to choose. Please join me and the overwhelming majority of sensible, thinking Americans and the people of the State of Illinois in voting to put this Amendment deleting sexual orientation as a preference and I ask for a Roll Call vote on the measure."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1, on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston. The question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Withdraw Amendment #2."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, I move for passage of Senate Bill 2267, it creates the offense of Hate Crimes. Unfortunately, Representative Petka's Amendment got on which takes out sexual orientation but it does still increase the penalties for crimes against people based on their religious beliefs and it expands the number of crimes that ethnic intimidation now covers. So I move to adopt and pass Senate Bill 2267."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act in relation to Criminal Law and Sentencing. Third Reading of the Bill."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of this Bill. On this question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

"Madam Speaker, I'm gonna vote for this Bill but I really believe that some years ago we made a mistake by adding so many different categories of crime. I think when you kill somebody for example you kill somebody and I don't care if it's an aged person, a young person or who it is. That is a crime. And I think really what this Legislature ought to do is I think it's really about time for a whole rewrite of the Criminal Code. I think we ought to get a blue ribbon group, a task force and do what they did about thirty years ago, and rewrite the Criminal Code. So that a person doesn't have to, for example, look in a computer and say well if I commit this crime what category does it come under? A crime is a crime and the more simple we make the Criminal Code, the better it's going to be, so I think the next General Assembly ought to put that on its highest priority. Let's rework the Criminal Code and do a good job of it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Speaker. I agree thoroughly with the Representative from Lake County. The...there are three basic concepts involved here, one concept was the one that the Lord High Executioner did in The Mikkado, and that was to make the punishment fit the crime. And there is logic in that, the other is one that some of our socialist people favor whereas we make the punishment fit the criminal and if we can make the criminal nice enough we let him go again and that has been acceptable over the last forty years, here in the State of Illinois to one extent or another. Here we're introducing an entirely new concept.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

And this is the concept of making the punishment fit the victim. Now, this is totally ridiculous, if someone were to assault this young lady here, it's no more going to do her no more harm than it would do that young gentleman there to be assaulted. An assault is an assault and I think this is an absolutely ridiculous Bill and it deserves to be beaten. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yeah, you know, a crime is a crime is a crime. And the motivation of the criminal has no bearing on whether an offense has been committed. That's historically how our criminal laws have been made and enforced. This introduces an element of motivation which the state has to prove. I think it does violence, no pun intended, to our system of criminal law and enforcement, it absolutely is meaningless, it is a waste of Judicial effort a waste of prosecutorial effort, I'm glad the Amendment went on but it is still a bad Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, is recognized to close."
- Cullerton: "Well. thank you Madam Speaker. Apparently it is necessarv for me to read a letter that was written yesterday by James E. Ryan, the DuPage County States Attorney, and the Republican candidate for General, expressing full support for this Bill regarding Hate Crimes. "As the DuPage States Attorney, I recognize it will provide a valuable tool against one particular type of truly offensive criminal conduct. Many crimes including violent crimes tend to be committed on the spur of the moment in uncontrolled anger, while these emotional responses that circumstances can never be condoned, they can be understood. However, the commission of Hate Crimes

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

involves the premeditated and conscience choice by perpetrator to translate his personal prejudices into violent attacks, intending to punish another citizen for the conditions of that victim's life. That conduct is beyond understanding and is intolerable as a society of law important for us to make a strong statement against Hate Crimes. Senate Bill 2267, does make that statement and I support it and the prohibition of violent bigotry it That's James E. Ryan, the DuPage States represents. Attorney, the Republican candidate for Attorney General, and I salute him for his support. Clearly we recognize our current Criminal Law the fact that certain victims should be treated differently and we have enhancements for those types of victims, we have enhancements when children are the victims, we have enhancements for penalties when the elderly or the handicapped are the victim, and this talks in the same vein about people who happen to particular religion, or a particular race and that's why the State's Attorney of Dupage County supports it, that's why the Anti-Defamation League supports it. The State's Attorney of Cook County strongly supports it as well. is very consistent with what we have passed many times over with overwhelming votes and the issue of sexual orientation was removed by Representative Petka's Amendment. There is no reason why anyone should vote 'no' this Bill. on appreciate and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2267 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. This is final passage. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 14 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Jesse White is in the chair for a special introduction."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. We have before us some wonderful individuals, young people who are friends of mine and they reside in a city called Cole City, Illinois. I have had the great pleasure for many years in working with their coach, Miss Kim Brooks. They are fortunate in that they will travel to Russia, representing the great State of Illinois for two years, two...for a two month period of time. I would now like to introduce their coach, Miss Kim Brooks."

Kim Brooks: "Thank you. Do I...I get a minute to speak said. dance troop is between the ages of 10 and 19 years old. They were one of two dance troops in the United States asked to tour and perform in the Soviet Union. leaving on Independence Day, the 4th of July, and returning on the 18th. They are the youngest group ever to be invited and they are also from the smallest town ever in the United States to be invited. This troup has been together for less than two years and in two years they have accomplished so much and they're something that this city and state can be very proud of and including our country. As I said in the House of Senate a few moments ago, we started out a small town hoping to do something and since then we've had friends all over the State of Illinois including the Governor who we just met a little while We want to especially thank all of you for all the support and love that you giving us. Special thanks to Mr. Jerry Weller, to Mr. Jesse White and to Mrs. Ann Zickus who brought us here today. And David Boilin with the Governor's office who brought us here to perform. Thank you very much and God bless you all. We'll see you when we come back."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The next Order of Business is Civil Law, Third Reading. Senate Bill 2308, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2308, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I wish to bring the Bill back to Second Reading."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to ret...Representative Martinez, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Martinez: "Point of personal privilege please."

Speaker Breslin: "State your purpose, please."

Martinez: "I would like to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 2267."

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

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "My Motion would be to table certain Amendments which
we adopted. In light of the opposition of the Senator who
sponsors the Bill. My Motion would be to table Amendments
1 through 5. I've discussed this, the Sponsors of the
Amendments are myself and Representative Lang, I've
indicated this desire to Representative Lang which he
concurs. The Motion is to table Amendments 1 through 5."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendments 1 through 5 to Senate Bill 2308. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendments 1 through 5 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the chair the 'ayes' have it and Amendments 1 through 5 are tabled. Any

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

further Motions or Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2308, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill now does three things. The original Senate Bill eliminates the provisions allowing prisoners to bring civil actions up to two years after the person ceases to be inprisoned. The...that was the original Bill yhat still remains Amendment #6 is still on the Bill which was a request of the Supreme Court. deposits of certain fees with the court Authorizing providing that those deposits are put into a certain which has to draw interest. And that some of the monies from the various funds...I'm sorry...as I indicated, should require interest to be deposited...interest should be paid those that are deposited on those funds. Also, Amendment #7 which makes a technical change to a section of a code entitled lien of judgement to clarify the intent of Bill that we passed last year with regard to bankruptcy and what is protected from the bankruptcy court. So I'd be happy to answer any questions and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2308. And on the question is there any discussion? Does anyone rise in opposition? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2309 pass...08 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye' and none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- declared passed. The next Order is the Order of Revenue, Second Reading. Senate Bill 2210, Representative Currie.

 Out of the record. Representative Cullerton in the Chair."
- . Speaker Cullerton: "On the Order of Concurrence, State and Local Government, House Bill 3109, Representative Preston...It's House Bill 3109, Representative Preston, this is on the

Order of Concurrence."

- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3109. This simply makes a small language change in the Bill. Deletes the word, I guess, 'education'...or. 'relations', that's what it does. It deletes the word 'relations' from the parenting and family education legislation that we passed out of the House and the Senate agrees with it. They just delete one word. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3109. On that is there any
 discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
 McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know this is important to the Sponsor and he has spent a lot of time and energy on this issue. I just don't think it's good policy though. I think what will happen invariably is that the kids will come home and tell their parents their parents are doing something wrong. That they've learned how to parent at school and then if the parents don't do it that way the kids don't have to obey. I just don't see any good coming out of this. That's a personal point. I suppose I'll be the only 'no' vote but..."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? The question is,
 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 3109?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. this question there are 70 voting 'yes' 41 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present' and the House does concur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 3109 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Steczo on the Order of Education, Senate Bill 1512. Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1512, a Bill for an Act in relation to drivers license. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Steczo."

"Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1512 is the Bill that we heard yesterday which amends the Motor Vehicle Code and the School Code and authorizes the cancellation or denial of a drivers license for failure to maintain school attendance. I would like to take this opportunity to try to reiterate some of the points that were addressed yesterday. To indicate to Members of this House that a lot of time and effort has gone into making Senate Bill 1512 a Bill more workable than previous attempts at addressing this issue. This Bill, Senate Bill 1512, first of all has a repealer clause. A five year sunset provision which allows us to be able to review the program at the end of five years to determine whether or not it's worked. Other Bills did not have that provision. It also provides that the local school districts are required to provide the State Board of Education with information so they can ascertain the value of the program as it relates to the drop-out rate. There are many individuals who indicate that this Bill simply will not work. We would like to have that information reported to

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the State Board of Education so that we can determine as we are sure it will show that it does work. There are also the exemptions that people spoke of yesterday. allows the superintendent with the concurrence of the school board to provide exemptions for economic or medical necessity or family hardship. Many concerns were raised regarding that kind of issue. That issue was addressed. In addition to that, prior efforts, prior efforts to secure the passage of this kind of legislation did not give the students a second chance. This Bill says that if a student comes back to school, if the student is progressing GED or if that student is involved or enrolled in an alternative education program then the Secretary of State automatically and immediately shall reissue the student's license. Other Bills dealing with the subject matter have those provisions. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a Bill that has become law in other states. It's one that the State Board of Education in the past has never supported, confident enough in the provisions that it contains now the first Bill that is supported by the State Board of Education. I believe it is something that can work will work and will, at least, provide for some students to stay in school and I would ask for your approval and would answer any questions you might have relating to Senate Bill 1512."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of .

Senate Bill 1512. On that is there any discussion? The

Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's initiatives. There are 10 other states that have enacted such laws this year alone. There are 24 states who are considering such legislation and I think

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

with the support of the State Board of Education we seriously ought to give it a shot in the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Thank you. Representative I commend you as Representative McCracken stated earlier that you've worked very hard on this Bill and I know that all of us here would be happy to join you in trying to attack the problem, your're trying to get to the root cause of, I'm not sure this is the best way to do it but there is one thing that weighs most heavily on my mind. Are you aware of a Supreme Court case called the people versus Linder?"

Steczo: "Representative Black, no I'm not."

- Black: 'Well, I guess the real reason I can't support your Bill Representative. Let me just call the attention of the Body to a Supreme Court case in 1988. People versus Linder in which it was declared unconstitutional to deny or revoke a person's drivers license for a nonmotor vehicle related offense. Now in light of that decision and I'm certainly not an attorney and there are people here who could enlighten me I'm sure, I think the Bill is obviously unconstitutional. Whether it's already on the books in 10 states or 20 I'm just not sure that the Gentleman is going to be able to do what he'd like to do with this Bill and I rise in reluctant opposition."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sutker."
- Sutker: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I spoke against this Bill before. I think it's important that we have attention to this Bill now. Do not be beguiled by the status of the Sponsors of this Bill who

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

outstanding Representatives. But this Bill is conceptionally flawed. It's cumbersome its in implementation and can only be counterproductive. Not only unconstitutional as has been suggested Representative Black, but beyond that. It's the wrong Bill the wrong time for the wrong purposes. It creates punishment that doesn't fit our time's and doesn't need be applied at this juncture. It's been defeated before and it should be defeated now. You do not and must not use the intimidation of drivers license with respect to education. You should not use nondrivers violations for the purposes taking away driving privileges or suspending drivers licenses. It sends out the wrong message. It should resoundingly defeated and I urge a no vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When we pass legislation we never know whether or not it's going to work or not. However, in the states that have passed Bill, and I think it's up to ten now, it works. simple. It works. More than 50 percent in all those states students who have dropped out come back to school. To me that's a positive effort that is needed in this state to get young people back into the school system so they can be prepared to go into the work force. Let's give it a try. It's only for five years. We'll be able to see how it proves out. And to me, if we could put 50 percent the drop-out kids back into the school, do you know that's 17,000 kids. 17,000 kids going back to school, completing high school. To me that's money well spent. I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Santiago: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I rise in opposition to this Bill. What this Bill does basically, it would make criminals out of 16 and 17 year old kids. Let me give you an example. In the Chicago area, there's about a 50 percent drop-out rate, high school drop-out rate. These kids are going to drive vehicles when they drop out of school. And what's going to happen is, they're going to run into someone they're going to be charged with not having a drivers license is gonna create a problem and a bigger hazard for those parents. So I warn you; what you're going to do if you vote for this Bill you're making criminals out of young 16 and 17 year olds. I want you and I tell you in our area, in my district I have kids 40 and 50 percent of them drop-out. first thing they do, they go out, they try to find they try to get a part time job and the first thing they do, they buy a vehicle. And what's going to happen with this Bill, they're not going to be able to buy insurance, they're not going to be able to get a drivers license and what's going to happen, you're creating a bigger and a bigger burden and you're putting that burden on parents. So I ask for everyone here to let your conscience dictate your vote and vote 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill and I think it's about time that we sit down and think about it. The problems that we're having in society today is I think that we are just too lenient with our rules and our laws we put forth. Let's clamp down. The drop—out rates is horrendous. I think that we have to start doing something with the states where this law is in existence. We have seen that it has

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

worked over there and I think it's about time that we put down the law and stop being lenient and say we mean business and let's try to keep these kids in school and hopefully a Bill like this will work. Thank you."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The last Speaker, Representative from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "If I'm the last one, let's go. I know how I'm going to vote."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. Representative Steczo, you wish to close? Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just quickly in closing, there were comments made, number one, that this Bill cumbersome and it places too many restrictions and what have you. We, who are dealing with the subject matter a choice. We could have made it noncumbersome and said, if you drop out of school you're going to lose your license period. But in order to take into account all of arguments that people...people made about having the availability in terms of economic necessity or medical necessity or what have you, or employment. We did take into account those considerations as a result, the Bill has become, if you would want to call it cumbersome, you can do Fair is word that. the that I like use. Notwithstanding, it's the carrot and the stick approach. But those of us who have had teenagers know how important the drivers license is. And Notwithstanding, all the comments about cumbersome, or what have you, there is vital fact that we must take into consideration. And that is the fact as Representative Ropp said, it works. Ιt works. So I would encourage you to help us adopt a program that works and hopefully will help keep children in school and I would urge your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1512

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative...Representative Giorgi has asked me to announce that if all those people who promised to be number 60 should get on now. Representative Preston, for what purpose do you rise?"

Preston: "Just to explain my vote Mr. Speaker. I see too many green votes up there. I can't pretend to be able to duplicate the sage words of Representative Davis who is at a meeting right now, but among her main points that she gave us yesterday was that Bills like this are not going to increase school attendance or increase the ability children to learn in schools. The only way you do that is to make school interesting and stimulating comfortable and safe place for students to go for learning. And until we do that, Bills to bribe children through saying you won't get a drivers license, we might as well have another Bill saying they won't get allowance and see if that's going to increase school attendance. That simply is bizarre. It doesn't work. Only through the interest of students in school will they be in the proper kind learning environment and I'd ask you to please consider that and vote 'no'. This simply doesn't work."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Mautino to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. I also stand in opposition to the legislation. And I think for a different reason. Number one, I'm sure that if, in fact, this is signed into law, there's going to be a lot of parents that are going to be calling their Legislators to find out how they can get some assistance in getting their child's drivers license back. It's difficult enough now on the provisions that were established by this General Assembly on other violations, whereby everyone loses their drivers license. We're losing

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the drivers license is a hammer for everything. That is ridiculous. Give those young people the opportunity to work, to do after school things or in fact what happens if an individual is married in high school? We take away their drivers privileges because they're not in school when in fact they have to be somewhere else to earn a living. I think this is a very bad hammer to once again use on the young people of this state and I stand..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Leitch, one minute to explain your vote."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there anyone here who seriously thinks that these young people will not drive anyway? A young person who is having trouble in school or a drop out has enough problems without losing their license and then inevitably driving and then inevitably running a file in the criminal justice system and just adding and adding more and more problems. Representative Mautino is exactly right. This may be a very well intendioned Bill but it practically is a very bad idea and is going to create far more problems than it solves. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Hasara one minute to explain your vote."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge a few more 'yes' votes up there. I think we're forgetting exactly what this is about. This is to stop kids from dropping out. Will there be some kids who drop out and drive anyway? Certainly. But I am convinced that it will keep some kids in school and that's what this is about. The drivers license is simply the means. For years, we have tried to address this problem nothing has ever passed. We sit here year after year, no one else comes up with another solution or anything better than this. Let's do it this year and get it out."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Barger, one minute to explain
 your vote."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know as a parental responsibility this is a good idea. If I have kids doing what they don't want to I lay down the law to them and tell them what to do. But, as a government in position on them this is the same as the police coming to a troubled child a troubled teenager, and this is the time in their life when they have the most mental problems. Come to them and say, you've got to do it my way or I'm going to abuse you. This is not good, this Bill should be defeated and I'd like to see a lot of those green votes up there disappear. Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Lang, one minute to explain
 your vote."

Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everyone on this floor wants to do something about the drop out rate. If we want to do something about the drop out rate, let's do it in a reasonable way that makes some sense. Let's have more early childhood education to teach kids why it's important to be in school. Let's have parental education so that they know why it's important that their kids stay in school. But this type of approach where the punishment has nothing to do with the crime is nonsense. Let's do something reasonable and let's put more red votes up on the board."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative...have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 54 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 15 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1512 having failed received required the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lossed. Representative Keane, on the Order of State and Local Government, Senate Bill 2171. Mr.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2171, a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Ropp on Amendment #1."

Ropp: "Withdraw, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Keane, Amendment #2."

"Amendment #2, there are Amendment number...there Bill, a similar Bill that we passed out of the House earlier in the Senate. The basic Bill deals with the radiation protection credited...accreditation standards. The Amendment #2 which we have before us now is not the final agreed radiation credit standard. What my intention is to do is to send the Bill to the Senate. In the event that the...there are further negotiations and further agreements then the Bill will be changed. This part of the Bill will be changed and you'll be seeing it again. now all this is is one stage and it may or may not be the final stage of the agreement worked out between the Medical Society and the Department. If it is, fine. There's an indication that it may not be the final agreement and if that's the case then we will be coming back on a Conference Committee. I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, is it your intent to use this Bill as a vehicle to change the low level standards or the low level classification of waste?"

Keane: "Oh no, no, no. This just deals with qualifications for people who take x-rays. It deals with x-ray technicians and their qualifications. And I, you know..."

Weaver: "No intention at all in terms of classifications towards waste?"

Keane: "No."

Weaver: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Olson, M.: "Jim, is this Amendment designed to be in addition to or counterproductive of House Bill 3506 which deals with this radiation protection sunset? Are you familiar with 3506?"

Keane: "As it's amended in the Senate right now?"

Olson, M.: "Yes."

Keane: "No. What this...this is the Bill that Senator Dunn had.

He picked up my Bill that went over there. The Department and the Medical Society are working together. We had this amended draft...Amendment drafted. It was something. If there is not agreement between the two parties then it will not become...I've talked to Representative Dunn already. They're working on an agreed Amendment. We'll put the Agreed Amendment on and that will be the Bill. And that will be part of the Bill...this part of the Bill."

Olson, M.: "Alright. But the fact is, there's an administration Bill in the Senate now. House Bill 3506."

Keane: "I don't know if that administration Bill has satisfied

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the desires of the Medical Society."

Olson, M.: "Thanks very much."

Keane: "What I'm going to do Myron is go only with an Agreed
Bill."

Olson, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments? Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Ropp on Amendment #3."

Ropp: "Thanks you, Mr. Speaker. This in essence is House Bill 2903 that passed out of here 110 'yes' votes and I welcome your support."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes. I'd just like an explanation of Amendment #3 other than there was another Bill."

Ropp: "It's the state soil."

McNamara: "And what is the name of this state soil?"

Ropp: "Drummer silly clay loam."

McNamara: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Keane asks

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- leave. No, I'm sorry. The Bill was on Second Reading. The Bill's on Third Reading. Representative Keane. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2171, a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you've heard in my discussion of Amendment #2 and you've heard 3 the Bill represents something that you may be seeing again. Especially as regards Amendment #2. If we have to work out the agreement between the Medical Society and the Department if the Bill does not have an agreed Amendment on #2 then I just won't call the Bill when it comes back. And I'd ask for an 'aye' yote."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Bill 2171. On that is there any discussion? being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2171 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lang wishes to vote 'aye'. Mr. Clerk. please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present' Bill 2171 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Environment, Third Reading, Representative Currie. 2253. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2253, a Bill for an Act to amend the Toxic Pollution Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill has three distinct provisions. One is an Amendment to the Toxic Polution PreventioPrevention Act adding some

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

additional program requirements. Secondly, a second section in the Bill requires the owners and operators of landfills, incinerators and transfer stations to report to the Environmental Protection Agency on the origin and the amount of wastes received and finally, the Bill requires strong recycling and waste reduction programs both through Central Management Services in state government and in the state university system. I'm aware of no opposition and I would appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Ladies moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2253. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Currie I didn't hear all your explanation. I just, one question. Is there anything on this Bill dealing with stream protection or wetlands?"

Currie: "No."

Kulas: "Thank you."

Any further discussion? No. Any further discussion on the Bill? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2253 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 2253 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Leverenz, are you prepared for the Order of Concurrence?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Pardon me. Now?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative, did you not get the script?

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

You're jumping on my lines."

Speaker Cullerton: "Sorry."

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Now. On the Order of Concurrence..."

Leverenz: "Well, I gotta put my coat on because the Republican photographer is coming up the aisle and might catch me..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. We'll give you a moment to put your coat on."

Leverenz: "...out of uniform. Proceed."

Speaker Cullerton: "Thank you. On the Order of Concurrence,

State Budget, appears House Bill 3001, Representative
Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Representative Ryder, do we want to concur on these Senate Amendments to House Bill 3001?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Ryder?"

Ryder: "Yes we do. Indeed. We do, now."

Leverenz: "Could I just move to concur with all Senate

Amendments? All House Bills?"

Ryder: "Not quite. One or two klinkers."

Leverenz: "I would move that the House concur with Senate
Amendment #1 which deletes nothing and restores \$67
thousand dollars in General Revenues Funds. Move for the
final passage."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Amendments #1 to House Bill 3001. Any discussion? The Gentleman's Motion is to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2. Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3001?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

'present'. And the House does concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3001. And this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We have Representative Leverenz, one interruption. Representative Weller has a Bill we want to take up before we go back to concurrence. Representative Weller on Senate Bill 1874. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1874, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."
 Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller."
- Weller: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to bring Senate
 Bill 1874 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an
 Amendment."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman asks leave to take the Bill back to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk please..."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Regan."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Regan on Amendment #5."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Amendment #5 is a Bill that was in the Senate 2194 that passed out 53 to 2. That wrapped up with little problems. It simply is a substance abuse treatment program for prisoners. A pilot project to be instituted in the Illinois Department of Corrections in effect to assist inmates in their rehabilitation from illicit drug and alcohol abuse. It lays out some pattern lines what to do. The program should include 30 day treatment program. Highly structured activities. Healthy living skills and a peer counselor shall active in providing support and assistance to inmates participating in the program. It's particularly important because of the peer area I believe. Inmates who have successfully completed all the assignments

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

within the program will be considered graduates and receive a certificate of achievement award and the Department itself of Corrections shall have the authority to promulgate such rules and regulations as the director deems necessary to carry out for the purposes of this act. I think this is certainly something that we want. When the criminals come out of jail we certainly would like to see them off the drug habit, off the alcoholism and back in the society. I urge its passage."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1874. On that is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Weller?"

Weller: "Mr. Speaker, I ask if the House..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1874, a Bill for an Act in relation to sentencing and substance abuse treatment. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1874 is simply legislation which passed the Senate 53 to zero. It allows counties and the major part of the Bill allows counties, the discretionary authority to recover the cost for mandatory drug testing, electronic monitoring of prisoners. According to the language of the Bill the county board with the concurrence of the chief judge of the judicial circuit in which the county is located may establish reasonable fees to recover

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

those costs. Amendment #4 gives the Director of the Department of Corrections the discretionary authority that he shall, when reasonably able, require convicted persons reimburse the department for the costs of theirimprisonment and last was Amendment number five which Representative Regan just added to the Bill which simply establishes a one year pilot project for rehabilitation for inmates. ask your support. Legislation is initiated by the Metro County Council and it is also supported by the Urban County Council, affects all counties equally. I know of no known opposition. I ask for your support."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1874. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1874 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. And this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1874 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Kubik? Senate Bill 2190. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Motions filed with respect to Amendment
#1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kubik on Amendment #2."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 simply strips the Bill and makes it a shell Bill. This particular Bill is a citizen's council on Public Aid Bill. We're undergoing some negotiations we haven't completed those negotiations. What we'd like to do is send it to the Senate, create a conference and work out the differences between the two sides. So, I...all the parties have agreed that we ought take this Bill to conference and I would appreciate your support on this Amendment."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion? There being none, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Kubik? On Senate Bill 2190. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I indicated, this particular Bill is now a shell Bill. We'd like to send it over to the Senate and work out the differences and come back with an agreed Bill. I appreciate your support."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman's moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2190. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall Senate Bill 2190 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open, this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 2190 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie on Senate Bill 2127. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2127, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Public Health and Safety Code. This Bill's been
read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Committee."

Speaker Cullerton: "Are there any Motions? Is this on Third Reading or Second reading, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading."

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry. The Bill's on Third Reading. So you wish to bring it back to Second? No, you wish to have the Bill heard on Third. So, has it been read on Third Reading?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2127, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Health and Safety Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill as it came to us was a shell Bill. It now contains the emergency bypass procedures for Hospitals that were developed by the Department of Public Health in connection with local government paramedic and ambulance services and with the institutions that are involved in the emergency medical service program. So I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support. The Bill is identical to House Bill 3317 which passed this chamber a

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

few weeks ago."

- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2127. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2127 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 2127 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Breslin? I believe you have a Motion on Senate Bill 2001? Mr. Clerk, it's Senate Bill 2001."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2001, a Bill for an Act in relation to recyclable and degradable products. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 have been adopted previously."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Breslin,"
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would like to make a Motion to extend the deadline on this Bill until November 30th, 1990."
- Speaker Cullerton: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. On that is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the Lady moves that we extend the deadline on Senate Bill 2001. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Representative Breslin? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Motion to extend the deadline on Senate Bill 2001 prevails. And is adopted. Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "On the Order of State Government Administration, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1496.

133rd Legislative Day

- June 21, 1990
- Representative Cullerton is recognized for a Motion on this Bill. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, on Senate Bill 1496, I would move to extend the Third Reading deadline to June 30th, 1990."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, I rise in opposition. This is the same Motion we defeated about an hour ago. This would take \$500,000 dollars from the large fair fund and make it available for Cook County. I rise in opposition to the extension."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House extend the deadline on Senate Bill 1496 until June 30th, 1990?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Representative...record Representative Mautino as voting 'no' please. Representative Piel, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Piel: "We defeated this before Madam Speaker. And if it reach, should see he required number I'll ask for a verification."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Please only punch your own switches. Sixty votes are required. Representative Olson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Olson, B. "I would, I would like to echo the words of Representative Hicks when we debated this a few moments ago, a few minutes ago. He said, and I repeat, all of you legislators from downstate counties who have county fairs in your district think about talking to, you ought to get in contact, you will be hearing from the Chairman of your County Fair Board. I urge you to vote 'no' on this."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye' 53 voting 'no' none voting 'present'. Representative Piel has

133rd Legislative Day June 21, 1990 asked for a verification. Poll the affirmative, Mr. Clerk.

Poll the affirmative please. Representative Currie asks

leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed sir."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Barnes. Bowman. Buqielski. Capparelli. Cullerton. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Homer. Giglio. Giorgi. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Kirkland. Krska. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. Keane. LeFlore. Lev..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Jones asks leave to be verified. And Representative Bugielski asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Parke. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Saltsman. Santiago. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. Wennlund. White. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. Zickus and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the affirmative Mr. Piel?
 Representative Younge asks leave to be verified. Wyvetter
 Younge. Leave is granted. Record Representative Breslin
 as voting 'aye' Mr. Clerk. Representative Piel, do you
 have any questions of the affirmative?"
- Piel: "Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Monique Davis. Representative Davis. The Lady is not in the chamber. Remove her from the Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez? Representative Ben Martinez is in the chamber."

133rd Legislative Day June 21, 1990

Piel: "Representative Anthony Young?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young, Anthony Young?"

Piel: "I see him."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay."

Piel: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin? Ellis Levin? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him."

Piel: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Morrow? Charles Morrow?"

Piel: "He's right here. I see him. Representative Giorgi?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi? Zeke Giorgi? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Piel: "Representative White?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White? Jesse White? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Piel: "Representative Sutker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Sutker is in the chamber.

Representative Giorgi has returned to the Chamber add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Piel: "What did you say about Sutker?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Piel: "Okay. I'm sorry. Representative Krska?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Williamson, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Williamson."

Williamson: "Would you change my vote from 'no' to 'aye' please."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative Williamson as 'aye'. Any further questions, Mr. Piel?"

Piel: "Representative Ronan?"

Piel: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw? Bill Shaw? Is in the chamber."

Piel: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Laurino is in the chamber."

Piel: "I see him. Representative Steczo?"

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

Piel: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne? Mr. Van Duyne is in the chamber. Representative Levin has returned. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Representative Ronan, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ronan: "Verification."

Speaker Breslin: "You've already been verified sir."

Piel: "I'm sorry Madam Speaker. What did you say about Van Duyne?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne? Mr. Van Duyne? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

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

Piel: "Representative Woolard?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Woolard is in the chamber.

Representative Monique Davis has returned to the chamber.

Add her to the Roll Call voting 'aye'.

Piel: "Representative Kulas?"

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

Piel: "I see him. Representative Zickus?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Zickus? Representative Zickus?

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Ann Zickus. The Lady is not in the chamber.

Remove her from the Roll Call."

Piel: "Representative LeFlore?"

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

Piel: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Breslin: "Ralph Capparelli? Representative Capparelli's in the chamber."

Piel: "Lou Jones?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lou Jones? The Lady had leave to be verified, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Representative Brunsvold?"

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

Piel: "Representative Bugielski? Oh, he's there. I'm sorry. I
see him. Representative Deleo?"

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Zickus has returned to the chamber. Add her to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Piel: "Representative DeLeo?"

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

Piel: "No further questions Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 52
voting 'no' and the Motion is adopted. This Bill's
deadline will be extended until June 30th. The next Bill
is Senate Bill 1641, Representative Wennlund. Clerk, read
the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment would require continuing education for county auditors. The Bill and the Amendment apply only in downstate counties. This has been requested by your auditors. This, as a Bill, passed the House previously and was held in Senate Rules for matters unrelated to the merits. I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1641. 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 O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill, the underlying Bill is requested by the Illinois Association of Auditors. And what it does is it allows auditors to audit those vendors who have furnished the county with services and to audit the underlying Bills in addition to the Amendment that Representative McCracken put on. I move for its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of...has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1641. On that question the Gentleman from Coles Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, as amended this Bill requires training of county auditors at the expense of the county.

Is that correct?"

Wennlund: "Representative, I haven't confirmed with Representative McCracken yet but will you nod your head

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Representative McCracken? Yes it does."

Weaver: "So it is a mandated training requirement that the cost must be incurred by the county? Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1641 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'aye' 22 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order is the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. Read the Bills Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Debt Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Bill on the Consent Calendar be passed?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? This is only one Bill. The other Bill has been taken off the Consent Calendar. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Bills knocked off the Consent Calendar appears Senate Bill 2067, Representative Saltsman. Mr. Saltsman? Your Bill is up next. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. This Bill now appears on Second Reading.

Amendments #1, 2 and 3 ha've been adopted."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments?"

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Read the Bill on Third Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf. Excuse me, Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman. What this Bill does, it changes the date and the deadlines for taxing from financing districts that were established before 1981. It only affects a few communities in the State of Illinois and some of the older districts that had some bad economic programs in the '80's and they're just trying to get started now and it extends their deadline."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2067. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2067 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. 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 114 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen we'd like to go to the Order Appropriations. Representative Leverenz and Ryder, Stephens and Bowman. We hope that you will come Floor and be prepared to do appropriations. Yes, we intend to...this is our last Order of Business, are Concurrences on Appropriations. So if those Gentlemen would come to the floor we would be ready to go to our last Order of Business. Thank you, Representative Leverenz. Now, Representative Ryder is here also. The next Bill on the Order of Concurrences, State Budget, appears Senate

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Bill 3143. Representative Matijevich. Clerk read the Bill. That's right. We don't even have to read Concurrences so just present the Bill Representative Matijevich."

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

 The Senate made further cuts in the Appropriation Bill for the courts in the State of Illinois where it is now \$8 million dollars less than the introduced level. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3143."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. there any discussion? There being none, the question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3143?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open This is final action. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. this question there are 116 voting 'aye', 1 On This Bill having received the Constitutional voting 'no'. Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3171, Representative Madigan, Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, this is House Bill 3171. The last one was House Bill 3143. Representative Leverenz is recognized on his Motion."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and the budget then would be \$61,325,700. I move the House concur in Senate Bill #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3171. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3171?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3231, Representative Keane. Clerk..."

- Reane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move concurrence with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3231. I ask for a favorable
 Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3231. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3231?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3264, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. I would move that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 on 3264."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3264. On that question, the

 Gentleman from Morgan Representative Ryder."

Leverenz: "Vehicle Bill."

- Ryder: "The Gentleman stole my words. It is indeed a Democratic vehicle Bill. I would advise Republicans not to...vote to nonconcur."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 3264?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting...excuse me. That's...there is a disagreement. We could do this on a voice vote but we will take a record vote. All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3264. House Bill 3271, Representative Bowman. Mr. Bowman. Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 3271. A Democratic vehicle. Do what you got to do. Ask that you'd be with us."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman...you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I would ask Republicans to vote 'no'."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3271?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3271. House Bill 3338, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3338."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3338?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. 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 lll voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 3339, Mr. Stephens. Representative Stephens? You have all the next four or five Bills, Sir."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Stephens: "I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 3339."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3339?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3340, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I move to concur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 3340."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman...you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3340?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 114 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3341, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I move to concur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 3341."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3341?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3342, Representative Stephens."

- Stephens: "I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3342."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3342?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting This Bill having received the Constitutional 'ave'. Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3343. Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate

 Amendments to House Bill 3343."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3343?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110...111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3344, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Ryder says
 we are doing okay. I move to concur in Senate Amendments
 #1 and 2 to House Bill 3344."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 3344?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3392, Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2. Senate Amendment 2 corrects a staff calculation error in the Senate Staff not the House. We're always right. And Senate Amendment #1 eliminated \$262,600 in general revenue and I move for the concurrence with Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 3392."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3392. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in these Amendments to this Bill?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed voted 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action on House Bill 3392. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? 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 declared passed. House Bill 3393, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment and ask for your support and Representative Ryder wants to make his speech known as #1 and with leave of the Body to revise and extend his remarks in the Congressional Record."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is that adequate Representative Ryder?"
- Ryder: "It's as accurate as the Representative normally is on

- June 21, 1990
- appropriation matters which is close enough for government work. I would indicate it's a Democratic vehicle Bill and ask Republicans to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3393?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3393. House Bill 3453, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I move the House...concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3453."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3453?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty 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'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3457, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask that we concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3457, Capital Development Board."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3457?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Representative Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition? Turn off Representative Harris light please. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question

- June 21, 1990
- there are 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3458, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you Madam Speaker. I would move nonconcur in Senate Amendments 3458."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment 1 to House Bill 3458. Is this a Republican vehicle Bill?"
- Ryder: "I wish it were but I doubt that it is."
- Speaker Breslin: "On this question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "We like it and we're gonna to vote with him so that we can adjust the numbers."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3458?' All those in favor say 'aye' opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the 'nos' have it rather...no. The 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3458. House Bill 3459, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This...on this Bill I would move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to House Bill 3459."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3459. On the question is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments to this Bill?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 voting 'aye'. Representative Brunsvold votes 'aye'. There are 106 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no'. This

- June 21, 1990
- Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3459, Representative Ryder. 3459. I'm sorry, 3460, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the House nonconcur with the Senate Amendment. They know not what they do.

 And I would ask that you join with your...signifying by 'aye'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3460. On the question is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3460?' All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3460. House Bill 3461, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3461, which is the Department of Transportation."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3461?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3462, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On this Bill we would move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment 1 to House Bill 3462. Is there any discussion?

 There being none the question is, 'Shall the House

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- nonconcur in the Senate Amendment to this Bill?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3462. House Bill 3463, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I would advise the Members of the House that it will be my position to concur with Senate Amendments for the for Historic Preservation and for approximately the next dozen Bills so I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3463."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "We would, if you want to take them in a group you can take 3463 up to 3549 and simply read the Bills and concur in all Senate Amendments to them. Representative, that will help us with about 45 minutes."
- Ryder: "Representative, I would be glad to do that if it's acceptable to the Chair and it's mechanically possible through the Clerk."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich wishes to address that Motion."
- Matijevich: "I'll go along with that all the way but not including 3549. I want to speak briefly to the Commerce Commission."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentleman the Gentleman's Motion with agreement on both sides of the aisle is that we take a Roll Call on several Bills at one time. House Bill 3463, 3464, 3465, 3466, 3467, 3472, 3473, 3474, 3534, 3535, 3537, 3538, 3539, 3540, 3541, 3543, 3544, 3545, 3546 and 3547. All on one Roll Call. And 3548. All on one roll call. The board will not reflect the numbers. They're doing from 3463 to 3548 on our Calendar that has been distributed with

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

the Special Order of Call. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Madam Speaker, we have examined the list once again and we are in agreement with that which I had proposed and had agreed to with the other side with the exception that we would ask that House Bill 3539, the Illinois Sports Facility Authority, be removed from that list and we would vote on that one independently. With leave of the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "What's the number sir?"

Ryder: "3539, Illinois Sports Facility Authority."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. You have one and I understand the Democrats have another one."

Ryder: "That's fair. We'll match them one for one. And their selection is?"

Speaker Breslin: "Their selection is 3541, the appropriation for the Department of Corrections."

Ryder: "I'll trade my one for your one."

Speaker Breslin: "Is that agreeable with the Assembly? If we take out those two Bills 3539 and 3541? Hearing no objection, that is agreeable. I'll read through the Bills one more time. We're going to do one Roll Call and you will vote 'yes' or 'no' on all of them at one time. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments to the following Bills: House Bill 3463, 3464, 3465, 3466, 3467, 3472, 3473, 3474, 3534, 3535, 3537, 3538, 3540, 3543, 3544, 3545, 3546, 3547 and 3548?' On that question, Representative Dunn, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Madam Speaker, I was off the floor, just came in.

Couldn't write the Bills down as fast as you read them.

Are these all appropriation Bills?"

Speaker Breslin: "They are all Appropriations Bills. They are on your Calendar. Your Special Calendar for Special Orders of Business. They start at House Bill 3463, go down to

- June 21, 1990
- include 3548 but excludes two Bills. House Bill 3539, the appropriation for the Sports Facility Authority and the appropriation for the Department of Corrections, 3531."
- Dunn: "And let's get this straight. We're going to vote on all ll of these without time for the Members to A) see the Senate Amendments, B)see a synopsis of them, C) see an analysis of them and D) reflect upon the Bills. If that's the case I object to the procedure and ask the Bills be called individually with time to..."
- Speaker Breslin: "You are within your rights Representative Dunn.

 The Gentleman objects."
- Dunn: "Be willing to withdraw my request if there is...what we usually have done here, when we're going to call the Bills on a Roll Call is to put out some kind of summary, some kind of synopsis so we have some means to take a look at these Bills. A lot of us are not on Appropriations Committees. We haven't seen these Bills. Don't know what's in them and it's not proper to vote for them at this time. If you want to do it in an hour and put out some kind of synopsis fine, otherwise I object."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you persist in your objection Representative
 Dunn? Do you persist in your objection? The Gentleman
 persists in his objection. The Bill is House Bill 3463.
 Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with House Bill 3463. It's for the Department of Historic Preservation. To concur with Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3463?' On that question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Yes. The Historic Preservation Agency, what was their, what will be their fiscal '90 expenditure and with the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Senate Amendments how many dollars, or what percentage or both does this agency budget deviate from last year?"

Ryder: "This agency has been reduced by \$313 thousand from the amount that was introduced, it passed the House..."

Dunn: "No, not from introduced..."

Ryder: "As it passed the House it was \$16,561,700 dollars as it passed the Senate it was \$16,517,000, a reduction of 44,000, Representative."

Dunn: "You haven't answered my question. What is the change from fiscal '90 expenditures?"

Ryder: "It's part of the 3 percent reduction."

Dunn: "From fiscal '90 expenditures or from fiscal '90 introduction."

Ryder: "No. It was three percent as introduced from the amount as introduced."

Dunn: "That's what I thought you were saying. But introduction has nothing to do with fiscal '90 expenditures. What is the difference between the level of this budget now in dollars and the fiscal '90 expenditures?"

Ryder: "Representative, I..."

Dunn: "Up or down or even?"

Ryder: "Representative the fiscal year' 90 estimated expenditure was \$11 \$11,337,000 as introduced. This was \$16,830..."

Dunn: "I don't want to know what was introduced. What is the difference now between what this fiscal '90 estimated expenditures are and the level of this Bill now?"

Ryder: "It is, it is approximately \$5,400,000 more than the fiscal year 90 expenditure."

Dunn: "So, this agency is up a little over \$5 million from the fiscal '90 expenditures. Is that correct? It's hard to hear here. Is that correct? It's up a little over 5 million over fiscal '90 estimated expenditures. Is that correct? I had trouble hearing."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Ryder: "Representative, we're attempting to, our analysis doesn't show that comparison. So we're attempting to do this mathematically. If you'll give us just a moment please."
- Dunn: "Incidentally, I'll have the same question on each of these Bills."
- Ryder: "Alright. Then I would strongly suggest that you order dinner."

Dunn: "Fine."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens, for what reason do you
 seek recognition?"
- Stephens: "Well Madam Speaker. We have a Democrat Staff analysis comparing the fiscal '90 expenditures with the current state of the Bills. Now it's a mathematical calculation each time, it's a little difficult because we have to subtract the Senate Amendment and then do the math for the Gentleman. Now, we can go through that and we can be here well into the evening. But I suggest that maybe we just have our staff walk over there, show him in black and white what the expenditure was and we can move on with the business of the House."
- Speaker Breslin: "I would advise, or ask that you make a copy of that and give it to Representative Dunn. I'm sure he would appreciate having it. Representative Leverenz, for what reason..."
- Dunn: "It's nice that he has a Democratic Staff analysis. I don't have one."
- Speaker Breslin: "We were all given them Representative Dunn during the Caucus. And we spent an hour on those so they'll make a copy of it and get it to you. Representative Leverenz on the question."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The printout that

 Representative Stephens and I perhaps are both sending to

 Representative Dunn was distributed in the Democratic

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Caucus yesterday. Those in attendance received it. The question however was total expenditure of FY90 as compared to the budget as it is right this minute. Expenditures were \$11,337,100 and currently we are at..."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment..."
- Leverenz: "Let me just answer his question. \$16,517,000 total.

 And the print out reflects general revenue which is our most critical area. Though we rise in support of the Republican Motion. With the exception of one on this side."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3463?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3464, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with the Senate Amendments on 3464, which is the Department of Mines and Minerals."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Madam Speaker. I have the same question I had on the last
 Bill. What is the amount of fiscal '90 estimated
 expenditures and how much is that more or less or the same
 than the level of the Bill now?"

Ryder: "We believe that it is approximately \$800 thousand more than last year's expenditure."

Dunn: "It's up about \$800 thousand?"

Ryder: "Correct."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz on the question."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will have our, I would bring my own appropriation books down to Representative Dunn. He simply has to flip to the actual Bill number and look at the first blue sheet on each of the Bills and he will be able to answer the questions on FY 90 expenditures. And I will give him the figures or Representative Ryder will tell him how much is in the Bill and he'll be able to answer the questions that he has."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3464?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Representative Shirley Jones, for reason do you seek recognition? The lady indicates she does not wish to speak. Have all voted who wish? Clerk till take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3465, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3465, the Illinois Racing Board. to the question of the And in answer Gentleman we believe that the appropriation million more than the amount expended in approximately \$3 the current fiscal year."

Speaker Breslin: "This appropriation is \$3 million more than the amount spended last year. Representative Dunn is recognized."

Dunn: "With regard to this budget, I'm told that the fiscal '90 estimated expenditures are \$10,746,000. What is the level of appropriation of this Bill now?"

Ryder: "13f477,900."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Dunn: "So we're increasing the Racing Board in tough times by about \$3 million dollars? Thank you very much. It's a bad Bill and no one should vote for it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3465?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak. One minute to explain your vote."
- Novak: "I don't need to explain my vote. I would just like to ask Representative ve Bugielski to turn around and say hi to everybody on the House floor."
- Speaker Breslin: "A little hard to do that right now. Hey,
 Representative Bugielski! Mr. Clerk, take the record. On
 this question there are 98 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', 4
 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate
 Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 3465 and this Bill having
 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared
 passed. House Bill 3466, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the appropriation for the Department of Insurance. House Bill 3466. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendments to this Bill. I would indicate that as it passed the Senate it appropriated \$14,726,600 dollars which is approximately \$1,500,000 more than the estimated expenditures, \$13,211,000..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed. Excuse me, proceed sir. I cut you off there. What was the end of that?"
- Ryder: "I said that it's 1,500,000 more than the expenditure of \$13,211,900 dollars for fiscal year 90."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you, Mr. Sponsor for the fine explanation. We're trying to tell people that we're cutting 3 percent and one percent and the reason I'm

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

doing this, most of these budget's are up. Whether you believe the Department of Insurance should or should not have an extra million dollars, you should at least know that that is the case. Thank you very much. So vote accordingly. I think we shouldn't vote for another million dollars for the Department of Insurance since money is so tight this year."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3466?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Barger. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1. House Bill 3467, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the appropriation for the office of the Lieutenant Governor I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. The increase from last year is approximately \$4.3 million because of an adjustment for the bonding reserve. And the current amount is \$9,202,300."

Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Yes, there is such as blind pig finding an acorn, when times are tough I think all the Members should know that what I just heard is this. Is that the budget for the Lieutenant Governor is \$9 million dollars plus this year which against \$26 million, billion dollar budget isn't much. However, last year fiscal '90 expenditures were \$4,430. So, all of should know as you vote on this budget when you're going back home and tell everybody how tough

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

you've been to conserve taxpayer dollars that you've doubled the budget for the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois whoever that person is. If you think it's a good idea, vote for this Bill. If you think it's going to be tough to defend on a campaign trail, maybe you oughta think twice about a 'yes' vote on this Bill. It doubles the Lieutenant Governor's budget."

Speaker Breslin: "There being...Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "Perhaps the downstate Members should think three times on this Bill because the increase was the debt reserve for the rural bond bank which was put in this year for the first time with the Lieutenant Governor's budget. And that is the significant increase in the budget. I would encourage all to vote 'yes' in the Motion to concur."

Speaker Breslin: "I've already recognized the Gentleman to close so I'll go and recognize you to explain your vote Representative Mautino and Leverenz. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3467?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Mautino, one minute to explain your vote."

Mautino: "That's fine."

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates that is not necessary. Have all voted who wish? 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 passed since the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3467. House Bill 3472, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the Department of Financial Institutions. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. It is approximately \$1,933,900 over last year's expenditures. The current amount is \$9.636

- June 21, 1990
- million of appropriations which is in excess of \$1.9 in excess of last year's expenditures."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you Mr. Ryder. Another budget up over last year's expenditure over a million dollars. It's a good idea vote for, it if you don't, don't."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3472?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 110 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3472. House Bill 3473, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move that we concur on Senate Amendment #1, the Department of Agriculture. The current expenditure proposed in this Bill is \$59,400,000. The last year'sxpected expenditures is 57,425,000 which is the difference of approximately...approximately \$2 million different from the expenditure."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The analysis which I do have in front of me this time indicates that the estimate expenditures for fiscal '90 are \$56,577,000 and if I understood you correctly that's about a million below the number you gave to me. That's one question. The second question is why, what are we going to buy for the extra 2 or 3 million dollars or 5 million dollars, whatever it is,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

increase in this budget?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Representative, the increases in this budget including, increases in the personal services and the other normal expenses, there are no new programs as part of this increase, nor are there any new initiatives."

Dunn: "There are what? I can't hear you."

Ryder: "Representative, the increases came in the form of personal services. Further they came in the form of related items. For example, utilities. There are no new programs and there are no new initiatives in this budget."

Dunn: "So we've got four or five million dollars in increase of personal services, in this budget is that correct?"

Ryder: "Representative, I believe that the total increase in the entire budget was approximately 2 million dollars."

Dunn: "Okay. Thank you, thank you very much."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just need to ask one question, for the record. Tom, we added in the House, \$1 and a half million dollars GRF for grants for soil and water conservation districts. The Senate Amendment just simply cuts out what they call new cost share grants. For the record, are the soil and water conservation grants still in the budget? Or were they removed by the Senate Amendment?"

Ryder: "It's my understanding they were removed."

Black: "Thank you very much."

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

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify the money for the F and E's are no longer in this budget, isn't that correct?"

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Pardon me?"

Hicks: "The money for the fairs and expositions are no...is no longer in this Budget isn't that correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "Is that correct Representative Ryder?"

Ryder: "Yes, that's correct."

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

Hicks: "Thank you."

Hartke: "I think I can clarify Representative Blacks question. I
think that is in Senate Bill 1802."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3473?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 110 voting 'aye'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3474. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill...that was House Bill 3473...this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3474, Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is the Criminal Justice Information Authority. Fiscal '90 expenditures are approximately \$17,700,000. FY '91 appropriations are \$23,600,000 for a difference being an increase of \$5,900,000."

Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I'm, I'm, you've confused me Mr. Sponsor. Did...I thought you said that the level of the Bill now was about \$17,700,000. Is that correct, roughly?"

Ryder: "I entered it approximately \$17,700,000, that's a rounded

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

figure."

Dunn: "Yeah, and then the estimated expenditures was \$17,724,000?"

Ryder: "Representative, fiscal year '90 estimated expenditures, \$17,700,000. FY '91 appropriation is \$26,600,000."

Dunn: "As the Bill stands now?"

Ryder: "Yes."

Dunn: "And what is the \$6 million dollar difference about?"

Ryder: "Six million dollars is federal fund difference. That's a majority of the federal fund grants. That's the majority of the funds in this line."

Dunn: "Okay. Alright."

Ryder: "Grants, the Criminal Justice Information Authority provides grants to local units of law enforcement including your Sherriff's Department and your..."

Dunn: "Thank you, that's fine."

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

Weaver: "Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Just a brief question. The House Amendments had withdrawn the McGruff funding part of the program. Did the Senate Amendments restore that money or are we gonna be without McGruff this next year?"

Ryder: "I'm sorry, Representative. What did you, the McGruff program, you were inquiring if that was..."

Weaver: "Was that readded by the Senate Amendment or are we gonna live without McGruff next year?"

Ryder: "I am unreliably informed that McGruff had a premature but not permanent demise."

Weaver: "So McGruff has been neutered."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3474?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. 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 107 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed since the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3474. House Bill 3534, Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is Energy and Natural Resources. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Fiscal year '90 expenditures were approximately \$67.7.

 The difference is \$58.4 million. FY '91 appropriation is approximately \$126,100,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "The problem is, I didn't hear the numbers. Could you repeat the numbersnumbers please? I should do that."
- Ryder: "FY '90 expenditures \$67.7 million. FY 91 appropriations, \$126.1 million. The difference is \$58.4 million."
- Dunn: "The first question I have is the analysis supplied to me by my appropriation staff says that the estimated 90 expenditures are \$50 million. Not \$67 million. Do you know why what is?"
- Ryder: "Representative, the figures that I have are those that have been provided by staff. We're doing our best to compile these figures. This is not a calculation that is normally contained in our analysis."

Dunn: "I know but..."

Ryder: "As a result, we're doing our best to try to find those figures. And I would also suggest that we, because it's not necessarily in our analysis, we do not have the opportunity to correspond that number with our Democratic counterparts if there is a discrepancy we'll be glad to attempt to work that through."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Dunn: "Well, I can understand some discrep...I

don't...maybe...did I hear you right? The fiscal '90

estimated expenditures for the Department of E and R are

\$67.7 million?"

Ryder: "That's the figure that I have. Specifically, \$67,755,500."

Dunn: "Okay. Then I'll ask my staff to come down and explain why our analysis says \$50 million. Hopefully, someone will know the answer to that. Secondly..."

Ryder: "Representative, let me explain to you, part of the problem may be as to the exact date in which that item was made because those expenditures are on ISL forms and they may have been made in January, updated in March, updated in June. So unless I know the date and source of yours, I'm unable to do it. But our best estimate at this point is \$67.7 million."

Dunn: "Okay. Okay. If the estimated 90 expenditures that you are using then are as of what date on all these Bills?"

Ryder: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question."

Dunn: "As of what date are you reporting to me 90 expenditures?"

Ryder: "This is the most recent data available from the department which I believe is as of June."

Dunn: "As the first of June?"

Ryder: "I..."

Dunn: "Roughly."

Ryder: "I don't know the exact day of the year but I believe
it's..."

Dunn: "Okay. And what are the, what are the, what is the \$58 million dollar increase for?"

Ryder: "The majority of these funds are laps or reappropriations for ongoing grants through this department. It's not operations. The majority is not operations."

Dunn: "They are grants? Federal money?"

133rd Legislative Day June 21, 1990

Ryder: "Yes. Yes."

Dunn: "Grants from whom?"

Ryder: "Federal and state grants, reappropriations, or continuing appropriations for those grants."

Dunn: "So these were grant monies that were not used in the past I guess. I'm sorry, but this is the first time I'm seeing anything about any of these Bills. I don't know. Okay, thank you very much. Go ahead with the Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "Are you finished, Representative Dunn? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3534?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye'. The House does concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3534 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3535, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the emergency services and disaster agency. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. The expenditures in 19, fiscal year 90 is \$5.9 million. We have appropriated \$41.9 million for a difference of \$36 million. We offer this agency in a large amount of appropriations authority if there are no disasters or emergencies they do not spend it. They are unable to come back to the General Assembly of course to ask for our authority when we have disasters and that's the reason for the increase."

Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "What was the size of the pool on the Senate side in fiscal '90 for...to have on hand in case of a disaster?"

Ryder: "The total amount of the FY '90 appropriation was \$5.9

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

million. Did I misunderstand your question?"

Dunn: "Well, I noticed that and I presume if it's a concern to set aside money for disasters in fiscal 91 there were the same kind of concerns in fiscal '90. And I wonder a year ago how much of a pot of money was set aside for disasters? If the expenditures were \$5 million dollars, looks like there wasn't a pot. And if there was no pot last year, then my question is why are we setting aside a pot this year?"

Ryder: "Representative, give me a moment to check on that.

Representative that reserve is approximately \$36 million dollars. Their normal operations are in the \$5.9 range and that is, that's the reason for the different appropriations."

Dunn: "Is that what the reserve was a year ago?"

Ryder: "Yes."

Dunn: "And so it is about the same this year?"

Ryder: "Right."

Dunn: "Alright, thank you very much."

Ryder: "You're welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3535?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed since the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3535. House Bill 3537, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to the Property Tax Appeal Board. Tony where are you? I would suggest that the appropriation expenditure in fiscal 1990, \$772,500,000 has been increased

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

by \$36,000 to the approriation of \$808,000 for this fiscal year."

- Speaker Breslin: "You're heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman..there is no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3537?' All those in favor vote opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take...the Clerk will take On the question there are 114 voting 'aye'. record. House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3537 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3538, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This Pollution Control Board, fiscal year '90 expenditure was \$1,438,200. Appropriated fiscal year '91 is \$1,620,400. The increase is \$182,200,000 besides the normal increases there is also an increase of 3 personnel on the support staff."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, is there any discussion?' There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3538?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there voting 'aye'. The House does concur 114 in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3538 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3539, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 3539 appropriates \$18 million from the Illinois Sports Facility Fund to the Illinois Sports

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Facility. The Senate Amendment #1 basically removes the 50/50 Amendment and so at this point I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "This is a wonderful piece of legislation for those of you who support the White Sox Stadium."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3539?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Sixty votes are required. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Representative Terzich. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are voting...on this question there...Representative Santiago changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Homer changes his vote from 'aye' Representative Olson changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Churchill you better start lobbying. Representative Trotter votes 'no'. Representative Churchill, one minute to explain your vote."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Whether or not you like the Bill or the White Sox, we have passed that Bill. At this point the bonds have been issued and we do have to pay back those bonds. This is \$18 million dollars that has come into the system that goes from one fund into the fund that pays off the bonds. It has to be done. We can't go back on the people that have purchased the bonds and say 'no, we're not going to pay for the cost of the bonds.' This is a Bill that does have to pass at some point along the line if we're going to pay off the bond holders."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Granberg changes his vote

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Doederlein changes her vote from 'aye' to 'no'. You weren't very convincing Representative Churchill. Would anyone like to help Representative Churchill? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'm confused. Please record me as 'present'."

Speaker Breslin: "Record Repre...Representative Leverenz as
 'present'. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Well, I'll give it a shot. But so far we've been losing more votes than we've been gaining. For those that have changed their votes. For those that are voting 'no' this time, you should understand that the decision to build is done. What we're talking about now is bonded authority State of Illinois. In the event that this doesn't either today, you run a significant problem in attempting to continue the bonding authority of the State of Illinois. I'm not going to tell you that the state is going collapse tomorrow, but I am going to tell you that you do damage to the ability of the state to then maintain its rating. Therefore we are not talking about whether it was or was not a good idea. I suppose what we're talking about is whether the state is supposed to pay its debts. In the event that you believe the state shouldn't be paying its debts then a red vote sounds right. If however, you think that the integrity, the faith and credit in the State of Illinois should be upheld then a green vote is the one you should have. In difference to the two previous speakers, at least I didn't lose any green votes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barger changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, I am convinced that the Gentleman's presentation Representative Ryder, that any other vote other than green would be irresponsible. Therefore, record

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative Leverenz as voting 'aye'. Representative Mautino votes 'aye'. Representative Kirkland votes 'aye'. Representative Young votes 'aye'. Representative Hicks votes 'aye'. That was Mautino, Kirkland, Hicks, and Young. Representative Parke 'aye'. Representative changes...Parke 'aye'. Phelps Phelps changes his vote to 'no'. Representative Breslin votes 'aye'. Representative Curran 'no'. votes Representative McPike, one minute to explain your vote."

McPike: "Well, Representative Leverenz is correct. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. It really is irresponsible of the General Assembly to authorize the construction of any building or any facility and sell the bonds and then not pay for the bonds. I mean, how silly can we get on this floor. No one is asking you to vote for the White Sox Stadium. We're asking you at this point to live up to the commitment of the State of Illinois to pay its debts. It's absolutely absurd not to vote for this. We owe the people that bought the bonds. Now maybe some of these people live in your district. These bonds were sold. They're backed by the State of Illinois. Hopefully a couple of your constituents will call you and say well I'm not getting my payments here."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund votes 'aye'.

Representative McNamara, one minute to explain your vote."

McNamara: "Yes, just just as a question. It was my understanding that this bond issue was backed by the Hotel Motel Tax that was passed in the City of Chicago. And isn't this in large part a transfer of those funds from that bond issue? And I assume that he would say correct, so the right thing to do would be to go along with the transfer of the dedicated funds that were made for this, for this purpose. It is

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

not, to my understanding, anything new or anything else...I understand. It is the agreed way of funding that stadium out of a tax revenue source that was dedicated for that purpose."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Johnson votes 'aye'.

Representative Capparelli votes 'aye'. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3539 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3541, Representative Ryder.

Representative Ryder, 3541."

Ryder: "What happened to 40? Excuse me, Madam Chair. Madam Speaker..."

Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry. House Bill 3540. Representative Ryder's Bill."

Ryder: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed sir."

"Thank you. I apologize for the confusion. I would move Ryder: to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3540 which is the Department of Professional Regulation. would indicate that the estimated expenditures for the fiscal '90 \$18,531,800. year are That FΥ '91 appropriations is \$20,998,900 or a \$2.4 million dollar increase over FY90. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being...the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "A little over a \$2 million dollar increase, Tom?
 Representative Ryder?"

Ryder: "Yes. I'm sorry."

Dunn: "A little over \$2 million is it?"

Ryder: "\$2.4 million."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Ryder: "All of the funds are dedicated funds. There are no GRF

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

funds."

Dunn: "What are they dedicated for then, as long as we're into

Ryder: "The particular professions pay those funds and when they pay licensing, testing and renewals it goes into a dedicated fund for the purpose of operation for those particular agencies...or those particular occupations and for operation of the department. They do not operate on GRF funds."

Dunn: "There are no GRF funds in this budget then. Is that correct?"

Ryder: "That's my understanding, yes."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3540?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This if final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question, there are 111...110 voting 'aye' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3540 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3541, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3541, the Department of Corrections. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year '90 or \$527,987,000. FY '91 appropriations are \$597,522,000, the difference increase is \$69,535,000"

Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Wennlund: "Representative Ryder, the previous year's amount was

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

\$597 million?"

Ryder: "\$527 million."

Wennlund: "\$527 million. So it represents a ..."

Ryder: "This year's amount is \$597 million. It represents a \$69 million increase."

Wennlund: "Is that..."

Ryder: "A little bit more than a 10 percent increase."

Wennlund: "Will this result in lay offs of current Department of Corrections employees?"

Ryder: "No."

Wennlund: "It will not?"

Ryder: "Obviously, you need to ask the director of that. But the appropriations that we are providing in this Bill I am informed and I believe, will not result in those lay offs."

Wennlund: "I have been informed by the Department of Corrections that indeed it will result in lay offs and I think the Members of the General Assembly ought to be aware that there's a ticking time bomb out there and when summer hits and heat gets hot in August with over 26 thousand residents, the Department of Corrections which is more than \$5 thousand dollars, 5 thousand residents over capacity that if there's not enough money to fund correctional officers for the Department of Corrections we're in for a long hot summer. And don't be surprised when the prisons riot this summer because we have a lack of correctional officers and then the safety of correctional officers in our many institutions in Illinois are going to create a serious problem."

Dunn: "Representative, in response to your question, I share the concern that you have about the conditions within our prison facilities. I would suggest to you that there are two elements that you discussed that are appropriate. One it does not contain the Amendment for the immediate hiring

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

on of new employees that was sponsored by the AFSCME organization. And I'm certain that you're sensitive to Additionally, because of the amounts of funds that are provided that we will be phasing in new hires slower than we would have had we appropriated at the Governor's leve. We will not, however, be laying off employees. The seriousness of this situation is certainly shared by all of us, and we understand that, which you say. But to my knowledge and my best belief this will not cause lay offs. It may cause new hires to be slower than you and I would like."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps. Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Ryder: "Yes he will."

Phelps: "Representative Ryder, I know I just heard what you said about no lay offs within this particular budget with the concurrence of these Amendments. But according to Corrections, by this action will it be necessary that, administratively, that they will be forced to do so? Even though it's not written as part of these Amendments will that have that cause and effect?"

Ryder: "Representative, the most recent information that we have, which was updated today, indicates that, that lay offs are not contemplated. We are not, in this budget, underfunding current operations. Although you and I both know, because of the facilities that we care about that current levels may not be adequate, we are, however, funding those levels and increased levels through the FY '91 appropriation. We are not reducing the numbers in FY '91. Does that answer your question sufficiently?"

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Phelps: "Yes it does. Thank you, Sir. Madam Speaker, just to the Amendments and the concurrence. I would just want to go on record and echo Representative Wennlund's concern that was action of this concurrence. We are going to be putting a lot of security officers in jeopardy in high risk situations because it does not address the increase in the inmates that are going in our prisons at the rate they are. This is a irresponsible action although I believe that we should be very sensitive and more accountable in our management of the budget. This is not a department, this is not a livelihood in which we should sacrifice or risk what is at stake. Appreciate your 'no' vote."

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

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "Representative, the Legislature of this Session has dealt with several Bills that attempted to help to correct inmates by educational or vocational programs. At one time there was something like \$12 million dollars taken out of that educational program. Have those funds been restored? And has the efforts to secure monies from the Federal Government through the Pell Grants that not been a part of this program?"

Ryder: "Representative, if I understand your question correctly, you are asking if approximately \$12 million dollars is contained within the budget for vocational education for prison inmates. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "Yea, the question is relative to funding either vocation programs or educational programs. There was an attempt to take part of that out, or a substantial amount."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm delighted to inform you that the school district operations will be expanding in FY '91."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Ropp: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As all of yuhs know we've all been down here long enough to know when you hear the whistle blow you might as well get off the track. seen the engine down here a while ago. So it's close. But want you's to know people, especially on this budget, from Representatives Hicks' district, to Phelps', to Bert Richmond's, to mine, we've all got an absolute minimum of ten, I think Representative Phelps has got as high as percent unemployment in his district. We all have prisons. They're all a powder keg, every one of them is. Instead of cutting any of these budgets we should have been adding more to them. I realize this Bill is going to pass but we're ought to take a hard look at it. Maybe we can go somewhere along the line on a supplemental or something and help this Bill out. I know it's going to come out of here but we should take a closer look at this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Curran: "Representative, we all have the highest regard for your veracity. We're being told that there are no positions being cut and I believe that that is what you must be being told because you wouldn't say it to us. However, is it not true that close to 500 positions are being cut from the House approved level. When that appropriation left the House to where it is now, are we not talking about 500 fewer positions? Let me give you a better number, 494. Which is the number that I am told."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Ryder: "Okay. Representative, you are correct in the fact that we passed an Amendment in the House Committee that would have added some 700 or almost 700 or \$7 million dollars that would have filled vacancies, three month vacancies, that I think correspond with the number that you're talking about that was over and above the Governor's approved level. That Amendment is no longer part of this."

Curran: "Even...Okay."

Ryder: "So the new hires that you discussed are not part of this Bill. There are new hires part of this Bill but they are phased in on a slower rate. That was, I think a well deserved and in my opinion I supported a well determined Amendment but unfortunately when we counted up all the dollars wasn't available."

Curran: "Wouldn't you also be willing to add the word deserve needed and almost crucial to the safety not only of the personnel who work in the Correctional System but also the prisoners or the inmates who are, who live there and try to survive there? Let me...that's a rhetorical question I understand. Let me take it a little bit further. What you're saying to us then is that across board in all the corrections institutions in this state, maximum security institutions as well as minimum security as well as medium security institutions institutions without regard to the difficulty of controlling those prisoners we are taking out 500 positions from what we thought when that Bill left this chamber was a good idea. Was fair and reasonable according to the estimates of what we felt we oughta be doing that time. Thank you."

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

Curran: "I got more."

Ryder: "The answer to the question is as I indicated before, the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Amendment that we placed on the House in Committee, and it did ultimately pass out of the House is no longer part of this Bill."

- Curran: "And so we cut across the board the same cuts for maximum security as we would for a work camp. The same cuts for minimum security as we would for medium security."
- Ryder: "Representative, I appreciate the point that you're making. You're doing a fine job of making it, but we are not cutting jobs that currently exist. I hope understand that. I'm not hearing you to say that terminating money for people who are currently at work. You and I happen to agree that more people are needed. You and I happen to agree that there is a serious situation in prison facilities in the State of Illinois. But I have to ask a rhetorical question to you. That we therefore have take that money from the Department of Children and Family Services or the Department of Public Aid and other places in order to meet the need here. What you see is the best that we can do with the resources that we have now."
- Curran: "Let me suggest to you that we can take it from the cash balance at the end of the year. The \$275 million we ..."
- Ryder: "We are doing that. This plan takes down the cash balance to what has been determined to be the minimum which is \$200 million."
- Curran: "Well, I think we've been considerably below \$200 million since I've been in office. One more point and that is, isn't this a 40 percent cut in purchase of equipment? Equipment such as locks for our prisons. Aren't we cutting purchase of equipment be a whopping 40 percent in the Department of Corrections budget?"
- Ryder: "Representative, I am reliably informed by the ADJUNCT Republican Staffer, the Chairman of the Committee, that the cut is 28 percent."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Curran: "Thank you."

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

Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Motion to concur in the Senate Amendments. because as has been pointed out here on the floor, whether it's \$300 as my analysis would indicate, closer to \$500 Representative Curran's analysis would indicate, concurrence Motion will eliminate security officers from our correctional centers throughout the State of Illinois. The effect of eliminating those positions is to endanger the lives of the guards who will remain on duty throughout this next year. Those folks who will remain on duty are my friends and my neighbors and I cannot in good conscience concur in this Amendment which will endanger their lives." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I too must rise in opposition to the concurrence Motion. Let me just very briefly explain why. I have a correctional center in my district that opened in 1985 and was designed to hold 896 It currently holds 1320. Now I admit with a inmates. degree of bias, I think the people who work there are some of the finest in the system, in fact the finest in the system and I think they run the finest correctional center the system. However, they are doing so today 33 correctional officers short. 33 short today. talking about a maintenance budget, we're not talking about lay offs. We're already 33 short and concurrence in this Amendment simply exacerbates a problem that is out of I can't in good conscience vote for the control.

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

concurrence Motion."

133rd Legislative Day

Dunn:

June 21, 1990

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Maybe there is some boop it comes to things like this. But let's see what we're doing here today. Just in the last few minutes we said that we should put aside a pot of money in the Energy and Natural Resources Agency budget, in case we have a physical or natural disaster. And that's probably a smart thing to do. With this budget however, we are saying phase in some new employees but we will not provide enough employees and so we will do nothing essentially to provide for what happens in case the tinder box explodes and our prison system in the State of Illinois. course also, even though this budget is underfunded it is up about \$69 million dollars and if you back off and think a minute that's about what it costs for road diversions and the raid of the teachers' retirement system. It's at times like this that maybe we could back off and think about our overall policy in the State of Illinois. Are we doing right thing when we incarcerate people rather than educate them, and if we were educating them rather than incarcerating them we would be doing more and more what the taxpayers want us to do. This is a glaring example of what we do when we use smoke in mirrors. The previous speakers have clearly indicated there are not enough provided in this budget to do the job to confine the people that we have locked up with our criminal laws we've enacted in recent years. And we need more prisons yet. So, I wish you would vote 'no' on this budget."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3541?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing, one minute to explain your vote."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the is certainly a very serious matter we have before us and all of us who have correctional institutions in our communities and I think I represent one that's got one of the toughest correctional institutions in Pontiac, are very concerned about the funds that are available for personnel. I am disturbed by the talk of reduced personnel in any our prisons and in particularly those in Pontiac. But I do believe that there are ways that this legislature at a later date in the year can address this problem if necessary. There are abilities for the director transfer, line items to put cash in personnel. I think we. probably have to accept this concurrence today and are going to do it. But, my pledge to my constituents and to this Body that I'm going to work to be sure that there is always sufficient funds for the personnel needed to man our prisons and I vote 'yes'.

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'aye' 34 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3541 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Senate Bill 3543, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1, this the Law Enforcment Training Board. They expended approximately \$8.8 million in 1990, fiscal year 1990. Appropriation is \$10,560,000 for fiscal year 91, a \$1.3 million increase."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3543. Is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House concur in this Senate Amendment to House Bill 3543?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required.

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Representative Mautino, do you wish to explain your vote? He indicates he does not wish to speak. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3543 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3544 Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3544, the
 Department of Revenue. I move that we concur with Senate
 Amendment 1. My calculations indicate appropriation in FY
 '91 of \$513,500,000. Approximate expenditures fiscal year
 '90 \$361,400,000 for an increase of \$152,100,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Yeah. The expenditures are up quite a bit on this budget.

 I didn't hear how much. Could you repeat that please?"
- Ryder: "It's a \$152,100,000 which is a redistribution from Sales Tax Reform. The we passed recently, that's as I said a redistribution."
- Dunn: "And if there is a way to compare apples and apples do we know what we would visualize as general revenue expenditures? Are they going to be next year compared to what they are this year?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being...Rep...the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver. Excuse me, are you not finished Representative Ryder?"
- Ryder: "I got it. GRF is approximately \$21 million. Twenty
 million of which is GR...or is circuit breaker."
- Dunn: "So, GRF is \$21 million and 20 million of it is circuit breaker? Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The House Amendments had removed or reduced down to a dollar the office of the Ombudsman. Did the Senate Amendment restore that money?

Do we now as the budget stands have an Ombudsman in the department or not?"

Ryder: "No."

Weaver: "No?"

Ryder: "No, I'm sorry. Doctor Bob currently may have a position but currently he doesn't have any money."

Weaver: "So he's gone with McGruff."

Ryder: "I think you indicated that McGruff had been neutered and I'd hate to say that about Doctor Bob. However, I would indicate to you that he has requested a meeting with the Conference Committee for his future plans."

Weaver: "Do we have any budgets that have cats in them? As long as we're taking care of people and dogs..."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm sure if we looked long enough we can find almost anything."

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

Leverenz: "Yes. Representative Ryder and Weaver, I would hope that Representative Weaver could just walk over and ask his questions because Representative Mulcahey says he could have been past Bloomington already."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3544?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3544. This Bill having received the Constitutional

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Amendment has...the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3545, Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Thank you. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments on this Bill for the Arts Counsel. We show expenditures in FY '90 of \$11,300,000. FY '91 is \$10,600,000. That is a decrease, repeat a decrease of \$1 million and 3."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3545?' Representative Dunn, did you wish to speak to this?"
- Dunn: "Yes. It's a shame that we have cut this agency."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3545?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3545 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 35...3546. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the Educational Labor Relations Board expenditures in FY '90 were \$1.2 million dollars. Appropriation in FY '91 is \$1.3 million an increase of \$60.600."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3546?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 113 voting 'aye'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

to House Bill 3546 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3547, Representative Daniels or Ryder. Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Thank you for this Judiciary Required Board I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. FY '90 approp. \$360,800, FY '90 expenditures \$350,100. Increase of \$10,700."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3547?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record? On this question there are 116 voting 'aye'. The House does concur om Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3547 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3548, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Liquor Control Commission, I
 move to concur in Senate Amendments FY '91 approp.
 \$1,598,200. FY '90 expenditures \$1,424,000. Increase is
 \$174, 200 dollars none of which is GRF."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3548?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3548 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House

133rd Legislative Day

Matijevich."

June 21, 1990

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 for the Illinois Commerce Commission. 91 appropr. \$24,783,300. FΥ '90 expenditures, \$22,150,400. A 2,069,500 increase. None of which is GRF." Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question. Gentleman the from Lake Representative

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 'no' vote on this Bill, House Bill 3549, is a registration of my protest against the Illinois Commerce Commission for dragging its feet in adopting a court ordered refund to Commonwealth Edison customers. It is not only dragging its feet with regards to the refund. are indications that it will shortchange the rate payers at least \$50 million dollars in refunds and \$30 million dollars in rate cuts. The illegal rate increase which Supreme Court ruled on its illegality was a six percent rate increase. The anticipated cuts in refunds amount And they delayed their vote on that on that 4.8 percent. refund until June 26th. Oddly the reports, that's the same day that we're going to adjourn. The Illinois Commerce Commission likes to do things when we're not around and, or we don't have time to react. Further, I have a suspension that after they shortchange the customers later on they are going to vote for an increase for Commonwealth Edison if the past is prologue. So, I would like to urge, well is my personal vote, but I'm voting 'no' against this based on my personal protest."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3549?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty votes are required. Representative Morrow one minute to explain your vote."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Morrow: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I might have a possible conflict of interest on House Bill 3549. I will vote 'present' on House Bill 3549."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3549 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3646, Representative McCracken. Ryder. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is for the Secretary of State expenditures FY '90 \$219,400,000. FY '91 approp. \$249,800,000 the difference is \$30,400,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "If I heard you correctly this budget is up about \$30 million dollars. Why is that?"
- Ryder: "There are three programs that take part of the increase.

 Commercial Drivers Program which federally mandated as I recall the Literacy Program has some increase and mandatory insurance."
- Dunn: "And in connection with this \$30 million dollar increase in this budget, how many new personnel are in this budget?"
- Ryder: "It's my understanding there are no new personnel request."
- Dunn: "There are no new personnel in this budget?"
- Ryder: "Part of the increased cost for personnel services is because we are phasing, they phased in employment for two of those programs that I just mentioned and this is an annualization of those costs. But again, it is my understanding that we are not talking about new numbers of people."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

- Dunn: "So, thank you very much. I don't know what conclusion we are to draw from all of this. If this office is going to administer \$30 million dollars of new programs in the next year with the same number of people it has this year, makes me wonder if maybe they had too many people this year. But none the less..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3646?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Sixty 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'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3546 and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3727, Representative McPike or Leverenz. Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "I move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 3727."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 3727. Any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3727?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3727. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Children there appears Senate
 Bill 1593. The Bill was on the Order of Third Reading.
 Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.
 Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative
 Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

House."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It establishes a subcommittee on women's alcohol and substance abuse treatment within the Illinois Advisory alcoholism and other drug dependency. This Amendment is an Agreed Amendment between the department and the Citizens Counsel. With this Amendment it would remove the department's opposition and I know of no opposition to the Bill, or the Amendment. I would appreciate the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1593, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Trotter."

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

I don't need to belabor the issue. Representative Kubik
just told what the Bill was about. It creates a
subcommittee within the Department of DASA and I would ask
for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'aye', no one voting 'no'. This Bill having

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1496. I believe this matter is on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill has been moved back to Second Reading and held."

Speaker Madigan: "And I believe there was a request for a fiscal
 note."

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note has been filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hicks for a Motion on Senate Bill 1065."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1065 I would move to extend the deadline to June 30th, 1990. The reason being there are a some things in horse racing we're trying to work out. I think we can have more done by the end of next week."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to extend the deadline until June 30th, 1990. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ropp. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 104 people voting 'aye', 5 people voting 'no'. This Motion having received sufficient votes is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hicks for a Motion relative to Senate Bill 2083. Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2083 is the Savings Bank Act Bill. This Bill has been agreed to on both sides that will be held and we'd like to extend the deadline until November 30th, 1990. It is a shell Bill. We think we can use it for cleanup in the Act that's goint to take place in the near future. Thank you."

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to extend the Third Reading deadline relative to Senate Bill 2083 to November 30th. 1990. Those in favor of the Motion signify by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record? On this question, 114 people voting 'aye', no one voting 'no'. The Motion is adopted. The Chair is now prepared to adjourn. Unless there is some matter to be brought before the Body. Mr. Edley, did you have anything to bring before the Body? you have any wisdom to share with us on anything? to return on Monday at 4:00 o'clock. So I would thank you for your fine work this week, ask you to get some the weekend and be prepared to work through to the The Chair recognizes the Clerk for the adjournment end. Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 143 resolved by the House of Representatives of the 86th General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The Senate concurring herein; when the House of Representative adjourn of Friday June 22, 1990 it stands adjourned until Monday June 25, 1990 at 4:00 o'clock And when the Senate adjourns on Friday June 22, 1990. It stands adjourned until Monday June 25, 1990 at 12:00 o'clock noon."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The Motion is adopted. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, can we do that in Perfunctory? Alright fine. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 142, Klemm; House Resolution 1975 Noland; 1976, Speaker Madigan; 1977, Speaker Madigan; 1978, Ropp; 1979, Speaker Madigan; 1980, Noland; 1981, Goforth; 1982, Black; 1983, Balanoff; 1986,

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Speaker Madigan; 1987, White; 1989, Barger; 1990, Capparelli; 1992, Mulcahey; 1994, Hasara."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I move to adopt the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, on General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1988, offered by Representative Shaw."

Speaker Madigan: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1984, offered by Representative

Shaw with respect to the memory of Arnie Ruth Mason. House
Resolution 1985, offered by Representative Currie with
respect to the memory of Roland Pierre. House Resolution
1991, offered by Representative Cowlishaw with respect for
the memory of Gale D. Swang. House Resolution 1993,
offered by Representative Mautino - Leverenz, with respect
to the memory of Mauldin Jones"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions Mr. Clerk, alright. Okay. Mr. Cullerton moves adopted. that the House stand adjourned until 4:00 p.m. on Monday, 25, 1990 providing that there shall be a Perfunctory Session tomorrow from 9:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. Alright, strike that comment concerning the Perfunctory Session. There shall be a Perfunctory Session tomorrow beginning at 2:00 p.m. until the Clerk has finished reading messages from the Senate. And also providing for a Perfunctory Session this evening, for the same purpose? For the same purpose. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until

133rd Legislative Day

June 21, 1990

Monday at 4:00 p.m."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Miss Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives with the passage of the following Bills: together with the Amendments the adoption which I'm instructed to ask concurrence to the House to wit: House Bills number 3902, 3949, 3962, 4061, 4169, 4208, 3852, 3694, 3897, 3891, 3875, 3859, 3853, 3815, 3740, 3718, 493, 950, 951, 953, 982, 1269, 1504, 1681, 2367, 2388, 2543, 2884, 3019, 3024, 3131, 3149, 3164, 3167, 3168, 3202, 3220, 3273, 3290, 3310, 3330, 3406, 3454, 3506, 3536, 3614 and 3655. Passed the Senate as amended June 11, 1990, Linda Hawker, Secretary.' There being no further business, the House now adjourns until Perfunctory Session tomorrow at 2:00 p.m."

A STATE OF

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

SB-1593 SECOND READING

SH-1593 THIRD READING

SB-1613 THIRD READING

JUNE 21, 1990

91/01/17

15:45:27

HB-3001 CONCURRENCE PAGE 137 HB-3109 CONCURRENCE PAGE 122 PAGE 152 H8-3171 CONCURRENCE HB-3231 CONCURRENCE PAGE 153 153 HB-3264 NON-CONCURRENCE PAGE HB-3271 NON-CONCURRENCE PAGE 154 154 HB-3338 CONCURRENCE PAGE 155 PAGE HB-3340 CONCURRENCE HB-3341 CONCURRENCE PAGE 155 HB-3342 CONCURRENCE HB-3343 CONCURRENCE 156 PAGE PAGE 156 HB-3344 CONCURRENCE PAGE 156 PAGE 157 HB-3392 CONCURRENCE HB-3393 NON-CONCURRENCE PAGE 157 HB-3453 CONCURRENCE PAGE 158 HB-3457 CONCURRENCE PAGE 158 Ha-3459 CONCURRENCE PAGE 159 160 HB-3460 NON-CONCURRENCE PAGE HB-3461 CONCURRENCE HB-3463 CONCURRENCE PAGE 160 PAGE 161 HB-3464 CONCURRENCE PAGE 166 H8-3465 CONCURRENCE PAGE 167 HB-3466 CONCURRENCE HB-3467 CONCURRENCE 168 PAGE PAGE 169 HB-3472 CONCURRENCE PAGE 170 H3-3473 CONCURRENCE PAGE 171 H8-3474 CONCURRENCE PAGE 173 HB-3534 CONCURRENCE HB-3535 CONCURRENCE PAGE 175 PAGE 177 HB-3537 CONCURRENCE PAGE 178 HB-3538 CONCURRENCE PAGE 179 HB-3539 CONCURRENCE PAGE 179 HB-3540 CONCURRENCE PAGE 183 HB-3541 CONCURRENCE PAGE 184 HB-3544 CONCURRENCE PAGE 194 HB-3545 CONCURRENCE PAGE 196 HB-3546 CONCURRENCE HB-3547 CONCURRENCE 196 PAGE PAGE 197 HB-3548 CONCURRENCE PAGE 197 HB-3549 CONCURRENCE PAGE 198 HB-3646 CONCURRENCE PAGE 199 H8-3727 NON-CONCURRENCE PAGE 200 HB-3753 DISCUSSED PAGE 58 SB-0722 SECOND READING SB-0722 THIRD READING PAGE 46 PAGE 47 SB-1484 THIRD READING SB-1484 THIRD READING PAGE 3 PAGE 8 SB-1488 THIRD READING PAGE 4 SB-1491 SECOND READING PAGE 48 SB-1491 THIRD READING PAGE 51 PAGE SB-1496 SECOND READING SB-1496 MUTION 78 PAGE 143 S8-1501 THIRD READING PAGE 71 103 SB-1504 SECOND READING PAGE S3-1504 THIRD READING S8-1512 THIRD READING S8-1515 THIRD READING PAGE 107 PAGE 123 PAGE 22 SB-1523 SECOND READING PAGE 66 SB-1523 THIRD READING PAGE 67 SB-1532 DISCUSSED SB-1568 THIRD READING PAGE 14

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

75

200

201

6

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

67 ₁₇₀ or

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

91/01/17 1 :: 45:27

PAGE 12 PAGE 15 PAGE 108 PAGE 69 PAGE 148 PAGE 149

64

q

65

108 61

19

47

17

25

143 39

PAGE PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE 138 PAGE 139 PAGE 150 PAGE 47

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

JUNE 21, 1990

S6-1617 THIRD READING SB-1617 THIRD READING SB-1638 THIRD READING SB-1639 THIRD READING SB-1641 RECALLED SB-1641 THIRD READING

SB-1643 SECOND READING

SB-1643 THIRD READING

SB-1643 THIRD READING

SB-1704 THIRD READING SB-1838 THIRD READING

SB-1847 THIRD READING

SB-1874 SECOND READING SB-1874 THIRD READING SB-1905 THIRD READING

SB-1962 THIRD READING SB-1965 OUT OF RECORD

S8-1994 THIRD READING

SB-2001 MOTION SB-2020 THIRD READING

SB-2036 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-2067 SECOND READING	PAGE	150
SB-2067 THIRD READING	PAGE	151
SB-2075 THIRD READING	PAGE	18
SB-2076 SECOND READING	PAGE	45
SB-2076 THIRD READING	PAGE	46
SB-2084 THIRD READING	PAGE	17
SB-2113 DISCUSSED	PAGE	13
SB-2127 RECALLED	PAGE	142
SB-2127 THIRD READING	PAGE	142
S6-2150 SECOND READING	PAGE	32
SB-2150 THIRD READING	P-AGE	38
SB-2167 THIRD READING	PAGE	52
SB-2171 SECOND READING	PAGE	132
SB-2171 THIRD READING	PAGE	135
SB-2190 SECOND READING	PAGE	140
SB-2190 THIRD READING	PAGE	141
SB-2222 SECOND READING	PAGE	100
SB-2222 THIRD READING	PAGE	102
SB-2239 SECOND READING	PAGE	56
SB-2239 THIRD READING	PAGE	58
SB-2253 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-2253 THIRD READING	PAGE	135
SB-2267 SECOND READING	PAGE	112
SH-2267 THIRD READING	PAGE	115
SB-2277 SECOND READING	PAGE	58
SB-2277 THIRD READING	PAGE	59
SB-2308 SECOND READING	PAGE	120
S8-2308 THIRD READING	PAGE	121
SB-2309 THIRD READING	PAGE	70
SB-3143 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	152
SB-3339 CONCURRENCE		154
SB-3458 NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	159
SB-3462 NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	160
SB-3543 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	193
HJR-0143 ADOPTED HJR-0143 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	203
HJR-0143 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	203
MJK-0143 KESULUTION OFFERED	PAGE	203
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER GIGLIO	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND ALAN FANNING	PAGE	ī
PLEDGE	PAGE	ī
	· · ·	-

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES P . . DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

91/01/17 15:45:27

JUNE 21, 1990

SUBJECT MATTER

			_	
ROLL C	ALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2	
AGREEO	RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	Z	
GENERA	L RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2	
DEATH	RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2	
SPEAKE	R MADIGAN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	26	
REPRES	ENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	60	
REPRES	ENTATIVE CULLERTON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	122	
REPRES	ENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	143	
SPEAKE	R MADIGAN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	200	
AGREED	RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	203	
COMMIT	TEE ON ASSIGNMENT	PAGE	204	
DEATH	RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	204	
ADJOUR	NMENT	PAGE	204	
MESSAG	E FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	205	